Composition and Template-Based Approach for Persuasive Writing in Grade 10

Rachelle A. Cortez[1], Chester M. Derequito, MAEd[2]

Lucban Academy, Lucban, Quezon Laguna State Polytechnic University, San Pablo City, Laguna

Abstract:

This study aimed to investigate the effectiveness of composition writing templates in enhancing the persuasive writing skills of Grade 10 students. Specifically, it aimed to investigate the impact of student demographics on writing competencies, identify common gaps in persuasive writing, and evaluate the acceptability and validity of the writing templates in terms of format, content, presentation, and accuracy. The study used a developmental research design, focusing on the creation and evaluation of instructional material. A total of 42 Grade10 students from Lucban Academy participated in the study, completing pretest and post-test persuasive writing tasks. Eleven English teachers assessed the composition templates. Data collection involved a self-made questionnaire and an analytic rubric for scoring pretest and post-test tasks. Results showed that students faced challenges in understanding persuasive text features and formulating clear arguments. However, the use of composition templates significantly improved their writing skills, with post-test scores indicating a marked increase in proficiency. The templates were found to be highly acceptable across all evaluated areas: content, format, presentation and organization, and accuracy/up-to-datedness. Paired t-tests showed statistically significant improvement in the students' writing proficiency. The study concluded that structured writing templates are a valuable instructional tool for improving persuasive writing skills and recommended their continued use.

Keywords: **Composition templates, Persuasive Writing, Grade 10 Writing, Acceptability, Writing Composition.**

INTRODUCTION

The era of globalization has witnessed a remarkable trend in the worldwide acquisition of the English language. The ubiquity of English in various domains, from science and technology to education and entertainment, has made its acquisition increasingly crucial for individuals seeking greater opportunities for employment, travel, higher education, and an improved standard of living (Chand, 2021). The mastery of the English language lies on the mastery of the macro skills: listening, speaking, reading, writing, and viewing.

Writing is an effective instrument for conveying ideas, thoughts, and feelings, just like the other four key talents of speaking, listening, reading, and looking. Writing is a versatile communication tool that writers use to share their opinions and make unique remarks with readers. Writing requires a range of skills, including mastery of rhetoric and cognitive abilities. Skilled writers must possess a comprehensive mastery of syntax, grammar, and vocabulary and the ability to accurately assess, understand, and express their perspectives coherently. Liwanag (1999) asserts that writing is a collaborative endeavor that reflects our daily interactions and the contexts in which we engage.

Grade 10 students in the Philippine curriculum develop expertise in writing persuasive and argumentative essays, which are considered essential skills for conducting research. To effectively express their viewpoints and influence the ideas of others, tenth-grade students must have a considerable level of expertise in persuasive writing, as stated by Crowhurst (1990). Within the realm of ESL education, the ability to write persuasively not only enhances vocabulary and language proficiency but also equips students with the necessary skills to succeed in various academic and professional settings. Persuasive writing, as a genre, requires the writer to utilize appropriate rhetorical and linguistic structures to effectively convey their message and persuade the reader (Osman, 2021). This skill is particularly important for ESL learners, as it allows them to navigate complex academic and professional environments, where the ability to argue and convince is highly valued.

The ability to write persuasively is crucial for academic success. However, Filipino students frequently encounter challenges in this aspect due to linguistic and cultural barriers, limited resources and teacher training, the emphasis on rote learning in the Philippine education system, large class sizes, and the diverse needs of students. Understanding the nuances of persuasive writing in English, the primary language of instruction, can be a challenge for Filipino students.Furthermore, Filipino educators often face a shortage of adequate resources and opportunities for professional development to effectively teach persuasive writing. Moreover, the Philippine school system frequently places greater emphasis on memorization rather than on developing critical thinking and analytical abilities, both of which are crucial for effective persuasive writing. Furthermore, providing individualized feedback and support for persuasive writing development is challenging in large and diverse classrooms.

The preceding concepts and difficulties inherent in teaching and producing effective persuasive writing inspired the creation of composition templates to address these issues. Composition templates, by offering a structured framework, can guide students in developing well-organized and thoroughly supported persuasive compositions.

Background of the Study

Writing as one aspect of language learning is important because it enables students to express their ideas, thoughts, and feelings on various topics in a written form. It becomes an integral part of school and the workplace; thus, it should equip learners with the necessary competence to function in the real world.

Many students have been observed to have writing difficulties, whether it is a narrative, descriptive, persuasive, or argumentative essay they are tasked with writing. The writing process often takes some time, students find it hard to start, and there are extensive revisions before the final output. They find it hard to select an interesting topic in which he/she can produce enough information

and at the same time, catch the reader's attention. In other cases, the student-writer may not experience problems in selecting subject matter or generating enough ideas, but rather in organizing them. There are times when a writer's mind is overflowing with ideas that give them/a hard time organizing them. One of the most common reactions and questions of students after giving them a writing task is, "Sir/Ma'am, how many sentences?" Meeting the required number of sentences to write an essay became the primary objective of the student, just for compliance, not the expression of their thought.

By contrast, persuasive writing aims to get the reader to accept the writer's point of view by appealing to the reader's intellect. Aristotle's timeless maxims of ethos, pathos, and logos underscore the need for credibility, emotion, and logic in persuasive communication (Cross, 1991). Learning how to construct effective arguments is a crucial factor in achieving high-level success in learning (Isai et al., 2020).

Through persuasive writing, students can showcase their thought-provoking skills and develop logical, coherent solutions to challenges. It also enables meaningful contributions to academic discourse and influences educational policy and practice (Neeley & Ryder, 2016).

Persuasive writing is an essential requirement even in academia as well as in the professional world. "The art of communications is the language of leadership and communication skills are just a must for leaders – if you want to lead and be successful, you've got to be able to communicate," says Geri, who has helped professionals in a variety of fields, including social work and business, learn how to communicate their ideas and gain support from stakeholders to make the case for their company's goals and projects. The power of civic engagement depends in large part on the persuasive figuration of literature. People that can put their opinions to words eloquently, build an argument based on rational accepted premises, and provide evidence that show why they're right, and why the other person isn't, and act as such are better influences on the democratic process, and have the opportunity to mold policy and society for the better.

The Influence of Persuasive Writing: Has Writing Become a Basic Skill? Schools are teaching students the power of persuasive writing, so empower them. This, Crowhurst (1990) claims, allows students to develop the necessary skills to communicate effectively, think critically and productively participate in their communities (and the world in general) in a meaningful way, a claim with which I concur.

Teaching persuasive writing is a great challenge for teachers, as they need to supply students with sufficient tools and strategies to cover the difficulties of this academic writing (Cahyani, 2020). Research has shown (Crowhurst, 1990) that students struggle with persuasive writing, demonstrating a lack of ability to provide adequate evidence for their arguments, strategically organize their ideas, and use complex vocabulary. Additionally, this difficulty can be attributed to the cognitive demands of persuasive writing compared to narrative writing. The aim is to develop a well-reasoned, coherent, and logical argument that is mature, persuasive, and audience appropriate (Lechtenberg, 2013), in contrast to those types of writing that are very descriptive. Persuasive writing requires considering complex issues, understanding cause and effect relationships, and articulating insights gained from information.

The prevailing worry in the field of academic writing instruction is that students struggle to write high-quality papers because they lack sufficient scaffolding activities. Scaffolding, a concept originating from Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) theory, emphasizes the importance of providing strategic support to students to help them complete activities that are beyond their current skills (Azi, 2020; McCoy, 2017; Ikawati, 2020). On this note, teachers must be creative in providing innovative ways and strategies for teaching writing. Moreover, writing teachers must prepare materials and exercises that will prove significant in developing and enhancing students' writing abilities.

Existing research has explored the efficacy of various scaffolding techniques, including the use of composition templates as a means of supporting student writing. Composition templates, which provide a structured framework for organizing and developing written work, can serve as a valuable scaffolding tool, guiding learners through the key components of the writing process and enabling them to engage with the task's complexities in a more manageable way (Reiser, 2004).

In addition to that, the concept of writing templates itself is akin to controlled writing, also known as guided writing. Controlled writing or guided writing has been a tradition for a long time in English as a second/foreign language classrooms.

Raimes (1983), one of the main proponents of controlled writing, states that unlike free writing, controlled writing takes place when learners are supplied with a great deal of the content and/or form such as an outline to complete, a paragraph to manipulate, a model to follow, or a passage to continue. He argued that controlled writing is a process of reinforcing grammar, vocabulary, and syntax in context. In addition, as students write the passages, they are using the conventions of written English, such as indentation, punctuation, and connecting words, as well as correct spelling.

Composition templates serve as effective scaffolding tools in various educational contexts. Research investigating the application of scaffolded instruction in a junior English writing class found that the strategic use of a range of scaffolding strategies, including the use of composition templates, should be employed to motivate students to write, develop their writing proficiencies, and nurture their core literacies (Luo & Dai, 2023).

Moreover, as students' skills increase, the scaffolding in the templates can be phased out, allowing them to gain independence and expertise in the writing process (Diaferia et al., 2018).

The widespread adoption of technological advancements in academic infrastructure has raised questions about the integrity and originality of academic content (Dong, 2023). Composition templates, nonetheless, could provide a solution to this challenge that decreases the dependence on AI-generated content and fosters genuine academic language.

In summary, employing composition templates in the process of scaffolding education has appeared to be a promising pedagogical approach to provide learners an organized structure to interact with as factors that lead them to go through the writing process at a given moment in time, showing an engagement to deal with the complex content and strategies of the discipline in question. With the above ideas and reflections, the investigator planned a study on training persuasive writing skills and using writing templates as an intervention tool.

Statement of the Problem

This study attempted to utilize composition writing templates and determine how it contributes to the development of grade 10 students' persuasive writing proficiency. Specifically, this sought to answer the following questions:

1. What are the demographics of Grade 10 students, including sex, parents' educational attainment, monthly exam frequency, reading preferences, and reading habits?
2. Common gaps in students' persuasive writing.
3. What is the level of acceptability and validity of the templates for composition writing in terms of:
3.1. Format,
3.2. Content
3.3. Presentation and organization
3.4. Accuracy and up-to-date of information?
4. What is the proficiency level of student respondents in persuasive writing, in terms of their pretest and post-test scores?
5. Is there a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of the respondents' writing proficiency?

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employed a mixed-methods approach to create, test, and refine composition templates designed to enhance students' persuasive writing skills. The design is developmental, with the development of composition templates based on a combination of quantitative and qualitative data.

The quantitative aspect involved pre- and post-test measures of student persuasive writing, using a standardized rubric that assessed argument, structure, and clarity. Statistical analysis was used to determine whether the quality of writing improves significantly after using the templates.

In the qualitative section, the analysis focused on students' persuasive writing outputs, conducting a thematic analysis of recurring flaws, including those in organization, logical development of ideas, and the use of persuasive techniques. This analysis helps reveal where students find difficulty in persuasive writing.

Ultimately, this mixed-method approach provided both measurable evidence of improvement and in-depth insights into the specific writing challenges students faced, allowing for targeted adjustments to the templates.

Respondents of the Study

The primary respondents of the study were 42 Grade 10 students from a heterogeneously sectioned class in Lucban Academy, who were selected to participate in the pre-test and post-test persuasive writing tasks. These students also utilized the developed composition templates during the implementation phase of the study.

In addition, eleven English teachers, comprising two (2) Master Teachers, six (6) from public institutions, and three (3) from private institutions, served as expert validators. They evaluated the instructional material (composition templates) using DepEd's LRMDS assessment guidelines. Their feedback played a crucial role in revising and enhancing the quality of the instructional materials used in the study.

Research Instrument

The study utilized a self-made questionnaire that consisted of three main parts: (1) the respondents' demographic profile, (2) a Likert scale questionnaire to determine the respondents' reading preference and reading habit adapted from Nguyen (2022), and (3) the persuasive writing pretest task. To assess students' proficiency in persuasive writing, the study employed an adapted analytic scoring rubric from Brown and Bailey (1984), which includes components such as content, organization, vocabulary, language use, persuasive techniques and mechanics. This rubric was applied to both the pretest and posttest writing tasks, which were identical in format and prompt to ensure consistency in measurement.

Additionally, a survey instrument was used to determine the level of acceptability of the composition templates from the perspective of the teacher-respondents. This instrument was adapted from the Department of Education's (DepEd) Guidelines and Processes for LRMDS Assessment and Evaluation. The survey instrument was a modified Likert scale that assessed content, format, presentation, and organization, as well as the accuracy and up-to-dateness of the information. The posttest writing task followed the same structure and scoring procedure as the pretest to measure growth and changes in students' persuasive writing proficiency.

More so, the instruments were revised and finalized to ensure that they contain all the pertinent information and data needed in the study. The researcher presented it to the thesis adviser and other panel members for corrections and suggestions on its enhancement. The researcher asked for the content validation conducted by three (3) English experts to guarantee the quality of statements and alignment to the subject matter under the study.

Research Procedure

Instrumentation. To evaluate students' persuasive writing proficiency, the researcher used a self-made writing task aligned with Grade 10 content and performance standards of the K to 12 Curriculum. The same task was administered for both pre-test and post-test to ensure consistent measurement of students' growth. Outputs were assessed using a modified analytic rubric adapted from Brown and Bailey (1984), focusing on content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. To address gaps previously identified in students' persuasive writing, the researcher developed composition templates to serve as instructional material. These were validated by two (2) Master Teachers and nine (9) English experts (six from public and three from private institutions) using DepEd's LRMDS assessment guidelines. The validation tool, a Likert-scale questionnaire, assessed the content, format, organization, and accuracy of the information. Revisions were made based on expert feedback.

Implementation. Before the study, the researcher secured approval from the LSPU-San Pablo City Campus Graduate School and Applied Research Office and submitted a formal request to Lucban Academy on December 4, 2024. The pre-test was administered on December 17, 2024, to a selected heterogeneously grouped Grade 10 class. From December 18, 2024, to January 22, 2025, students used the validated composition templates. During the Christmas break, one template was completed independently with guidance provided via a group chat. Upon resumption of classes, students continued with the templates in face-to-face sessions. The

post-test, identical to the pre-test, was conducted in the fourth week of January 2025. Pre-tests were checked from mid-December to late January, followed by the post-test evaluation using the same rubric and procedures.

Data Analysis. The students' outputs were analyzed using both qualitative and statistical methods. Qualitative analysis interpreted writing performance, while statistical treatment identified measurable improvements. Pre-test results and feedback directly informed the development and revision of the composition templates, targeting specific areas for improvement.

Ethical Considerations. The study strictly adhered to ethical standards. Informed consent was obtained from all participants, and official permissions were secured from both the university and the target school. The anonymity and privacy of the respondents were protected by omitting their names from all records and maintaining the confidentiality of their data. The researcher ensured that all data collected were honestly presented, with no manipulation or fabrication of results, upholding the integrity and credibility of the research process.

Use of Artificial Intelligence Tools. The researcher utilized artificial intelligence (AI) tools, specifically ChatGPT (OpenAI) and Grammarly, to support certain aspects of the research process. These tools were employed for the following purposes: (1) grammar enhancement and improvement of clarity, coherence, and academic tone throughout the manuscript; and (2) assistance in organizing and articulating patterns during the qualitative thematic analysis. All insights, interpretations, and final decisions were made solely by the researcher. The use of AI tools did not involve the generation of data or the automation of academic judgment.

Statistical Treatment

The data on how students' demographics (sex, parents' educational attainment, monthly family income, reading preference, and reading habit) influence the writing competencies in grade 10 were analyzed using frequency, mean, and standard deviation.

Mean and standard deviation statistical treatment were used to describe the writing composition templates as perceived by the student-respondent.

In response to the presentation of descriptive data on the pretest and post-test scores, the performance of the student respondents in composition writing, as well as the frequency and percent distribution, was examined.

To analyze the result of the data in response to the inferential question of pretest and post-test comparison within groups, the paired sample t-test will be used.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Table 1: Profile of the Respondents in Terms of Sex

SEX	Frequency	Percentage
Male	22	52.4%
Female	20	47.6%
TOTAL	42	100.00%

Table 1 shows that the respondents comprise 22 males (52.4%) and 20 females (47.6%), resulting in a relatively balanced distribution by sex. This nearly equal representation provides a fair foundation for evaluating the influence of composition writing templates on persuasive writing proficiency, as it reduces the likelihood of gender–based bias in the results. Including both sexes in comparable proportions guarantees that the findings are more widely applicable to the broader population of Grade 10 students.

Recent literature supports the idea that gender-balanced samples contribute significantly to the validity of educational research. Santos and Aguilar (2019) emphasized that a nearly equal distribution of male and female students in classroom-based studies enhances the generalizability of findings, especially when evaluating pedagogical tools like writing templates. They argue that instructional methods should be designed to be universally effective, regardless of gender, to avoid biases in learning outcomes.

Similarly, Morales and Tan (2020) conducted a study on persuasive writing among Filipino high school students. They found minimal differences between male and female learners in terms of performance when exposed to the same instructional strategies. Their findings reinforce that the quality of teaching interventions more heavily influences writing proficiency than by sex-related cognitive variations.

Table 2 : Profile of the Respondents in Terms of Mother's Educational Attainment

Mother's Educational Attainment	Frequency	Percentage
Postgraduate	1	2.4%
College Graduate	27	64.3%
College Undergraduate	6	14.3%
High School Graduate	7	16.7%
High School Undergraduate	1	2.4%
TOTAL	42	100.00%

Table 2 shows that the majority of the respondents' mothers (64.3%) are college graduates, while smaller percentages are college undergraduates (14.3%), high school graduates (16.7%), and high school undergraduates (2.4%). Only 2.4% have attained postgraduate education. This distribution indicates that most respondents come from households where mothers have a relatively high level of formal education.

Recent studies affirm the strong correlation between a mother's educational attainment and her child's academic performance, particularly in literacy and writing. According to Delos Santos and Aragon (2019), children of mothers who have attained a college education are more likely to develop advanced reading and writing skills early on, largely because these mothers tend to provide structured learning environments and have a better understanding of educational expectations. Their research in public secondary schools showed that learners whose mothers had higher educational backgrounds scored significantly higher in language proficiency tests.

Expanding on this, Chua and Manlapig (2020) observed that college-educated mothers often engage in home-based literacy practices

such as reading aloud, vocabulary building, and assisting with homework. These practices contribute to a child's cognitive and linguistic development, which lays the groundwork for strong writing skills. The authors concluded that maternal education is a key factor in creating literacy-rich home environments.

Furthermore, Lopez and Gutierrez (2021) found that students with college-educated mothers displayed better organization and coherence in their writing, attributing this to higher levels of parental guidance, access to educational materials, and familiarity with academic standards. Their study emphasized that such students often benefit from indirect modeling of structured communication, which complements classroom writing instruction.

However, scholars also recognize the disparities faced by learners whose mothers have lower educational attainment. Reyes and Santos (2022) argued that students from less-educated households may lack home-based academic support but can thrive when provided with well-designed instructional scaffolds like writing templates. These templates help standardize writing development regardless of the learner's background by guiding students through the writing process step by step.

Table 3: Profile of the Respondents in Terms of Father's Educational Attainment

Father's Educational Attainment	Frequency	Percentage
Postgraduate	1	2.4%
College Graduate	26	61.9%
College Undergraduate	6	14.3%
High School Graduate	7	16.7%
High School Undergraduate	1	2.4%
Total	**42**	**100.00%**

As shown in Table 3, the majority of the respondents' fathers are college graduates (61.9%), followed by college undergraduates (14.3%) and high school graduates (16.7%), while the least are high school undergraduates (2.4%) and postgraduates (2.4%). This distribution demonstrates that, like the mother's profile, most fathers have achieved higher education, suggesting that many students come from relatively well-educated homes.

Recent studies reinforce the influence of paternal educational attainment on students' academic readiness and performance, particularly in language-related tasks. Martinez and Sarmiento (2019) emphasized that fathers with college degrees are more likely to engage in intellectual discourse at home and provide educational encouragement, which contributes to the development of their children's verbal and written communication skills. These fathers often model the value of education through both behavior and structured home activities that support academic success.

Lopez and Navarro (2020) found that paternal education had a significant influence on students' cognitive development and academic engagement in Filipino secondary schools. Their findings suggested that children whose fathers were college-educated showed greater motivation and confidence in language subjects, likely because they received both verbal reinforcement and consistent expectations related to academic achievement.

Ramos and Delacruz (2023) argued that structured interventions like composition writing templates help level the playing field for students from varying socioeconomic and educational backgrounds. They demonstrated that students with lower home literacy support still improved significantly in writing tasks when provided with guided writing frameworks and consistent teacher modeling.

Table 4: Profile of the Respondents in Terms of Monthly Family Income

Monthly Family Income	Frequency	Percentage
Less than 9,00	2	4.8%
9,100 to 18,200	10	23.8%
18,200 to 36,400	16	38.1%
36,400 to 63,700	6	14.3%
63,700 to 109,200	5	11.9%
109,200 to 182,000	2	4.8%
Above 182,000	1	2.4%
TOTAL	**42**	**100.00%**

Table 4 shows that majority of the respondents (38.1%) belongs to the families with a monthly income between ₱18,200 and ₱36,400, while 23.8% fall within the ₱9,100 to ₱18,200. Moreover, a smaller percentage belongs to higher income (14.3%) earning ₱36,400 to ₱63,700, (11.9%) earn ₱63,700 to ₱109,200, and only (2.4%) earn above ₱182,000. Notably, 4.8% of families earn less than ₱9,000 monthly. This implies that the majority of the family came from low- to middle-income families. Often signaled by family wealth, socioeconomic status (SES) significantly impacts students' academic success, especially their development of writing ability.

According to Rivera and Mendoza (2019), students from low- to middle-income families often face limitations in access to educational resources such as books, tutoring services, internet connectivity, and quiet study environments, all of which are essential for effective writing development. Their study among junior high school students in Metro Manila found a consistent gap in writing scores correlated with income levels, stressing the need for structured classroom interventions.

Soriano and Calimag (2020) highlighted how lower-income families frequently prioritize basic needs over academic materials, which can inadvertently affect students' language development and academic motivation. They emphasized that school-based tools, such as composition templates, help mitigate disparities by providing consistent writing instruction that doesn't rely on external support systems. These templates are especially beneficial to students whose home environments lack the literacy-rich conditions typically available to higher-income peers.

Fernandez and Lucero (2023) found that strategy-based writing instruction led to a marked improvement in coherence and organization among students from low-income households. Their data suggested that explicitly teaching students how to plan and structure their writing through templates had a more profound effect on struggling writers than on their higher-income peers, demonstrating the compensatory potential of structured interventions.

Table 5: Profile of the Respondents in Terms of Most Preferred Reading Material at Home

Most Preferred Reading Material at Home	Frequency	Percentage
Magazines	2	4.8%
Dictionary	1	2.4%
Academic Books	8	19.0%
English Stories	4	9.5%
Newspaper	12	28.6%
Wattpad	1	2.4%
Pocket Books	5	11.9%
Others	9	21.4%
TOTAL	**42**	**100.00%**

Table 5 reveals a diverse range of reading preferences among the respondents. The majority of the respondents ' preferred reading materials were newspapers (28.6%), followed by academic books (19.0%) and materials categorized as "others" (21.4%). Additional preferences include pocket books (11.9%), English stories (9.5%), magazines (4.8%), Wattpad (2.4%), and dictionaries (2.4%). This suggests that students are exposed to a wide range of texts at home, which may influence how they process and create written information.

According to Villanueva and Santos (2019), exposure to informational texts, such as newspapers and academic books, enhances students' ability to understand argumentative structures, vocabulary precision, and persuasive techniques, skills essential for effective composition writing. Their study among junior high school students in Manila revealed a strong correlation between frequent reading of news and opinion articles and improved performance in persuasive writing tasks.

Lopez and Dela Cruz (2020) found that students who regularly read both fiction (e.g., pocketbooks, Wattpad) and nonfiction materials (e.g., newspapers) displayed greater flexibility in language use and tone in their compositions. Fiction readers demonstrated better narrative flow and creativity, while nonfiction readers performed well in structuring logical arguments. These findings underscore the importance of fostering diverse reading habits to cultivate well-rounded writers.

Sarmiento et al. (2025) concluded that the strategic use of writing templates in the classroom significantly helps students transfer knowledge from their reading habits into structured writing. Templates serve as cognitive organizers that bridge reading exposure and writing performance, particularly when students are taught how to mimic organizational patterns found in their preferred reading genres.

Examining the possible impact of Grade 10 students' reading interests and habits on their writing skills, Table 6 shows the average scores and standard deviations. With a total mean of 3.10 under the Reading Attitude component, which comes under the "Often" category, the results indicate that students usually have a good attitude toward reading. Students especially believe that reading increases their vocabulary (M = 3.55, SD = 0.50) and is a good use of time (M = 3.26, SD = 0.63), showing awareness of reading's educational worth.

Table 6: Students Reading Preference and Reading Habit Influence to the Writing Competencies of Grade 10

		Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
A. Reading Attitude	1. Reading is rewarding and interesting.	3.21	0.47	Often
	2. Reading helps to improve my vocabulary significantly	3.55	0.50	Always
	3. I usually take notes of less-common words, idiomatic expressions, colloquialisms, or useful structures from the texts.	2.81	0.63	Often
	4. I am into discussing the contents of the books with my peers.	2.69	0.84	Often
	5. Reading is a valuable use of time.	3.26	0.63	Always
	Total	3.10	0.44	Often
B. Reading Frequency	1. Despite being busy with my homework, I try to find some time to read every day.	2.64	0.79	Often
	2. I read at least two English articles or journals every week.	2.05	0.73	Rarely
	3. I finish at least one book every month.	2.62	0.79	Often
	4. I read at least two English books (not including textbooks) each semester.	2.55	0.71	Often
	5. I buy or borrow at least one new book every three months.	2.07	0.87	Rarely
	Total	2.39	0.53	Rarely
C. Time Spent Reading	1. I read for less than 30 minutes a day.	2.67	1.03	Often
	2. I read for 30 minutes to 1 hour daily.	2.19	0.83	Rarely
	3. I read for 1 to 2 hours daily.	2.05	0.91	Rarely
	4. I read for 1 to 2 hours daily.	1.79	0.75	Rarely
	5. I read for 4 or more hours daily.	1.68	0.79	Rarely
	Total	2.08	0.51	Rarely
D. Reading Purpose	1. I read to relax and relieve stress.	2.93	0.81	Often
	2. I read to relax and relieve stress.	3.05	0.76	Often
	3. I read to gain knowledge and stay informed about the world.	2.74	0.86	Often
	4. I read for academic purposes like assignments, writing, or exam prep.	3.07	0.84	Often
	5. I read to understand different perspectives and opinions.	2.98	0.92	Often
	Total	2.95	0.61	Often

Note: 3.5-4.0 Always, 2.5-3.49 Often, 1.5-2.49 Rarely, 1.0-1.49 Never

The Reading Frequency category, on the other hand, produced a lower overall mean of 2.39, implying that while students value reading, they only sometimes engage with it. "I read at least two English articles or journals every week" (M = 2.05) and "I buy or borrow at least one new book every three months" (M = 2.07) are among specific indications that fall inside the "Rarely" category, suggesting irregular and inconsistent reading practices. Under Time Spent Reading, the overall average is likewise just 2.08, suggesting that many students do not spend much time each day reading. Most of the answers indicated little immersion in large reading activities; they strongly disagreed with reading for four or more hours per day (M = 1.68) and opposed reading for 1 to 2 hours (M = 2.05).

With a total mean of 2.95, the Reading Purpose component shows rather good involvement, classed as "Often." Students reported reading for several reasons, including relaxation (M = 3.05), information acquisition (M = 2.74), and academic assignments (M = 3.07), indicating that they view reading as both practical and personally rewarding.

These results suggest that although students often view reading favorably and appreciate its value, their perceptions may not align with their actual reading practices and time commitment. Higher writing skill development may be affected by this disparity, particularly in fields that require lexical richness, syntactic fluidity, and logical coherence, which are typically cultivated through regular and thorough reading (Krashen, 2004). Guthrie and Wigfield's (2000) research underlines the importance of motivation and regular reading participation as key indicators of academic performance in language-related activities, including writing.

The relevance for teaching lies in the necessity to promote good reading attitudes and design organized initiatives that support regular reading practices and time allocation, especially with English resources outside of textbooks. Promoting individual reading via book clubs, reading journals, or combined reading-writing assignments could help close the gap between reading attitudes and actual practices, improving writing ability.

Figure 2

*A Student's Persuasive Essay Attempting Structure And Argument But Lacking Coherence And Support*The essay attempts to follow a traditional structure, comprising an introduction, body, and conclusion; however, it lacks clear paragraph transitions and an overall cohesive flow. While an introduction is present, it is vague, and the body paragraphs repeat ideas without a logical progression. This weak organization makes it difficult for the reader to follow the writer's line of reasoning from one point to the next.

Although the student's stance is clear, the ideas are underdeveloped and lack specific supporting evidence. The repetition of general statements such as "we should not hurt them" and "we should appreciate them" suggests a limited effort to elaborate on or deepen the argument. This underdevelopment results in a persuasive essay that feels superficial and unconvincing.In terms of language mechanics, the essay contains frequent errors in verb tense, subject-verb agreement, punctuation, and sentence structure, which interfere with the clarity of the message. Misuse of homophones and awkward phrasing further indicate a weak grasp of grammar and basic writing conventions.The use of persuasive techniques is minimal. The student makes some effort to appeal emotionally to the reader with phrases like "they have feelings too," but the essay lacks variety in its rhetorical strategies. There is little to no use of logical reasoning, appeals to credibility, or counterarguments, and rhetorical devices are largely absent.While the tone of the essay is sincere and empathetic, the quality of expression is simplistic and repetitive. The vocabulary is basic, and the sentence structures are uniform, which limits the writer's ability to express ideas in a compelling way.The student demonstrates a partial understanding of persuasive writing by identifying a topic and forming an opinion. However, there is a noticeable struggle with composing a structured, multi-paragraph essay and using a range of persuasive techniques. These issues reflect common gaps in students' ability to execute the demands of persuasive writing tasks fully.

Figure 3

*A Student's Persuasive Essay Expressing Personal Experience And Emotional Appeal With Limited Development*Figure 3 showcases a handwritten persuasive essay written from a personal perspective as a member of the LGBTQ+ community. The student clearly advocates for respect and anti-bullying efforts, expressing a heartfelt and sincere viewpoint. However, several areas fall short when evaluated against the rubric criteria.

In terms of organization, the essay lacks clear structural boundaries between the introduction, body, and conclusion. Although the tone is conversational, the ideas are loosely arranged, with limited paragraphing and abrupt shifts in topic. This lack of coherence makes it difficult for the reader to follow the argument in a logical and structured manner.

The development of ideas reflects genuine emotion and lived experience, but the arguments themselves are not systematically explored. Important points, such as the need for inclusive school policies and the discouragement of LGBTQ+ jokes, are mentioned but not sufficiently elaborated or anchored to a central thesis. This weakens the essay's persuasive impact.

Frequent grammar, punctuation, and mechanical issues further hinder the clarity of the writing. Errors in subject-verb agreement, inconsistent sentence boundaries, and informal phrasing, for example, "no need to become a no nothing shameless no life bully", affect readability. Some evidence of teacher edits suggests an attempt to correct structure and phrasing, indicating that the student may require support in this area.

Persuasive techniques are mostly limited to emotional appeal and personal narrative. While these can be powerful, the absence of logical reasoning, credible evidence, and effective rhetorical strategies weakens the argument. Devices such as repetition or rhetorical questions appear sporadically but are not consistently or skillfully used.

The tone of the piece is earnest and authentic, and the use of a first-person voice adds a relatable quality. However, the overall style suffers from informality, repetitive language, and run-on sentences. These features reduce the maturity and impact of the expression.

The student demonstrates competence in articulating an opinion and makes an effort to construct a persuasive text. Nonetheless, the lack of structural coherence and the narrow range of persuasive strategies highlight significant learning gaps. This essay underscores the need for targeted instruction in organizing content effectively and deepening the development of persuasive arguments.

Figure 4

A Student's Persuasive Essay Advocating For LGBTQ+ Rights With Passion But Weak Organization And Evidence

Figure 4 features a handwritten persuasive essay in which the student advocates for fair treatment of the LGBTQ+ community. The writer presents a strong stance and conveys clear passion for the topic. While there are several strengths in the piece, there are also notable areas for improvement when viewed through the lens of the rubric criteria.

The essay follows a multi-paragraph structure, comprising an introduction, body, and conclusion. However, the boundaries between these sections are not marked, and the transitions between ideas are weak. As a result, the logical flow of the argument is disrupted, making it harder for the reader to track the writer's line of reasoning.

The central message, promoting acceptance and advocating for policy change, is communicated with conviction. The student raises relevant issues, including bullying, school dress codes, and freedom of expression. However, these points are introduced briefly and without adequate elaboration or supporting evidence. This lack of development weakens the overall persuasiveness of the essay.

In terms of grammar, punctuation, spelling, and mechanics, the writing contains numerous errors. Sentence fragments, subject-verb agreement problems, and inconsistent punctuation are common. The text includes several edits, suggesting repeated mistakes in word choice, sentence construction, and capitalization. Examples such as "criticize," "theirs," and "themselves" indicate confusion with correct usage and standard conventions.

The essay's persuasive strategies rely heavily on emotional appeal and inclusive language. Statements like "they deserve to be their selves" reflect a strong sense of empathy. However, the argument lacks logical reasoning or factual support, and the calls to action, such as changing school dress code policies, are not well justified or fully explained.

The tone throughout the piece is empathetic and shows youthful passion. While the sincerity is a strength, the writing often leans toward redundancy and informality. Vocabulary is basic and frequently repeated, and stylistic elements like rhetorical emphasis (e.g., "If they want to be a boy, just be it") vary in effectiveness.

The student shows the ability to take a position and make an effort to structure a persuasive response. However, the essay falls short in using persuasive techniques in persuasive writing. The content also lacks depth. To support growth, instruction should focus on helping students build coherence, expand their reasoning, and refine rhetorical strategies for more effective persuasive writing.

Figure 5 presents a handwritten persuasive essay in which the student advocates for inclusivity and respect for LGBTQ+ students in school settings. The writer takes a clear stance and addresses relevant issues, such as equal treatment and the importance of respectful behavior. However, when assessed against the rubric and curriculum guide, several areas for improvement become apparent.

The essay follows a basic three-part structure, introduction, body, and conclusion, but the internal organization is weak. Ideas are listed without strong transitions or clear topic sentences, which creates a disjointed reading experience. The lack of cohesive structure makes it difficult for the reader to see how one point builds upon another, weakening the argument's overall flow.

Figure 5

A Student's Persuasive Essay Promoting Inclusivity With Surface-Level Ideas And Minimal Transitions

While the student expresses support for anti-discrimination policies and respectful language, the development of these ideas is superficial. Arguments are presented without elaboration, and there is some confusion between broad values like "respect" and more concrete policy suggestions. This limits the persuasive impact and clarity of the message.

There are numerous issues related to grammar, punctuation, spelling, and mechanics. Sentence fragments, inconsistent verb tenses, awkward phrasing, and subject-verb agreement errors are frequent. The presence of many teacher corrections throughout the essay indicates that the student struggles with standard writing conventions and overall clarity.

In terms of persuasive techniques, emotional appeal is evident through the use of inclusive and positive language, such as "each individual has the right." However, logical appeals and concrete evidence are absent. Suggested solutions, such as implementing rules or limitations, are vague and underexplained, reducing the effectiveness of the persuasive call to action.

The tone of the essay is sincere and respectful, aiming to foster a welcoming environment. Despite this, the style is overly simplistic and repetitive. Limited word choice and lack of sentence variety result in a flat, less engaging narrative that does not reflect the depth of expression expected at the Grade 10 level.

The student demonstrates a basic ability to express a viewpoint and follow a general persuasive structure. However, the underdeveloped content and minimal use of persuasive strategies point to significant gaps in the persuasive writing competencies. To support the student's growth, instruction should focus on improving content organization, elaboration, and the strategic use of rhetorical techniques.

Figure 6

A Student's Persuasive Essay Supporting LGBTQ+ Equality With Sincerity But Limited Structure And Rhetorical Skill

Figure 6 presents a Grade 10 student's handwritten persuasive essay that advocates for respect and equal treatment of LGBTQ+ individuals. The writer communicates a sincere and empathetic message, showing personal conviction on the topic. However, notable weaknesses appear when evaluated against the rubric and curriculum standards.

The essay is written as a single continuous block of text, lacking paragraph breaks or transitions. Although there is an identifiable introduction and a closing sentiment, the main arguments are not separated or organized. The absence of paragraphing and structural markers negatively affects coherence, making the progression of ideas difficult to follow.

The student's central position —that LGBTQ+ people deserve respect and equality —is clear, but the supporting points are underdeveloped. While the writer addresses relevant issues such as gender identity, school policies, and comfort rooms, these topics are mentioned only briefly and without logical development. The repetition of ideas and lack of elaboration weaken the argument's clarity and persuasive impact.

Grammatical and mechanical issues are frequent throughout the essay. Incorrect verb tenses, awkward word choices (such as "feel disrespected receiving not good words"), and run-on or unclear sentences disrupt the flow and comprehension. The presence of extensive teacher corrections indicates ongoing challenges with writing conventions that significantly impact meaning.

In terms of persuasive techniques, the essay employs emotional appeal, as evident in phrases like "they have feelings too." However, these appeals are not well developed or reinforced by logic, credibility, or evidence. Broad generalizations are made without explanation, reducing the effectiveness of the overall argument.

The tone of the essay is compassionate and inclusive, which is a strength. However, the quality of expression is hampered by limited vocabulary, vague phrasing, and repetitive language. The lack of sentence variety and specificity prevents the message from being as compelling as it could be.

Regarding curriculum alignment, the student demonstrates the ability to state an opinion and attempt persuasive writing. However, the essay reflects significant gaps in persuasive writing, including difficulties with organizing content into a multi-paragraph format and using a range of persuasive strategies. Targeted instructional support is needed to help the student develop coherence, expand reasoning, and strengthen rhetorical techniques in persuasive writing.

Figure 7

A Student's Persuasive Dialogue Offering Support With Informal Tone And Disorganized Reasoning

Figure 7 presents a handwritten persuasive text structured as a fictional dialogue directed toward an LGBTQ+ individual. The student adopts an empathetic and conversational tone, attempting to offer reassurance and support. However, this informal format presents significant challenges in terms of structure, coherence, and the execution of persuasive writing techniques when evaluated against rubric criteria and curriculum expectations.

The organization of the piece deviates from the standard persuasive format. Rather than following an introduction, body, and conclusion structure, the text unfolds as a loosely connected monologue. Ideas appear scattered, with no clear sequencing or transitions. As a result, the reader struggles to follow a logical progression or identify the key components of a coherent argument. The central idea, promoting acceptance and expressing solidarity with LGBTQ+ individuals, is evident but weakly developed. Statements are made in a casual, disjointed fashion, often without explanation or elaboration. Abrupt shifts in tone, unclear references, and an overall lack of cohesive development muddle the message. Inconsistencies in the delivery dilute the intended message of support.

In terms of language mechanics, the draft exhibits numerous errors in sentence structure, verb tense, and punctuation. Phrasing is often unclear or incorrect, as seen in examples like "pulling my leg paper," which disrupts meaning and confuses the reader. Teacher annotations throughout the text indicate ongoing struggles with basic grammar and clarity in written expression.

The use of persuasive techniques is minimal and unstructured. The student attempts emotional appeals through direct address and affirming language such as "don't let them drag you down" but vague and sometimes contradictory statements weaken these. There is no use of logical reasoning, factual support, or rhetorical devices typically expected in persuasive writing.

Stylistically, the tone is well-intentioned and inclusive, yet overly informal for the genre. Expressions like "you're good on my book" are grammatically flawed and out of place in a persuasive academic context. The language lacks the precision, variety, and maturity expected at the Grade 10 level. Ideas are often repetitive or unclear, which undermines the piece's effectiveness.

The student demonstrates a basic awareness of persuasive purpose (criterion b) and a desire to communicate empathy. However, the format departs significantly from conventional persuasive structures, and the lack of strategic persuasive techniques or organized content development indicates underperformance in persuasive writing. The use of a fictional dialogue may reflect creative intent, but it does not align with the expectations for a persuasive task as defined in the Grade 10 curriculum guide. Targeted instruction in structure, genre conventions, and rhetorical strategy is necessary to support the student's growth in persuasive writing.

Figure 8

A Student's Persuasive Essay Calling For School Policy Changes With Relevant Ideas But Unclear Structure

Figure 8 displays a handwritten persuasive essay in which a Grade 10 student calls for school-based policy changes to better support LGBTQ+ students. The essay presents a strong and sincere appeal for inclusion and institutional accountability; however, several challenges arise when assessed against the rubric criteria and curriculum expectations.

The organizational structure is weak. The entire essay is presented as a single long paragraph, which affects both clarity and readability. While there is a progression of ideas, from identifying existing problems to recommending policy changes, the absence of paragraph breaks and transition markers results in a lack of structural coherence. This limits the reader's ability to follow the development of the student's argument easily.

The student's stance is clearly articulated, and the essay raises several relevant concerns, including restrictive grooming rules, the importance of using inclusive pronouns, and the value of safe spaces such as gender-affirming comfort rooms. However, while these issues are timely and relevant, they are only briefly mentioned and not thoroughly explored. The argument relies on generalizations and lacks the kind of detailed support or specific examples that would strengthen the essay's persuasive power.

Mechanical issues are frequent and disruptive. The writing includes sentence run-ons, errors in subject-verb agreement, misplaced modifiers, and unclear phrasing. These problems significantly affect the clarity of the message. Numerous teacher edits throughout the text suggest difficulties with sentence structure and control of standard grammar conventions.

In terms of persuasive techniques, the student attempts to use cause-effect reasoning to advocate for policy reform, as seen in statements like "by making policies… they will feel accepted." However, emotional and logical appeals are inconsistently applied, and the essay lacks variety in its rhetorical strategies. There is no use of factual evidence or real-life examples to support the claims, which weakens the overall persuasiveness of the piece.

The tone of the writing is earnest and solution-oriented, demonstrating a commendable desire to promote equity and respect. Still, the expression is often vague and repetitive. Limited vocabulary and awkward sentence constructions detract from the overall fluency and impact. Efforts to use persuasive language are evident but are undermined by mechanical and stylistic challenges.

The student demonstrates a foundational understanding of persuasive writing, including the ability to express a clear opinion and reference relevant issues. The essay also attempts to follow the conventions of persuasive composition. However, the lack of structured paragraphing, underuse of diverse persuasive techniques, and weak content development reveal notable gaps in persuasive writing. To advance this student's writing, instruction should focus on improving paragraph structure, sentence control, and the strategic use of rhetorical strategies.

Figure 9 features a handwritten persuasive essay that advocates for fairness and school policy changes to support LGBTQ+ students better. The student conveys a clear and heartfelt perspective, maintaining a respectful tone throughout. While the piece demonstrates a greater degree of organization than previous samples, it also reveals several recurring issues across key assessment criteria.

Figure 9

A Student's Persuasive Essay Advocating For Fairness With Emerging Structure And Underdeveloped Arguments

The essay demonstrates structural awareness, featuring a recognizable introduction, clear development of ideas, and a well-crafted conclusion. This reflects growth in organizational control. However, the lack of paragraphing and weak transitions between points affect the pacing and overall coherence of the writing. Ideas are presented sequentially but without the connective tissue needed to create fluid and logically ordered arguments.

The development of ideas is focused on relevant topics such as social exclusion, dress code policies, and the importance of promoting acceptance. While these points are pertinent, they are stated briefly and without the elaboration or specific examples necessary to deepen their impact. In some cases, connections between cause and effect are not clearly explained; for instance, references to "haircut" and "feeling insecure" are not logically unpacked, leaving the reasoning underdeveloped.

Grammatical and mechanical issues are present throughout the piece. Common problems include awkward phrasing, inconsistent punctuation, article omissions, and errors in syntax and word choice. Despite these issues, the student's intended meaning remains largely understandable. Teacher annotations in the margins point to areas where language clarity could be improved with direct instruction and practice.

Persuasive techniques are used in a limited but genuine way. Emotional appeal is the most evident strategy, with the student referencing feelings of being left out and the impact of criticism on individual self-esteem. However, there is little to no use of logical reasoning, factual evidence, or rhetorical techniques such as counterargument or analogy. The persuasive strategy remains surface-level, relying heavily on moral sentiment rather than structured reasoning.

In terms of style, the tone is consistently supportive and inclusive. The writing demonstrates a genuine effort to promote equity and understanding. However, the expression is often repetitive, and the vocabulary lacks variety. Some phrasing is vague or imprecise, which dilutes the strength of the student's message.

The student demonstrates competency in establishing a point of view and recognizing key traits of persuasive writing. The structure of a persuasive argument is emerging, though inconsistent, and there is an underuse of strategic techniques in persuasive writing. Continued support in paragraphing, idea elaboration, and rhetorical strategy will help the student progress toward producing more compelling and well-rounded persuasive texts.

Table 7: Level of Acceptability and Validity of the Templates for Composition Writing in Terms of Content

Factor 1: Content	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. Content is suitable to the student's level of development.	4.00	0.00	Highly Acceptable
2. Material contributes to the achievement of specific objectives of the subject area and grade/year level for which it is intended.	3.91	0.30	Highly Acceptable
3 Material provides for the development of higher cognitive skills such as critical thinking, creativity, learning by doing, inquiry, problem solving, etc.	3.91	0.30	Highly Acceptable
4.Material is free of ideological, cultural, religious, racial, and gender biases and prejudices.	4.00	0.00	Highly Acceptable
5.Material enhances the development of desirable values and traits.	3.91	0.30	Highly Acceptable
6. Material has the potential to arouse interest of target reader.	3.91	0.30	Highly Acceptable
7. Adequate warning/cautionary notes are provided in topics and activities where safety and health are of concern.	3.55	0.52	Highly Acceptable
Total	3.88	0.11	Highly Acceptable

Note: 3.5-4.0 Highly Acceptable, 2.5-3.49 Acceptable, 1.5-2.49 Fairly Acceptable, 1.0-1.49 Not Acceptable

Table 3.1 shows that the composition writing templates were rated as "Highly Acceptable" in terms of content, with an overall mean of 3.88 (SD=0.11). Each item within this category—ranging from suitability to the students' developmental level to the ability to arouse interest—received high mean scores, mostly clustered at 3.91 and 4.00, suggesting strong consensus among evaluators regarding the content quality of the templates. Notably, the highest-rated indicators were those about developmental appropriateness (M = 4.00) and cultural sensitivity (M = 4.00), reflecting the material's alignment with both cognitive and affective dimensions of learning. The lowest rating (M = 3.55) was given to the provision of cautionary or safety notes, which, although still within the "Highly Acceptable" range, indicates a minor area for enhancement.

The results suggest that the writing templates are well-crafted to meet the academic and ethical criteria of instructional materials. High content ratings confirm the templates' fit with curriculum goals and their encouragement of higher-order thinking skills such as critical thinking and problem-solving which are vital in forming persuasive writing competency. Delos Reyes and Gonzales (2020) found that composition writing materials tailored to the cognitive levels of junior high school students significantly improved their ability to craft persuasive essays. Their findings emphasized that when content is developmentally appropriate and aligned with curriculum goals, students are more likely to engage with the material and perform better.

Similarly, Miranda and Bautista (2021) stressed the importance of integrating values education and critical thinking in writing instruction. Their study found that writing activities that incorporated ethical themes, cultural sensitivity, and inquiry-based prompts resulted in greater student awareness and improved argumentative skills. This aligns with the high acceptability rating received by the templates in the present study, especially regarding the promotion of desirable values and bias-free content. In addition, Ramos et al. (2023) evaluated educational materials used in Filipino classrooms and highlighted the need for resources that not only meet cognitive objectives but also stimulate learners' interest and creativity. Their research supports the inclusion of elements in writing materials that develop higher-order thinking skills such as problem-solving and creativity both of which received high scores in the current assessment of the writing templates.

Moreover, a study by Santos and David (2024) found that student engagement in writing tasks increases when the materials are contextually relevant and presented in a structured format. They emphasized that interest-boosting content is a key driver in the long-term development of writing proficiency. This supports the high rating given to the templates for their potential to pique the interest of student users.

Lastly, Vicente and Legaspi (2019) noted that while most instructional materials are strong in content, they often overlook practical concerns, such as safety instructions, in student activities. This insight explains the relatively lower score on cautionary notes in the current study, suggesting a commonly overlooked area in content development that should be addressed to improve instructional validity.

Table 8: Level of Acceptability and Validity of the Templates for Composition Writing in Terms of Format: Prints

Factor 2: Format	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. Prints			
1.1 Size of letters is appropriate to the intended user.	3.91	0.30	Highly Acceptable
1.2 Spaces between letters and words facilitate reading.	3.91	0.30	Highly Acceptable
1.3 Font is easy to read.	3.91	0.30	Highly Acceptable
1.4 Printing is of good quality (i.e., no broken letters, even density, correct alignment, properly placed screen registration).	4.00	0.00	Highly Acceptable
Total	3.93	0.16	Highly Acceptable

Note: 3.5-4.0 Highly Acceptable, 2.5-3.49 Acceptable, 1.5-2.49 Fairly Acceptable, 1.0-1.49 Not Acceptable

The data in Table 8 indicates that the composition writing templates are highly acceptable in terms of format, particularly in terms of print features. Each subcomponent under Factor 2, letter size, spacing, font readability, and print quality, received consistently high mean scores ranging from 3.91 to 4.00, with an overall average of 3.93 and a very low standard deviation of 0.16. This minimal variation in scores reflects a strong agreement among evaluators regarding the templates' usability and visual quality. The highest possible score of 4.00 for print quality implies that respondents found no visible issues in terms of printing output, such as broken letters or misalignment, suggesting meticulous attention to production standards.

These results emphasize that visual clarity is a crucial factor in instructional materials, particularly in writing templates, where learners require clear textual guidance. Well-designed templates help reduce visual strain and promote engagement during writing activities, particularly for beginning writers who are still developing their reading and writing fluency.

Recent literature supports the importance of visual and print features in educational tools. Velasco et al. (2020) emphasized that text formatting, including font size and spacing, directly affects learners' reading fluency and cognitive processing, especially among elementary and language learners. Their study concluded that materials designed with readable fonts and adequate spacing reduce reading fatigue and improve comprehension. Gomez and Sanchez (2021) also found that clean and consistent formatting enhances students' engagement and reduces errors during writing tasks, particularly when templates are used to scaffold writing activities. Their research highlighted that good print quality and appropriate text structure significantly contribute to writing performance and clarity of expression.

Furthermore, Lozano and Perez (2022) emphasized that high print quality and visual accessibility are crucial in inclusive education, particularly for learners with visual impairments or learning difficulties. They advocate for the integration of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) principles in printed materials, which the evaluated templates align with, given their high acceptability in legibility and format.

Lastly, Chen et al. (2019) noted that instructional materials that follow modern design principles, such as high-resolution printing, logical spacing, and age-appropriate fonts, positively influence learning outcomes by increasing motivation and reducing distractions.

These results indicate that the design decisions that may pertain to the template in terms of letter size, spacing, and appropriate materials are of crucial importance for assisting users to perform interactions and comprehend the content. This is critical for the design of more general educational resources, in which formatting could play a crucial role in learning effects.

Table 9: Level of Acceptability and Validity of the Templates for Composition Writing in Terms of Format: Illustrations

Factor 2: Format	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
2. Illustrations			
2.1 Simple and easily recognizable.	3.91	0.30	Highly Acceptable
2.2 Clarify and supplement the text.	3.91	0.30	Highly Acceptable
2.3 Properly labelled or captioned (if applicable)	3.82	0.40	Highly Acceptable
2.4 Realistic / appropriate colors.	3.82	0.40	Highly Acceptable
2.5 Attractive and appealing.	3.82	0.40	Highly Acceptable
2.6 Culturally relevant.	3.73	0.47	Highly Acceptable
Total	3.83	0.24	Highly Acceptable

Note: 3.5-4.0 Highly Acceptable, 2.5-3.49 Acceptable, 1.5-2.49 Fairly Acceptable, 1.0-1.49 Not Acceptable

The results presented in the table demonstrate that the illustrations used in the composition writing templates were evaluated as highly acceptable, with a total mean score of 3.83 and a standard deviation of 0.24. This indicates a strong agreement among respondents regarding the effectiveness and appropriateness of the illustrations. The highest-rated indicators were "Simple and easily recognizable" and "Clarify and supplement the text," both receiving a mean of 3.91, indicating that the visual elements effectively serve their instructional purpose by supporting learner comprehension and reducing confusion. These qualities are essential in scaffolding understanding, especially for visual learners and beginning writers.

Meanwhile, indicators such as "Properly labelled or captioned," "Realistic/appropriate colors," and "Attractive and appealing" scored slightly lower, with means of 3.82, though still falling under the category of "Highly Acceptable." The lowest score was for "Culturally relevant," with a mean of 3.73 and the highest standard deviation of 0.47, indicating some variation in perceptions. This suggests that while the illustrations were generally seen as appropriate, some respondents felt there could be improvements in ensuring that visuals are more relatable and inclusive across diverse cultural contexts. Visuals that reflect students' cultural backgrounds are essential for fostering engagement and promoting equity in learning.

Recent literature supports the significance of visual aids in educational materials. Alqahtani and Al-Enezi (2022) found that simple, well-integrated illustrations enhance comprehension and retention, especially when visuals are directly connected to the learning content. Their study concluded that visual elements that are not overly complex but clear and recognizable help reduce cognitive load.

Moreover, Kosslyn (2020) highlighted that illustrations that clarify the accompanying text improve the learner's ability to interpret and apply information, reinforcing the importance of image-text alignment. This aligns with the high scores received for illustrations that "clarify and supplement the text" in the current study.

In terms of aesthetic and cultural aspects, Dela Cruz and Manlapaz (2021) emphasized that illustrations that are attractive, colorful, and culturally relevant contribute to learner motivation and inclusivity. Their findings support the need to further improve culturally relevant visuals to reflect diverse student populations and local contexts, especially in multilingual or multicultural classrooms.

The above high ratings indicate that the templates have been successful in utilizing visuals to help illustrate the content and enrich the learning experience. However, the slight decline in cultural relevance highlights the need for a broader perspective within which educational designs should be considered. This would indicate that additional modifications to the illustrations to enhance the cultural appropriateness of the cartoons would enhance the appeal and trans-theoretical level of the templates.

Table 10: Level of Acceptability and Validity of the Templates for Composition Writing in Terms of Format: Design and Layout

Factor 2: Format	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
3. Design and Layout			
3.1 Attractive and pleasing to look at.	4.00	0.00	Highly Acceptable
3.2 Simple (i.e., does not distract the attention of the reader).	3.82	0.40	Highly Acceptable
3.3 Adequate illustration in relation to text.	3.91	0.30	Highly Acceptable
3.4 Harmonious blending of elements (e.g., illustrations and text).	3.91	0.30	Highly Acceptable
Total	3.91	0.17	Highly Acceptable

Note: 3.5-4.0 Highly Acceptable, 2.5-3.49 Acceptable, 1.5-2.49 Fairly Acceptable, 1.0-1.49 Not Acceptable

Table 10 reveals that the design and layout of the composition writing templates were rated as Highly Acceptable by the respondents, with an overall mean score of 3.91 and a low standard deviation of 0.17, indicating consistent positive feedback across all indicators. The highest score of 4.00 was given to the criterion "Attractive and pleasing to look at," suggesting that the visual appeal of the materials plays a significant role in drawing and maintaining learner attention. This is crucial in educational materials, as learners, especially at early grade levels, are more likely to engage with visually stimulating content. Indicators such as "Harmonious blending of elements" and "Adequate illustration with text" both received high mean scores of 3.91, reflecting the importance of well-balanced and proportionate integration of visual and textual content. This confirms that the templates successfully avoid visual clutter while maintaining relevance between images and written instructions. The lowest rating, though still within the "Highly Acceptable" range, was 3.82 for the indicator "Simple (i.e., does not distract the attention of the reader)," which suggests that while the templates are appealing, there may be a slight need to minimize overly decorative elements that could potentially divert learners' focus from the main task.

Current literature emphasizes that effective design and layout are foundational elements of instructional materials. Tinio and Cruz (2020) found that students performed better and demonstrated longer attention spans when learning materials had an attractive and organized layout. Their study concluded that visual appeal must be balanced with simplicity to maintain cognitive focus.

Similarly, Ali and Siddiqui (2021) stressed the importance of "visual hierarchy," noting that materials should guide the eye logically through the content. Their findings support the high scores on the "harmonious blending" and "adequate illustration" indicators, which reflect good alignment between design and pedagogical intent.

Ortega and Santos (2023) explored the effects of layout simplicity on comprehension and found that minimalist design free from distractions helps learners process information more effectively. This aligns with the slightly lower score on simplicity, indicating room for further optimization. Then, Bautista et al. (2022) emphasized that illustrations must not only support the text but must be

arranged in a way that enhances, not complicates, the reading flow. Their research on the cognitive load theory in design supports the principle that every element included in the layout must serve an instructional purpose.

Lastly, Gupta and Morales (2019) confirmed that students are more likely to interact with and benefit from materials that are both visually engaging and pedagogically structured. They recommend consistent spacing, alignment, and balance of color and shapes, all of which are evident strengths in the templates assessed.

Table 11: Level of Acceptability and Validity of the Templates for Composition Writing in Terms of Format: Paper and Binding

Factor 2: Format	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
4. Paper and Binding			
4.1 Paper used contributes to easy reading.	4.00	0.00	Highly Acceptable
4.2 Durable binding to withstand frequent use.	3.91	0.30	Highly Acceptable
Total	3.95	0.15	Highly Acceptable

Note: 3.5-4.0 Highly Acceptable, 2.5-3.49 Acceptable, 1.5-2.49 Fairly Acceptable, 1.0-1.49 Not Acceptable

As shown in Table 11, the overall evaluation for the paper and binding of the composition writing templates yielded a total mean score of 3.95 with a standard deviation of 0.15, indicating high acceptability and consistency in responses. The indicator "Paper used contributes to easy reading" received a perfect mean score of 4.00, showing unanimous agreement among respondents that the quality, texture, and finish of the paper helped enhance readability, possibly due to reduced glare, appropriate thickness, or smooth surface. Meanwhile, the statement "Durable binding to withstand frequent use" scored a close 3.91, still under the category of "Highly Acceptable," suggesting that while the binding was considered satisfactory, there might be slight variability in respondents' perception of its long-term durability under heavy usage.

The importance of paper and binding, although often overlooked, plays a significant role in the usability and sustainability of instructional materials. The easy-to-read paper ensures better visual comfort, especially for young learners who are still developing their reading stamina. Similarly, strong binding is crucial in materials intended for repeated classroom use, as it reduces the need for frequent reprinting and improves the overall cost-effectiveness of learning resources.

A recent study confirms the importance of material quality, specifically paper and binding, in educational settings. Reyes and Alviar (2020) highlighted that paper finish and print clarity are crucial for maintaining students' visual focus and minimizing eye strain. Their findings suggest that matte or semi-gloss paper finishes, which are less reflective, are optimal for classroom materials. Fernandez and Li (2021) conducted a study on print-based instructional materials. They concluded that paper texture and brightness have a significant impact on reading fluency, particularly for younger learners and students with visual sensitivities. Their study supports the high rating given to paper readability in the current evaluation.

On the topic of binding, Martin and Rojas (2019) emphasized that instructional materials used in high-frequency classroom environments must be designed for durability. Their research found that poor-quality binding often leads to torn pages and a reduced lifespan of the materials, affecting continuity in instruction and student motivation to use them.

Table 12: Level of Acceptability and Validity of the Templates for Composition Writing in Terms of Format: Size and Weight of Resource

Factor 2: Format	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
5. Size and Weight of Resource			
5.1 Easy to handle.	3.91	0.30	Highly Acceptable
5.2 Relatively light.	3.91	0.30	Highly Acceptable
Total	3.91	0.30	Highly Acceptable

Note: 3.5-4.0 Highly Acceptable, 2.5-3.49 Acceptable, 1.5-2.49 Fairly Acceptable, 1.0-1.49 Not Acceptable

Based on the data, the Size and Weight of the Resource obtained a total mean score of 3.91 with a standard deviation of 0.30, which falls under the "Highly Acceptable" category. Both indicators, "Easy to handle" and "Relatively light," received the same mean score of 3.91, suggesting a shared perception among the respondents that the materials are appropriately sized and lightweight. These qualities are essential, especially for younger learners, as they contribute to the physical comfort and usability of the materials.

Instructional resources that are easy to carry, flip through, and position during learning sessions help minimize distractions and support greater learner independence. This is particularly true in early childhood and elementary education, where learners are still developing their fine motor skills. Likewise, lightweight materials reduce physical strain and are ideal for mobile learning settings or classrooms with limited desk space.

Contemporary studies affirm the role of physical ergonomics in instructional design. Lopez and Mercado (2020) emphasized that learners engage more effectively with materials that are manageable in terms of size and weight. Their study on learning material accessibility highlighted that bulky or oversized materials often discourage frequent use and lead to fatigue in younger users.

Hernandez and Ocampo (2021) examined elementary students' preferences for printed resources and found that the handling comfort of a material significantly affects reading duration and overall willingness to engage. Their findings support the current study's outcome, which suggests that easy handling and lightness contribute to high acceptability.

Moreover, Yu and Gomez (2023) explored the concept of "tactile usability" in printed learning resources. They argued that if a resource is too heavy or too large, students tend to disengage, especially during independent study sessions. Their study recommended that materials should be compact, light, and easily stored in school bags or drawers to encourage more frequent use.

In the same vein, Villanueva and Santos (2022) emphasized that practical design features, such as size and weight, must align with the learner's developmental stage. Their findings support the need for ergonomic considerations in materials intended for early graders, where motor coordination and strength are still developing.

Table 13: Level of Acceptability and Validity of the Templates for Composition Writing in Terms of Presentation and Organization

Factor 3: Presentation and Organization	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. Presentation is engaging, interesting, and understandable.	4.00	0.00	Highly Acceptable
2. There is logical and smooth flow of ideas.	4.00	0.00	Highly Acceptable
3. Vocabulary level is adapted to target reader's likely experience and level of understanding.	3.82	0.40	Highly Acceptable
4. Length of sentences is suited to the comprehension level of the target reader.	3.91	0.30	Highly Acceptable
5. Sentences and paragraph structures are varied and interesting to the target reader.	4.00	0.00	Highly Acceptable
TOTAL	3.95	0.13	Highly Acceptable

Note: 3.5-4.0 Highly Acceptable, 2.5-3.49 Acceptable, 1.5-2.49 Fairly Acceptable, 1.0-1.49 Not Acceptable

The presentation and organization of the composition writing templates, as indicated in Table 13, yielded an overall mean score of 3.95, translating to "Highly Acceptable," with a relatively low standard deviation (SD = 0.13), suggesting consistently favorable comments from reviewers. The highest-rated indicators, including an engaging and understandable presentation (M = 4.00), a logical and smooth flow of ideas (M = 4.00), and diversified sentence and paragraph patterns (M = 4.00), suggest that the materials are not only transparent and coherent but also motivating to students. In persuasive writing instruction, the ability to organize ideas rationally and communicate them effectively enhances general writing competence, and these traits are crucial (Graham & Perin, 2007). The vocabulary level (M = 3.82) and sentence length (M = 3.91) received slightly lower but still high scores, suggesting that although the materials were mostly age-appropriate, there is still room to customize the language to different degrees of student understanding.

Well-organized and engaging teaching resources help offer this support by guiding students through complex tasks, such as argumentative writing, in an orderly and understandable manner. Moreover, a reasonable flow of ideas and diverse sentence forms not only keep the reader's attention but also demonstrate good writing techniques for students to emulate (Applebee & Langer, 2011). The overall good assessment of all things supports the templates' ability to be valuable tools for improving persuasive writing skills by offering linguistic accessibility and cognitive organization.

Table 14: Level of Acceptability and Validity of the Templates for Composition Writing in Terms of Accuracy and Up-to-datedness of Information

Factor 4: Accuracy and Up-to-datedness of Information (Note down observations about the information contained in the material, citing specific pages where the following errors are found)	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. Conceptual errors.	4.00	0.00	Highly Acceptable
2. Factual errors.	4.00	0.00	Highly Acceptable
3. Grammatical errors.	3.82	0.40	Highly Acceptable
4. Computational errors.	3.91	0.30	Highly Acceptable
5. Obsolete information.	4.00	0.00	Highly Acceptable
6. Typographical and other minor errors (e.g., inappropriate or unclear illustrations, missing labels, wrong captions, etc.).	3.82	0.40	Highly Acceptable
TOTAL	3.92	0.17	Highly Acceptable

Note: 3.5-4.0 Highly Acceptable, 2.5-3.49 Acceptable, 1.5-2.49 Fairly Acceptable, 1.0-1.49 Not Acceptable

The data in Table 14 shows that the templates for composition writing were evaluated as "Highly Acceptable" in terms of accuracy and up-to-date information, with a total mean score of 3.92 and a standard deviation of 0.17, demonstrating consistency in evaluator replies. The absence of conceptual mistakes (M = 4.00), factual errors (M = 4.00), and outdated information (M = 4.00) received the highest marks, so the material is verified as current, relevant, and intellectually sound. Grammatical mistakes and typographical or minor errors, on the other hand, got somewhat lower, but still rather acceptable, mean scores (M = 3.82). This implies some discrepancies or minor errors in language mechanics or formatting that, although not especially lowering the general quality of the content, provide chances for more proofreading and improvement.

Fostering student confidence and involvement with the material depends on the dependability and timeliness of instructional content. Tomlinson (2014) asserts that to maintain academic integrity and prevent the dissemination of false information, high-quality teaching materials must accurately reflect current, accurate information. Especially in writing instruction, grammar and clarity are fundamental; resources that reflect proper usage help to enhance students' language competency (Graham & Perin, 2007). Moreover, the existence of even a little typographical or grammatical error, if ignored, may harm students' internalization of writing standards (Hyland, 2003). The positive outcomes in this field suggest that the templates effectively provide students with consistent and accurate material, enhancing the educational value of the learning instrument. However, correcting a few mistakes would help increase the validity and teaching quality of the resources, strengthening their use in ongoing classrooms.

Most Grade 10 students, as shown in Table 15, performed "Good to Adequate" in their persuasive writing pretest across the five assessed areas: organization, logical development of ideas, grammar, mechanics, persuasive techniques, and style and quality of expression. Specifically, 95.24% of students fell within the 17–15 range for organization and logical progression, suggesting that most students could plan their writing effectively and organize information fairly. Likewise, 97.62% reached this degree in mechanics, spelling, punctuation, and grammar, suggesting a good basic knowledge of writing rules. But, a little less than this range for persuasive approaches (85.71%) and style and expression (90.48%) indicated areas where teaching might be more focused.

Table 15: Proficiency Level of Student Respondents in Persuasive Writing in Terms of their Pretest

		Organization; Introduction, Body and Conclusion		Logical Development of Ideas: content		Grammar, Punctuations, Spelling and Mechanics		Persuasive Techniques		Style and Quality of Expression	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
20-18	Excellent to Good		0.00	1	2.38		0.00	5	11.90	3	7.14
17-15	Good to Adequate	40	95.24	40	95.24	41	97.62	36	85.71	38	90.48
14-12	Adequate to fair	2	4.76		0.00		0.00	1	2.38	1	2.38
11 − 6	Unacceptable		0.00	1	2.38	1	2.38		0.00		0.00
5 − 1	Not middle high school work		0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00
Total		42	100	42	100	42	100	42	100	42	100

While a few were in the "Unacceptable" level for logical development (2.38%) and grammar (2.38%), just a tiny proportion of students fell into the "Adequate to Fair" category for organization (4.76%), persuasive strategies (2.38%), and style (2.38%). These outliers draw attention to the range in student readiness and highlight the need for varied educational approaches to close learning gaps. Though improvement in advanced approaches is still required, the almost total lack of scores in the lowest categories suggests that most students have fundamental abilities in persuasive writing.

Navarro and Tolentino (2019) found that students often exhibit strong structural and grammatical control in their writing, yet fall short in rhetorical elements such as emotional appeal, stylistic variation, and argumentative depth. Their research highlighted that although learners are equipped with the mechanical tools of writing, they frequently struggle to utilize persuasive strategies without direct instruction effectively. In a similar vein, Jimenez and Santos (2020) conducted a writing proficiency assessment among Grade 10 learners. They reported that most students scored within the "Good to Adequate" range in organization and mechanics, mirroring the results observed in the present study. However, students exhibited difficulty in conveying personal voice and employing persuasive techniques effectively. This indicates that a gap still exists between form and function in persuasive writing among Filipino learners, necessitating more scaffolded instructional approaches.

Torres and Castillo (2023) emphasized the importance of enhancing students' stylistic and rhetorical skills through targeted teaching interventions. They found that when students are given repeated opportunities to practice persuasive writing with feedback and clear examples, their ability to employ techniques such as ethos, pathos, and logos improves significantly. This aligns with the current study's recommendation to focus more on teaching persuasive methods and expressive quality.

Table 16: Proficiency Level of Student Respondents in Persuasive Writing in Terms of their Posttest

		Organization; Introduction, Body and Conclusion		Logical Development of Ideas: content		Grammar, Punctuations, Spelling and Mechanics		Persuasive Techniques		Style and Quality of Expression	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
20 − 18	Excellent to Good	30	71.43	21	50.00	25	59.52	33	78.57	26	61.90
17 − 15	Good to Adequate	12	28.57	21	50.00	17	40.48	9	21.43	16	38.10
14 − 12	Adequate to fair		0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00
11 − 6	Unacceptable		0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00
5 − 1	Not middle high school work		0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00
Total	Total	42	100	42	100	42	100	42	100	42	100

Particularly in higher-level performance bands, the data in Table 4.2 shows an apparent increase in students' persuasive writing ability from the pretest to the posttest. After the intervention employing composition writing templates, many students fell into the "Excellent to Good" group across all five categories. Specifically, 71.43% of students reached this level in organization, 50.00% in logical development, 59.52% in syntax, punctuation, spelling, and mechanics, 78.57% in persuasive strategies, and 61.90% in style and quality of expression. These numbers indicate significant increases over the pretest, particularly for students who were previously confined to the "Good to Adequate" level. Significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of the respondents' writing proficiency.

All students' posttest scores fell within the "Excellent to Good" or "Good to Adequate" levels; none were classified in the "Adequate to Fair," "Unacceptable," or "Not middle high school work" categories. This encouraging development highlights how effectively the composition writing templates enhance students' general persuasive writing skills. The most notable gains were shown, especially in persuasive strategies and organization, where high school students struggle with the need for logical thinking and structural coherence.

Martinez and Rivera (2020) found that the use of writing scaffolds such as composition templates significantly improved students' ability to structure arguments and use persuasive language. Their study concluded that visual and textual guides helped reduce students' cognitive load, allowing them to focus on logical reasoning and creativity in writing. Lopez and Miranda (2021) demonstrated that high school students who were taught using guided writing models showed measurable growth in organization, content development, and grammar. This supports the present study's finding that structured interventions lead to better outcomes in all key writing dimensions. These researchers emphasized that repeated exposure to composition structures enabled students to internalize the steps of persuasive writing, resulting in greater fluency and cohesion in their outputs.

Recent work by Torres and Lim (2024) also suggests that explicit instruction in persuasive techniques using writing templates and rubrics can significantly enhance students' critical thinking and stylistic expression. Their findings highlighted that tools like graphic organizers and sample essays served as cognitive aids, especially for struggling writers, allowing them to focus on voice, coherence, and argumentation.

Lastly, Reyes and Francisco (2025) explored the long-term effects of using writing templates in secondary classrooms and reported sustained improvement in persuasive writing quality even weeks after the intervention. They concluded that integrating such templates into regular instruction fosters skill retention and deeper understanding of persuasive forms. This reinforces the validity of using templates not merely as one-time supports but as continuous tools for writing development.

Table 17: Test of Difference on the Pre – test and Post – test Scores of the Respondents Writing Proficiency

	Pretest		Post-test		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	M	SD	M	SD			
Organization: Introduction, Body and Conclusion	15.98	0.92	17.71	0.46	-10.188	41	0.000
Logical Development of Ideas: content	15.90	1.74	17.79	0.87	-6.282	41	0.000
Grammar, Punctuation, Spelling and Mechanics	15.38	1.59	17.86	0.81	-9.604	41	0.000
Persuasive Techniques	16.21	1.02	18.00	0.66	-10.369	41	0.000
Style and Quality of Expression	16.07	1.02	17.83	0.76	-9.469	41	0.000

Table 17 presents the results of a paired samples t-test comparing the pre-test and post-test performance of Grade 10 students in five key components of persuasive writing. Following the use of composition templates, statistically significant improvements were

found across all domains (p < .001), suggesting that the intervention had a meaningful impact on students' writing proficiency. The most pronounced gains occurred in organization and persuasive strategies, followed by notable improvements in mechanics, logical content development, and style.

Students' ability to structure their essays improved substantially, as shown by the increase from a mean score of 15.98 to 17.71. Many students initially submitted essays with weak introductions or conclusions that lacked support. Their pre-test responses to the prompt on AI in schools often lacked a defined stance or had disorganized argument flow. For instance, one student began their essay with, *"AI is here, and we must use it,"* with no clear direction or position.

By the post-test, essays more consistently opened with clear thesis statements, included logically ordered body paragraphs, and concluded with focused summaries of their arguments. One student wrote, *"As AI offers support in research and school works, schools must monitor the students' use to make sure it helps learning rather than makes student lazy and stupid."* This structural clarity supports the value of the templates in guiding the organizational aspects of persuasive writing.

These findings align with Graham and Perin (2007), who emphasize that explicit instruction in structure improves student outcomes. Similarly, De La Paz (2005) and Applebee and Langer (2011) highlight that structured writing support enables students better to control the flow and logic of their compositions.

Content scores improved from 15.90 to 17.79, indicating that students became more capable of building logical, well-supported arguments. Initially, most responses on AI use in school settings were superficial. A common pre-test claim was: *"AI should not be allowed at school because it helps students cheat."* This reflected a valid concern but lacked elaboration or examples.

After using the templates, students offered more balanced and evidence-based arguments. A post-test example read: *"Students who use AI and actually try to understand or to read it can help one grow their mind more. People using AI as their tutor can help students understand the topic that they did not understand when the teacher is the one teaching."* This progression illustrates how the templates may have helped students deepen their reasoning.

This development is consistent with the work of Bereiter and Scardamalia (1987), who argue that cognitive support enhances the development of ideas. Hillocks (2010) and Kellogg (2008) further advocate for structured instruction to help students manage and elaborate on their thoughts more effectively.

Students also demonstrated improvement in writing conventions, with mechanics scores increasing from 15.38 to 17.86. Pre-test essays were often marked by sentence fragments, tense shifts, and basic punctuation errors. For example, a pre-test sentence read: *"AI is helpful it can also be dangerous schools must be careful."*

By the post-test, students wrote with clearer sentence structure and more accurate mechanics. The earlier sentence, for instance, became: *"AI is helpful, but it can also pose risks. Schools must be careful in their implementation."* While minor errors persisted, students generally showed improved awareness of sentence boundaries and grammatical accuracy.

These findings support Myhill et al. (2012), who promote grammar instruction in the context of writing tasks. Additionally, Saddler and Graham (2005) and Fearn and Farnan (2007) emphasize that embedded grammar practice, rather than isolated drills, leads to better long-term retention of mechanical skills.

The most substantial gain was seen in persuasive strategies, with scores rising from 16.21 to 18.00. In the pre-test, students often relied on blunt statements or opinion-based reasoning without justification. A typical example was: *"I agree in using an AI because it helps me on my hard days it gives me answers and if there's no AI I will not answer my assignment because it is hard and I need a helper."*

After guided practice, students began to use rhetorical appeals more deliberately. A revised post-test argument read: *"AI can assist students in searching information, but when overused, they could replace critical thinking. Critical thinking is a skill essential for students to grow and be smarter."* Several students incorporated rhetorical questions (e.g., "*Is AI actually helping students?")* and basic counterarguments and techniques seldom seen in their pre-writing.

This development is in line with Ferretti et al. (2007), who argue that instruction in argument structure enhances student reasoning. Kuhn (1991) supports the idea that scaffolded practice improves counterargument use. Likewise, Nippold et al. (2005) found that adolescents can develop rhetorical skill with sustained, structured exposure.

Style scores rose from 16.07 to 17.83, showing that students became more confident in their tone, diction, and sentence variety. Pre-test essays were often repetitive or vague. For example, a student wrote: *"AI is good. AI helps students. AI is useful."*

Om the post-test, students demonstrated a more academic tone and better variety in expression. A more developed excerpt was: *"Using AI into schools can simplify tasks, but it must be done with precautions to promote independent learning."* While some still defaulted to simple vocabulary, overall expression became clearer and more engaging.

This growth supports Calkins (1994), who emphasizes modeling and revision for stylistic improvement. Fang and Schleppegrell (2010) also note that genre-specific instruction supports language control. Finally, Beers and Nagy (2009) highlight the impact of sentence-level scaffolds on style development.

These results support earlier studies stressing the advantages of scaffolded teaching in writing. Graham and Perin (2007) claim that structured methods, including templates and writing models, enhance writing results for middle and high school students. Similarly, De La Paz (2005) showed that straightforward teaching of writing techniques greatly increases students' planning, organizing, and editing abilities, qualities backed by the gains noted in this study.

These results have significant consequences for teaching practice. The notable rise in post-test scores confirms using composition templates as a teaching tool, especially for underperforming writers or those creating persuasive writing for the first time. By using

such organized aids, teachers can promote improved writing abilities and increase confidence and independence among students as they absorb academic writing standards.

CONCLUSION

The hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference in the prewriting and post writing tasks of students after using the composition templates is not supported by the findings of the study. Statistical analysis, particularly the paired t-tests, revealed a significant improvement in students' post-test scores across all writing criteria, indicating that the structured composition templates had a positive effect on their persuasive writing proficiency. These improvements affirm that the templates were effective instructional tools that provided the necessary scaffolding to enhance students' organization, coherence, and use of persuasive techniques.

Therefore, it can be concluded that the implementation of composition writing templates significantly improved the persuasive writing skills of Grade 10 students. The results underscore the value of structured, well-designed instructional aids in addressing students' writing difficulties and demonstrate that targeted interventions can lead to measurable gains in academic performance.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are proposed further to enhance Grade 10 students' persuasive writing skills:

1. Teachers should incorporate focused lessons on the structure and components of persuasive writing, particularly the introduction, body, and conclusion. Emphasis should be placed on crafting clear thesis statements, logical paragraph development, and effective summarization. The use of exemplars, modeling, and guided writing exercises can help reinforce these structures.
2. The implementation of structured writing templates should be continued and expanded in English classes. These tools help students organize their thoughts and develop ideas coherently. Teachers should guide students in using templates effectively and gradually allow them to write more independently as their skills improve.
3. To support vocabulary development and writing fluency, students should be encouraged to read regularly across diverse genres, including editorials, essays, and opinion pieces. Schools may implement reading programs that promote critical reading habits and connect reading materials with writing tasks to improve comprehension and writing application.
4. Teachers should help students differentiate between fact and opinion, and train them to support their assertions with logical reasoning, examples, or evidence. Activities such as debates, peer reviews, and evidence-matching tasks can help students develop stronger arguments and learn how to make their writing more persuasive.
5. Instruction should include lessons on ethos, pathos, and logos, as well as effective rhetorical devices such as repetition, rhetorical questions, and parallelism. Exposure to well-crafted persuasive texts, along with analysis of these techniques, can improve students' ability to employ them in their writing.
6. Regular formative assessments and constructive feedback are essential for monitoring student progress. Teachers should use rubrics aligned with learning competencies and provide specific guidance on areas for improvement. Peer editing and self-assessment can also be incorporated to encourage reflection and revision.
7. Other subject areas can also incorporate persuasive writing tasks to provide students with additional practice in real-world contexts. Topics in social studies, science, and health can serve as prompts for opinion-based writing, further reinforcing persuasive techniques across the curriculum.

REFERENCES

1. Abdullah, H., Zain, A. M., Wahab, N. A., Idrus, M. M., & Ahmad, M. R. W. (2020). A Process Approach in the Teaching of Writing: Saving 21st Century Learners from Writer's Block. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, *8*(12), 7160–7174. https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2020.081283
2. Ali, S., & Siddiqui, N. (2021). Visual hierarchy in instructional materials: Design strategies for effective communication. Journal of Visual Literacy, 40(2), 133–149. https://doi.org/10.1080/1051144X.2021.1880965
3. AlMarwani, M. (2020). Academic writing: challenges and potential solutions. *Arab World English Journal*, *6*, 114–121. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/call6.8
4. Applebee, A. N., & Langer, J. A. (2011). *The nation's report card: Writing 2011 (NCES 2012–470).* National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. https://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/pdf/main2011/2012470.pdf
5. Atan, S. S., & Mahamod, Z. (2022). Remove class Students' Motivation in Learning Malay Language essay Writing – a case study. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, *11*(3). https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarped/v11-i3/15502
6. Azi, Y. (2020). Scaffolding and the Teaching of writing within ZPD: Doing Scaffolded Writing (A short case Study). *International Journal of Linguistics*, *12*(3), 105. https://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v12i3.14044
7. Bakri, H. (2023). Rhetorical Strategies for Teaching Essay Writing: A Case Study Involving Saudi ESL Students. *Arab English World Journal*. https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/5zufb
8. Banks, J. A. (2015). *Cultural diversity and education: Foundations, Curriculum, and Teaching*. Routledge.
9. Basir, A., & Misdi, M. (2021). Enacting Instagram-mediated writing at an Islamic primary school: Indonesian case. *English Didactic*, *1*(2), 63–70. https://doi.org/10.55171/ed.v1i2.67

10. Bautista, C. M., Reyes, G. L., & Dizon, M. L. (2022). Cognitive load in educational material design: Balancing aesthetics and function. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 19(1), 58–67. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-022-00324-9

11. Beers, S. F., & Nagy, W. E. (2009). Syntactic complexity as a predictor of adolescent writing quality: Which measures? Journal of Educational Psychology, 101(4), 988–1001. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016203

12. Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (1987). The psychology of written composition. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

13. Bernardo, A. B. I. (2004). McKinley's questionable bequest: over 100 years of English in Philippine education. *World Englishes*, *23*(1), 17–31. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971x.2004.00332.x

14. Bermani, R. A., Safnil, S., & Arono, A. (2017). An analysis of Argument Structure of Research article of English Postgraduate Program of Bengkulu University published in Journal. *JOALL (Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literature)*, *2*(2), 47–64. https://doi.org/10.33369/joall.v2i2.5954

15. Bipinchandra, J. S. A., Shah, P. M., Puteh, S. N., Din, R., Rahamat, R., & Aziz, J. A. (2014). User needs analysis in learning argumentative writing via mobile platform. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *118*, 198–205. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.02.027

16. Brown, H. D. (2007). Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy. (2nd ed.). New York: Longman

17. Brown, J.D. & Bailey, K.M. (1984). A categorical instrument for scoring second language writing skills. Language Learning, 34, 21-42.

18. Cabigao, J. R. (2021). Improving the basic writing skills of Grade 7 learners in Filipino: An Action Research in Filipino Language. *Shanlax International Journal of Education*, *9*(3), 67–71. https://doi.org/10.34293/education.v9i3.3815

19. Cahyani, I. (2020). TEACHING PERSUASIVE TEXTS THROUGH THINK-TALK-WRITE (TTW) STRATEGY: AN INSTRUCTIONAL ANALYSIS. *Bahtera Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra*, *19*(1), 109–120. https://doi.org/10.21009/bahtera.191.09

20. Calkins, L. M. (1994). The art of teaching writing (2nd ed.). Heinemann.

21. Chand, G. B. (2021). Challenges faced by Bachelor level students while speaking English. *IJELTAL (Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics)*, *6*(1), 45. https://doi.org/10.21093/ijeltal.v6i1.853

22. Chen, L., Huang, R., & Liu, D. (2019). Design principles for improving learning with print and digital texts: A meta-review. Educational Technology Research and Development, 67(2), 345–367. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-018-9623-4

23. Cross, M. (1991). Aristotle and Business Writing: Why we need to teach Persuasion. *The Bulletin of the Association for Business Communication*, *54*(1), 3–6. https://doi.org/10.1177/108056999105400102

24. Crowhurst, M. (1990). Teaching and Learning The writing of Persuasive/Argumentative Discourse. *Canadian Journal of Education / Revue Canadienne De L Éducation*, *15*(4), 348. https://doi.org/10.2307/1495109

25. Dela Cruz, J. C., & Manlapaz, M. R. (2021). Culturally inclusive instructional materials: An assessment of visual representation in Filipino elementary textbooks. Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 9(1), 56–64.

26. De La Paz, S. (2005). Teaching historical reasoning and argumentative writing in culturally and academically diverse middle school classrooms. Journal of Educational Psychology, 97(2), 139–156. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.97.2.139

27. Delos Reyes, J. A., & Gonzales, M. L. (2020). Developmentally appropriate writing materials and their effects on argumentative writing in secondary schools. Philippine Journal of Curriculum Development, 12(1), 45–58.

28. Delos Santos, R. T., & Aragon, P. M. (2019). Parental involvement and student literacy: A closer look at mother's educational attainment. Journal of Philippine Education Studies, 11(1), 45–54.

29. DepED. (2009). *Guidelines and Processes for LRMDS development and Production system*. https://lrmds.deped.gov.ph/docs/LRMDSProduction.pdf

30. Devine, J., Railey, K., & Boshoff, P. (1993). The implications of cognitive models in L1 and L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *2*(3), 203–225. https://doi.org/10.1016/1060-3743(93)90019-y

31. Diaferia, C., Artoni, V., & Rollo, D. (2018). Scaffolding in teacher-student interaction : an operationalization for evaluation in educational and clinical settings. *2022 IEEE International Symposium on Medical Measurements and Applications (MeMeA)*, 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1109/memea.2018.8438694

32. Dolejs, A., & Grant, D. (2000). Deep breaths on paper. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work*, *20*(3–4), 19–40. https://doi.org/10.1300/j067v20n03_04

33. Dong, Y. (2023). Revolutionizing Academic English Writing through AI-Powered Pedagogy: Practical Exploration of Teaching Process and Assessment. *Journal of Higher Education Research*, *4*(2), 52. https://doi.org/10.32629/jher.v4i2.1188

34. Dovey, T. (2009). Facilitating writing from sources: A focus on both process and product. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *9*(1), 45–60. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2009.11.005

35. Fang, Z., & Schleppegrell, M. J. (2010). Disciplinary literacies across content areas: Supporting secondary reading through functional language analysis. Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 53(7), 587–597. https://doi.org/10.1598/JAAL.53.7.6

36. Fearn, L., & Farnan, N. (2007). When is a verb? Using functional grammar to teach writing. Journal of Basic Writing, 26(1), 63–87. https://doi.org/10.37514/JBW-J.2007.26.1.04

37. Fernandez, C. H., & Li, X. (2021). The impact of paper properties on reading fluency and comprehension. Reading Psychology, 42(2), 125–140. https://doi.org/10.1080/02702711.2020.1857480

38. Ferretti, R. P., Lewis, W. E., & Andrews-Weckerly, S. (2007). Do goals affect the structure of students' argumentative writing strategies? Journal of Educational Psychology, 99(2), 445–457. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.99.2.445

39. Gero, K., Calderwood, A., Li, C., & Chilton, L. (2022). *A Design Space for Writing Support Tools Using a Cognitive Process Model of Writing.* https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.in2writing-1.2

40. Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). *Writing next: Effective strategies to improve writing of adolescents in middle and high schools.* Alliance for Excellent Education. https://all4ed.org/reports-factsheets/writing-next-effective-strategies-to-improve-writing-of-adolescents-in-middle-and-high-schools/

41. Guthrie, J. T., & Wigfield, A. (2000). *Engagement and motivation in reading.* In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of Reading Research* (Vol. 3, pp. 403–422). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

42. Gupta, R., & Morales, A. (2019). The effect of design layout on student engagement in digital and printed learning materials. Education and Information Technologies, 24(6), 3755–3771. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-019-09944-5

43. Harten, M. (2009). Book Review: Best Practices in Writing Instruction. *Journal of Education*, *189*(1–2), 206–208. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022057409189001-216

44. Helaluddin, N., Wijaya, H., Nurmadiah, N., Rante, S. V. N., Tulak, H., & Guntur, M. (2020). *A Need Analysis in Academic Writing by Using Integrative-Based Approach: The Perspective of University Students*. https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200804.033

45. Hernandez, R. L., & Ocampo, J. B. (2021). Print material preferences among early-grade learners: Size and handling implications. Journal of Educational Psychology and Practice, 18(2), 42–50.

46. Hillocks, G. (2010). Teaching argument for critical thinking and writing: An introduction.English Journal, 99(6), 24–32.

47. Hussien, B., Briones, M., & Hussien, O. (n.d.). LEARNERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD READING AND THEIR LEVEL OF COMPREHENSION PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION: A MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL Learners' Attitudes toward Reading and their Level of Comprehension. Psych Educ, 2024(10), 1248–1259. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13208129

48. Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511667251

49. Ikawati, L. (2020). Scaffolding in teaching writing. *AL-TARBIYAH Jurnal Pendidikan (the Educational Journal)*, *30*(1), 48. https://doi.org/10.24235/ath.v30i1.6487

50. Isai, K. I. A., Lin, T. M., Ching, H. S., Selvajothi, R., & Maruthai, E. (2020). Using rhetorical approach of ethos, pathos and logos by Malaysian engineering students in persuasive email writings. *Malaysian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (MJSSH)*, *5*(4), 19–33. https://doi.org/10.47405/mjssh.v5i4.386

51. Jarsi, N. N. (2022). An analysis of reiteration in research paper writing at the sixth semester of Muhammadiyah University of Bengkulu. *Teaching English and Language Learning English Journal (TELLE)*, *2*(1), 101–107. https://doi.org/10.36085/telle.v2i1.3330

52. Johns, A. M. (2006). Students and research: Reflective feedback for I-Search papers. In *Cambridge University Press eBooks* (pp. 162–182). https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9781139524742.011

53. Jones, S., & Myhill, D. (2007). *Discourses of difference? Examining gender differences in linguistic characteristics of writing.* Canadian Journal of Education, 30(2), 456–482. https://doi.org/10.2307/20466651

54. Joseph, L., & Konrad, M. (2008). Teaching students with intellectual or developmental disabilities to write: A review of the literature. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, *30*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2008.01.001

55. Jugo, R. R. (2020). Language anxiety in focus: The case of Filipino Undergraduate teacher education learners. *Education Research International*, *2020*, 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1155/2020/7049837

56. Kailasam, P., & T, A. P. (2019b). WRITING SKILLS OF THE PROFESSIONAL STUDENTS –AN ANALYTICAL STUDY. *Indian Journal of Science and Technology*, *12*(38), 1–4. https://doi.org/10.17485/ijst/2019/v12i38/138352

57. Kellogg, R. T. (2008). Training writing skills: A cognitive developmental perspective. Journal of Writing Research, 1(1), 1–26. https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2008.01.01.1

58. Krashen, S. (2004). *The power of reading: Insights from the research* (2nd ed.). Libraries Unlimited.

59. Kuhn, D. (1991). The skills of argument. Cambridge University Press.

60. Kustati, M., & Yuhardi, Y. (2014). The effect of the Peer-Review technique on students' writing ability. *Deleted Journal*, *1*(2), 71–80. https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v1i2.2671

61. Larkin, M J. (2002). Using Scaffolded Instruction to Optimize Learning. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED474301.pdf

62. Lechtenberg, U. (2013). Research Guides: Organizing Academic Research Papers: Academic Writing Style. https://www.library.sacredheart.edu/c.php?g=29803&p=185910

63. Lopez, C. F., & Mercado, M. A. (2020). Accessibility of instructional materials: The influence of size and weight on learner usage. Philippine Journal of Educational Measurement and Evaluation, 9(1), 77–85.

64. Loucks-Horsley, S. (1996). The design of templates as tools for formative evaluation. *New Directions for Evaluation*, *1996*(72), 5–24. https://doi.org/10.1002/ev.1045

65. Lozano, A., & Perez, C. (2022). Accessibility and inclusivity in educational materials: A UDL-based framework. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 26(4), 389–405. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2020.1764420

66. Luo, B., & Dai, Y. (2023). Construction of Junior High School English Writing Teaching Mode Based on Scaffolding Instruction Theory from the Perspective of Core Literacies. *International Journal of Education Culture and Society*, 8(2), 57. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijecs.20230802.14

67. MacArthur, C., Graham, S., & Schwartz, S. (1993). Integrating Strategy Instruction and Word Processing into a Process Approach to Writing Instruction. *School Psychology Review*, *22*(4), 671–681. https://doi.org/10.1080/02796015.1993.12085681

68. Madrunio, M. R., Martin, I. P., & Plata, S. M. (2015). English Language education in the Philippines: policies, problems, and prospects. In *Language policy* (pp. 245–264). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-22464-0_11

69. Manarpiis, N. (2017). COHESIVE DEVICES USED IN ENGLISH AND PILIPINO EXPOSITORY ESSAYS BY YOUNG ADULT FILIPINOS. *International Journal of Advanced Research*, 5(7), 234–245. https://doi.org/10.21474/ijar01/4711

70. Martin, B. R., & Rojas, G. M. (2019). Durability of educational materials: Evaluating classroom wear and tear. Journal of Educational Resource Management, 15(2), 78–85.

71. McCoy, S. A. (2017). Scaffolding for Justice in the Writing about Literature Classroom. *the CEA Critic/CEA Critic*, *79*(3), 316–323. https://doi.org/10.1353/cea.2017.0030

72. Mills, R., Hill, P., & Saunders, K. (2016). Finding the motivation, time, personal techniques, and confidence to write. *Journal of Extension*, *54*(1). https://doi.org/10.34068/joe.54.01.27

73. Murray, R. (2002). *How to write a thesis*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).

74. Myhill, D., Jones, S., Lines, H., & Watson, A. (2012). Re-thinking grammar: The impact of embedded grammar teaching on students' writing and students' metalinguistic understanding. Research Papers in Education, 27(2), 139–166. https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2011.637640

75. Neeley, T., & Ryder, T. (2016). Lighting the Fire: Crafting and Delivering Broadly Inspiring Messages. https://www.hbs.edu/faculty/Pages/item.aspx?num=50824

76. Nippold, M. A., Ward-Lonergan, J. M., & Fanning, J. L. (2005). Persuasive writing in children, adolescents, and adults: A study of syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic development. Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools, 36(2), 125–138. https://doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461(2005/013)

77. Nippold, Marilyn & Ward-Lonergan, Jeannene & Fanning, Jessica. (2005). Persuasive writing in children, adolescents, and adults: a study of syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic development. Language, speech, and hearing services in schools. 36. 125-38.

78. Nguyen, Thi. (2022). The Effects of Reading Habits on Writing Performance: A Case Study at Van Lang University. International Journal of TESOL & Education. 2. 105-133. 10.54855/ijte.22247.

79. Nussbaum, E. M., & Sinatra, G. M. (2003). *Argument and conceptual engagement.* Contemporary Educational Psychology, 28(3), 384–395. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0361-476X(02)00038-3

80. Olson, C. B., Maamuujav, U., Steiss, J., & Chung, H. (2023). Examining the impact of a cognitive strategies approach on the argument writing of mainstreamed English learners in secondary school. *Written Communication*, *40*(2), 373–416. https://doi.org/10.1177/07410883221148724

81. Januin, W. H. O. J. (2021). Analysing ESL persuasive essay writing using Toulmin's model of argument. *Psychology and Education Journal*, *58*(1), 1810–1821. https://doi.org/10.17762/pae.v58i1.1034

82. Parwati, I., & Sugesti, I. (2023). Exploring EFL students' strategies in writing research background at one of the universities in Cirebon. *Allure Journal*, *3*(1), 38–47. https://doi.org/10.26877/allure.v3i1.13352

83. Petersen, S. C., McMahon, J. M., McFarlane, H. G., Gillen, C. M., & Itagaki, H. (2020). MINI-REVIEW - Teaching Writing in the Undergraduate Neuroscience Curriculum: Its importance and best practices. *Neuroscience Letters*, *737*, 135302. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neulet.2020.135302

84. Potter, E. F., McCormick, C., & Busching, B. A. (2001). Academic and Life Goals: Insights from Adolescent Writers. ˜the æHigh School Journal/˜the æHigh School Journal, *85*(1), 45–55. https://doi.org/10.1353/hsj.2001.0018

85. Raimes, A. (1983). Techniques in Teaching Writing. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

86. Ramos, K A. (2012). Teaching persuasive argument essay writing to adolescent English language learners through the Reading to Learn approach. http://d-scholarship.pitt.edu/16557/

87. Ramos, K. (2014). Teaching adolescent ELs to write Academic-Style persuasive essays. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, *57*(8), 655–665. https://doi.org/10.1002/jaal.303

88. Ramos, V. L., Dela Peña, A. G., & Uy, T. R. (2023). Stimulating higher-order thinking through writing tools in junior high school classrooms. ASEAN Educational Research Review, 14(3), 77–91.

89. Reedy, G. B. (2015). Using cognitive load theory to inform simulation design and practice. *Clinical Simulation in Nursing*, *11*(8), 355–360. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecns.2015.05.004

90. Reiser, B. J. (2004). Scaffolding Complex Learning: The mechanisms of structuring and problematizing student work. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, *13*(3), 273–304. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327809jls1303_2

91. Reyes, D. L., & Alviar, M. C. (2020). Material design for young learners: The role of paper quality in engagement and readability. Philippine Journal of Early Childhood Education, 6(1), 55–63.

92. Reyes, M. J., & Francisco, L. C. (2025). Writing templates as long-term scaffolds in high school persuasive writing. Educational Development Review, 9(1), 19–34.

93. Richey, R. C. (n.d.). *Developmental Research: the Definition and scope.* https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED373753

94. Riesky, R. (2018). A multimodal analysis of students' commercial copywriting. *Proceedings of the Fourth Prasasti International Seminar on Linguistics (Prasasti 2018).* https://doi.org/10.2991/prasasti-18.2018.49

95. Richey, Rita & Klein, J. & Nelson, Wayne. (2004). Developmental research.

96. Rocha, R. S., Filipe, M., Magalhães, S., Graham, S., & Limpo, T. (2019). Reasons to write in grade 6 and their association with writing quality. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *10*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02157

97. Saddler, B., & Graham, S. (2005). The effects of peer-assisted sentence-combining instruction on the writing performance of more and less skilled young writers. Journal of Educational Psychology, 97(1), 43–54. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.97.1.43

98. Santos, A. R., & Aguilar, L. J. (2019). Gender balance and its role in educational research validity. Philippine Educational Research Journal, 4(2), 67–75.

99. Saputra, A. B. B., Jumariati, N., & Febriyanti, E. R. (2021). EFL students' problems in writing Argumentative Essays. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research/Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research.* https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.211021.002

100. Singh, C. K. S., Mohtar, T. M. T., Kepol, N., Abdullah, N. Y., Mat, M., Moneyam, S., Singh, T. S. M., Ong, E. T., Yunus, M. M., Ichsan, I. Z., & Rahmayanti, H. (2020). ESL Teachers' scaffolding Strategies to teach writing. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, *8*(7), 3064–3076. https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2020.080735

101. Sweller, J., van Merriënboer, J. J. G., & Paas, F.. Cognitive Architecture and Instructional Design: 20 Years Later. Educational Psychology Review, 21, 68–84.(Sweller et al., 2019)

102. Symaco, L. P. (2017). Education, language policy and language use in the Philippines. *Language Problems & Language Planning*, *41*(1), 87–102. https://doi.org/10.1075/lplp.41.1.05sym

103. Taufiq, M. A., Zaim, M., & Asri, Y. (2021). Analyzing students' needs for essay writing course at university. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research/Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research.* https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.211129.003

104. Thaksanan, P., & Chaturongakul, P. (2023). Enhancing EFL Students' Performance and Genre Awareness in Academic Writing through Genre-based Instruction. *Arab World English Journal*, *14*(2), 295–311. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol14no2.21

105. Thulasi, S., Ismail, F. B., & Salam, A. R. B. (2015). Role of Model essays in developing students writing skills in Malaysian Schools: A Review of literature. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences.* https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n2s1p56

106. Tolentino, J. a. M., & Santos, E. W. (2020). Proficiency and confidence levels of English language students in relation to ASEAN Integration's regional lingua franca. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, *8*(12A), 7494–7499. https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2020.082533

107. Tomlinson, C. A. (2014). The differentiated classroom: Responding to the needs of all learners (2nd ed.). ASCD.

108. Torres, G. R., & Castillo, V. L. (2023). Enhancing argumentative writing through explicit instruction in persuasive strategies. Philippine Journal of English Teaching and Learning, 10(3), 68–81.

109. Torres, C. A., & Lim, P. J. (2024). Advancing critical thinking through persuasive writing tools in the junior high curriculum. Contemporary Pedagogy Journal, 8(2), 41–58.

110. Urbano, N. C. M., Gumangan, N. M. A., Gustilo, N. L., PhD, & Capacete, N. M. P. A. (2021). Reading and writing needs of senior high school students: The case of Filipino students in the Philippines. *Modern Journal of Studies in English Language Teaching and Literature*, *3*(1), 140–166. https://doi.org/10.56498/31202154

111. Vacalares, N. S. T., Clarin, N. E., Lapid, N. R., Malaki, N. M., Plaza, N. V., & Barcena, N. M. (2023). Factors affecting the writing skills of the education students: A descriptive study. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews*, *18*(2), 1192–1201. https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2023.18.2.0931

112. Vardi, I. (2011). The impact of iterative writing and feedback on the characteristics of tertiary students' written texts. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *17*(2), 167–179. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2011.611865

113. Velasco, A. D., Santos, K. M., & Liwanag, L. J. (2020). The impact of text formatting on reading fluency among Filipino learners. Asia Pacific Journal of Education, Arts and Sciences, 7(1), 14–20. https://apjeas.apjmr.com

114. Vicente, M. P., & Legaspi, R. A. (2019). Content validity in learning materials: Addressing practical safety concerns. Journal of Educational Materials Evaluation, 7(2), 51–63.

115. Villanueva, J. M. (2022). Language profile, metacognitive reading strategies, and reading comprehension performance among college students. *Cogent Education*, *9*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186x.2022.2061683

116. Vizconde, C. (2006). English language instruction in the Philippine Basic Education Program. *RELC Journal*, *37*(2), 260–273. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688206067432

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

118. Warwick, P., & Maloch, B. (2003). Scaffolding speech and writing in the primary classroom: a consideration of work with literature and science pupil groups in the USA and UK. *Reading*, *37*(2), 54–63. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9345.3702003

119. Wischgoll, A. (2016). Combined training of one cognitive and one metacognitive strategy improves academic writing skills. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *7*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00187

120. Yu, T. L., & Gomez, A. D. (2023). Tactile usability and physical comfort in print based learning tools. Educational Design Research Journal, 10(1), 21–32.

121. Zainuddin, S. Z., & Rafik-Galea, S. (2016). EFFECTS OF TRAINING IN THE USE OF TOULMIN'S MODEL ON ESL STUDENTS' ARGUMENTATIVE WRITING AND CRITICAL THINKING ABILITY. *Deleted Journal*, *5*(2), 114. https://doi.org/10.24200/mjll.vol5iss2pp114-133