

FOUR-SQUARE WRITING TECHNIQUE IN VOCATIONAL HORTATORY WRITING: EFFECTS ON PERFORMANCE AND COMPONENTS

Ajeng Andana¹

¹ State University of Surabaya

¹ajeng.22142@mhs.unesa.ac.id

ABSTRACT

*This study investigates the effectiveness of the four-square writing technique in improving XI-grade vocational students' hortatory exposition writing skills within a marketing context. Employing a quantitative quasi-experimental design, the study involved two intact classes consisting of 44 students. The experimental group received instruction through the four-square writing technique, while the control group was taught using conventional outlining methods over three sessions. Students writing performance was measured through pre-test and post-test tasks in the form of 120 word hortatory exposition essays, assessed using an analytical scoring rubric adapted from Jacobs et al. (1981) covering content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. Following normality and homogeneity testing, the data were analyzed using the Mann-Whitney U, which showed there was no statistically significant difference in overall post-test writing performance between the two groups. Effect size was calculated using the *r* formula that indicating a small magnitude of difference between groups. To further investigate its effectiveness, the Friedman Test was conducted within the experimental group to examine differences in the level of improvement across writing components, revealing a statistically significant difference, with organization and content showing higher gains, while language use, mechanics, and vocabulary remained more limited.*

Keywords: Four-Square Writing Technique; Hortatory Exposition; Writing Skills; Vocational Students'; Persuasive Writing

Vocational education in Indonesia is designed to prepare students with occupational competencies that support their readiness for employment and further education in response to industry demands (Satibi, 2024; Datu & Sulindra, 2025). Alongside technical expertise, English proficiency plays an increasingly important role in enabling vocational students to communicate effectively in academic and workplace settings. Among the four language skills, writing plays a particularly important role as students are expected to express ideas, provide explanations, and construct persuasive arguments relevant to professional contexts (Simanjuntak et al., 2025). However, writing remains one of the most challenging productive skills for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners because it requires students to generate ideas, organize information logically, select appropriate vocabulary, and apply grammatical rules simultaneously (Pratiwi & Ika Sunardi, 2024; Datu & Sulindra, 2025). Previous studies have reported that vocational high school students frequently encounter difficulties in English writing due to limited vocabulary, inadequate grammatical knowledge, insufficient writing practice, and low confidence in expressing ideas (Pratiwi & Ika Sunardi, 2024; Datu & Sulindra, 2025).

Preliminary observations conducted in a vocational high school in Kediri, East Java, revealed similar challenges, with students relying heavily on online translation tools or copied online texts when completing writing assignments. These practices reflected difficulties in generating ideas, organizing paragraphs, maintaining coherence, and producing original texts. Such challenges become even greater in hortatory exposition writing because students are required to formulate a clear thesis, develop logical arguments, and provide persuasive recommendations. Previous studies have shown that many students experience problems in developing content, organizing ideas, using appropriate vocabulary and grammar, as well as applying the generic structure of hortatory exposition texts effectively (Hasibuan et al., 2020; Jameel, 2022; Sarnita, 2024).

To overcome these challenges, several studies have suggested the use of graphic organizers as an effective pre-writing strategy. Graphic organizers provide visual scaffolding that helps students organize ideas systematically, establish logical relationships among concepts, and improve text coherence before drafting (Amri, 2019; Jameel, 2022). In vocational education, graphic organizers have also been reported to enhance students' engagement and understanding by functioning as a thinking map that facilitates idea organization and technical vocabulary learning (Rainsyah et al., 2023). Similarly, Mayasari (2019) found that graphic organizers improved students' organization, coherence, and paragraph development during writing activities. Among various graphic organizers, the four-square writing technique (FSWT) provides a simple four-box framework that guides students in planning a thesis, supporting arguments, and a concluding recommendation through a structured pre-writing process (E. Gould & Gould, 1999). Its organizational framework closely reflects the generic structure of hortatory exposition texts, enabling students to distinguish the thesis, supporting arguments, and recommendation while maintaining logical relationships among ideas. This features particularly relevant because hortatory exposition requires students not only to express opinions but also construct persuasive and well-organized arguments, which are commonly identified as challenging aspects of writing for EFL learners (Hasibuan et al., 2020; Sarnita, 2024).

Although previous studies have demonstrated the effectiveness of the four-square writing technique in improving students' writing performance across several genres, most Indonesian studies have focused on descriptive, narrative, recount, and procedural writing (Hasanah et al., 2023; Hasanah et al., 2023). Relatively little attention has been given to its application in hortatory exposition writing, despite the fact that this genre develops students' ability to communicate persuasive ideas, justify decisions, and provide recommendations, which are competencies that are increasingly required in vocational education and workplace communication (Datu & Sulindra, 2025). Research investigating its application to hortatory exposition writing, particularly in vocational high school contexts, remains limited. Moreover, previous studies have largely focused on overall writing performance, leaving limited evidence regarding which specific writing components are most responsive to the structured planning support provided by four-square writing technique (FSWT). Accordingly, an important question remains whether the four-square writing technique can effectively improve vocational high school students' hortatory exposition writing performance and which writing components benefit most from its structured planning support. Addressing this question is vital since persuasive writing represents an essential competency for both academic learning and future workplace communication.

To address these research gaps, this study was guided by two research questions. The first research question is whether vocational high school students taught using the Four-Square Writing Technique demonstrate significantly different hortatory exposition writing performance compared

with those receiving conventional instruction, and the second research question is which writing components show the greatest improvement following the implementation of the Four-Square Writing Technique.

Therefore, this study aims to investigate the effectiveness of four-square writing technique (FSWT) in improving vocational high school students' hortatory exposition writing performance and to identify the writing components that are most responsive to the intervention. To achieve these objectives, a quasi-experimental design was employed to compare students' writing performance before and after the implementation of FSWT. By extending the application of FSWT to vocational school students' hortatory exposition writing, this study contributes to the growing body of research on teaching writing using graphic organizers and provides pedagogical implications for English teachers seeking structured pre-writing strategies to support persuasive writing in vocational education.

METHOD

This study employed a quantitative quasi-experimental design using a two groups pre-test post-test design to examine the effectiveness of the Four-Square Writing Technique (FSWT) on vocational high school students' hortatory exposition writing performance. This design was selected because random assignment was not permitted based on school administrative policy, making intact classes the most appropriate unit of analysis while allowing comparison between the experimental and control groups before and after the intervention. This study was conducted in the first semester of the 2025/2026 academic year at a vocational school in Kediri, East Java, Indonesia. The target population consisted of 361 eleventh-grade students from 13 intact classes. The marketing program was purposively selected because its vocational context was relevant to the study focus and the marketing related writing tasks used in this study. There were only two eleventh grade marketing classes at the school, therefore both classes that met the selection criterion were included in the study. Because individual random assignment was not permitted, the two intact classes were retained as the experimental and control groups. The final sample included 44 students (22 in the experimental group and 22 in the control group) who completed both the pre-test and post-test. The data source consisted of students' hortatory exposition essays produced during the pre-test and post-test, collected over five consecutive weeks in three phases including pre-test, treatment intervention, and post-test. In both tests, students individually wrote 100 to 120 words hortatory exposition texts based on parallel writing prompts on Q cards comparing two clothing products. Standardized instructions, time allocation, scoring procedures, and equivalent prompts were applied to ensure comparable testing conditions.

During the intervention, the experimental group received three treatment sessions using the FSWT as a structured pre-writing strategy, while the control group received identical instructions, learning materials, objectives, and writing topics but planned their ideas using their own outlining strategy. The parallel writing test served as the primary research instrument, and students' writing was assessed using a modified analytical scoring rubric adapted from Jacobs et al., (1981), which evaluates content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics with genre-specific refinements for persuasive writing. The writing instructions and scoring rubric were reviewed by two English language education experts to establish content validity, while inter-rater reliability was examined using the Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC) based on essays independently scored by the researcher and the classroom English teacher. All writing scores were analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics 27. Descriptive statistics were calculated first to summarize students' writing performance. To answer the first research question, improvement scores were calculated by subtracting the pre-test scores from the post-test scores, followed by a Shapiro-Wilk normality

test. Since the data were not normally distributed, the Mann-Whitney U test was used to compare improvement scores between the experimental and control groups. To answer the second research question, improvement scores for each writing component were analyzed separately using the Friedman test to identify the writing component that showed the greatest improvement after the implementation of the FSWT.

FINDINGS

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Students' Writing Scores

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Pre-Test Experimental	22	65	85	75.59	5.526
Post-Test Experimental	22	69	88	81.86	5.939
Pre-Test Control	22	67	86	78.64	6.161
Post-Test Control	22	66	87	79.86	5.759
Valid N (listwise)	22				

(Source: IBM SPSS Statistics 27)

To answer the first research question, descriptive statistics were first calculated to compare students' writing performance before and after the intervention period. As presented in Table 1, both the experimental and control groups demonstrated higher mean scores in the post-test than in the pre-test, indicating improvements in students' hortatory exposition writing performance following the instructional period. While both groups showed positive progress, the difference in their mean scores became smaller after the intervention, suggesting that improvements occurred in both classes regardless of the instructional approach.

Before comparing the improvement between groups, the normality of the gain scores was examined using the Shapiro-Wilk test. Since the assumption of normality was not met, the Mann-Whitney U test was used to compare the gain scores of the experimental and control groups.

Table 2. Mann-Whitney U Test Pre-Test Results

Test Statistics^a

Pre-Test Scores	
Mann-Whitney U	171.500
Wilcoxon W	424.500
Z	-1.658
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.097

(Source: IBM SPSS Statistics 27)

Table 3. Mann-Whitney U Test Post-Test Results

Test Statistics ^a	
	Post-Test Scores
Mann-Whitney U	180.000
Wilcoxon W	433.000
Z	-1.464
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.143

(Source: IBM SPSS Statistics 27)

As shown in Table 2, no statistically significant difference was found between the experimental and control groups on the pre-test ($U = 171.50$, $Z = -1.658$, $p = 0.097$), indicating that both groups had comparable writing performance before the intervention. After the instructional treatment, the post-test comparison also showed no statistically significant difference between the two groups ($U = 180.00$, $Z = -1.464$, $p = 0.143$). These findings indicate that although both groups experienced improvement after the instructional period, the magnitude of improvement was not different enough to produce a statistically significant difference between the instructional approaches. This finding suggests that the implementation of FSWT did not lead to significantly greater overall writing performance than conventional instruction. This finding differs from several previous studies that reported significant positive effects of FSWT on students' writing achievement, suggesting that its effectiveness may depend on contextual factors such as instructional duration, learner characteristics, and classroom context. Nevertheless, further analysis of individual writing components was conducted to examine whether the effects of FSWT differed across specific aspects of students' writing.

To answer the second research question, gain scores for the five writing components were analyzed to determine which aspect of writing were most responsive to the implementation of the FSWT. Since the gain scores did not fully meet the assumption of normality, the Friedman test was performed.

Table 4. Friedman Test Results across Writing Components

Ranks	
	Mean Rank
Content	3.45
Organization	4.09
Vocabulary	2.00
Language Use	2.91
Mechanics	2.55

(Source: IBM SPSS Statistics 27)

As shown in Table 4, organization obtained the highest mean score (4.09), followed by content (3.45), language use (2.91), mechanics (2.55), and vocabulary (2.00), indicating that the magnitude of improvement varied across writing components after FSWT implementation. This finding suggests that FSWT contributed more substantially to the improvement of students' organization and content aspects of writing than vocabulary, language use, or mechanics. This pattern is generally consistent with previous research highlighting that graphic organizers primarily facilitate idea generation and text organization, rather than linguistic accuracy.

DISCUSSION

This study aimed to examine whether the Four-Square Writing Technique (FSWT) significantly improved vocational EFL students' hortatory exposition writing performance and to identify which writing components benefited most from its implementation. Overall, the findings indicated that both the experimental and control groups improved their writing performance after the instructional period. However, no statistically significant difference was found between the two instructional approaches, while the component-level analysis revealed that the effects of FSWT varied across different aspects of writing.

The absence of a statistically significant difference does not necessarily indicate that FSWT lacks pedagogical value. Rather, it suggests that both instructional approaches supported students during the planning stage of writing. While the experimental group used FSWT as a structured graphic organizer, the control group was also engaged in pre-writing activities by developing their own outlines before drafting. As a result, students in both groups had opportunities to generate and organize ideas prior to writing, despite receiving different forms of planning support. This finding is consistent with the process model of writing proposed by Flower & Hayes, (1981), which identifies planning as a fundamental cognitive process that facilitates idea generation and organization before drafting.

The improvement observed in both groups may also be explained by repeated writing practice throughout the intervention. Because all students completed comparable writing tasks using the same learning objectives, writing procedures, and assessment criteria, they may have gradually become more familiar with the hortatory exposition genre and its writing expectations regardless of the instructional approach. This interpretation is consistent with recent studies suggesting that repeated writing practice contributes to gradual improvement in students' writing performance (Liu & Tang, 2025; Abdi Tabari et al., 2025).

The present findings should also be interpreted in relation to differences in the participants, research designs, intervention conditions, writing tasks, and assessment focuses of previous studies. For instance, study from Hasanah et al., (2023) investigated 18 grade eleventh EFL students using a one-group pre-test post-test design and a four session FSWT intervention, with the assessment specifically focusing on students' writing content. Their study reported a significant improvement from pre-test to post-test. In contrast, the present study involved 44 grade eleventh vocational marketing students and used a quasi-experimental design in which FSWT compared with students' own outlining strategy. This difference in comparison condition is important because the significant improvement reported by Hasanah et al., (2023) indicates change following FSWT, whereas the present study whether FSWT produced greater improvement than another form of pre-writing support. Since students in the control group also engaged in outlining before drafting, both groups received opportunities to plan and organize their ideas, which may have reduced the difference in improvement between the two groups.

A similar contrast can be observed when the present findings are compared with Sartika et al., (2024). Their study involved 54 eleventh grade students in vocational education in Indonesia,

specifically students majoring in motorcycle business engineering, and employed a quasi-experimental design with 27 students in each group. The students completed argumentative writing tasks, and their performance was assessed using a modified Heaton-based scoring rubric. Sartika et al., (2024) reported significantly higher writing performance in the experimental group and improvements in content, organization, language use, and mechanics. Although both studies therefore share a vocational grade eleventh context, they differed in participants' vocational specialization, writing task, and assessment procedure. The present study focused on marketing students writing hortatory exposition texts and assessed five components, including vocabulary in addition to content, organization, language use, and mechanics. These differences may partly explain why the present study did not produce the same statistically significant overall effect. In particular, the broader component-level assessment used in the present study required improvement across several dimensions, some of which are less directly targeted by a planning oriented technique such as FSWT.

The present findings are also comparable with Munawir, (2022), although that study examined a different graphic organizer, namely the Fishbone Method rather than FSWT, Munawir (2022) used a quasi-experimental design involving 62 senior high school students in two groups and examined descriptive writing performance through pre-test and post-test writing tasks. The study found that the Fishbone Method did not significantly improve overall descriptive writing performance, while content and organization showed improvement, with organization demonstrating greatest among the five writing components. This pattern is relevant to the present findings because both studies suggest that a visual planning strategy may contribute more clearly to particular writing components than to overall writing performance. However, the difference in writing genre should also be considered. Munawir (2022) examined descriptive writing, whereas the present study focused on hortatory exposition which requires students to organize a thesis, supporting arguments, and a recommendation. Thus, the findings across these studies suggest that the contribution of graphic organizers may vary according to the writing genre, the instructional comparison, and the specific components emphasized in assessment.

Study from İpek & Karabuga, (2022) provide another relevant but methodologically distinct comparison. Their study involved 50 B2 level learners of Turkish as a foreign language and examined the effect of FSWT primarily on writing anxiety rather than overall writing performance. The quantitative findings showed a statistically significant effect on writing anxiety, while qualitative responses also indicated perceived benefits related to planning, organization, idea generation, and writing quality. However, the participants were learners of Turkish as a foreign language rather than vocational EFL learners, and the primary outcome was affective rather than a direct measure of writing performance. Therefore, their findings support the broader potential of FSWT to influence writing related processes and experiences, but they should not be treated as directly equivalent evidence of improved overall writing performance in the present context.

Taken together, these comparisons indicate that differences in participant characteristics, research design, comparison conditions, writing genre, intervention conditions, and assessment focus may contribute to variation in findings across studies. The significant results reported by some previous studies do not necessarily conflict with the non-significant between group results of the present study because the studies did not examine identical instructional conditions or writing outcomes. In the present study, the use of an active outlining strategy by the control group, the relatively short intervention consisting of three treatment sessions, the focus on hortatory exposition writing, and the assessment of five writing components may have limited the observable difference between the two instructional approaches. These factors provide plausible explanations

for why students in both groups improved while the between group difference did not reach statistical significance.

Although the overall writing scores did not differ significantly between groups, the component-level analysis demonstrated that the influence of FSWT was not evenly distributed across the five writing components. Organization and content showed the greatest improvement, whereas vocabulary, language use, and mechanics demonstrated relatively smaller gains. These findings suggest that the pedagogical contribution of FSWT is more evident in particular aspects of writing than in overall writing scores. The stronger improvement in organization and content is consistent with the primary function of FSWT as a structured planning strategy. By helping students formulate a thesis, organize supporting arguments, and develop a recommendation before drafting, FSWT may provide greater support for the development and organization of ideas than for linguistic accuracy. This finding is consistent with previous studies reporting that graphic organizers primarily enhance idea organization, text coherence, and content development (Hidayat, 2017; Jameel, 2022; Munawir, 2022; Hasanah et al., 2023; Sartika et al., 2024). Within the vocational marketing context, such planning support may be particularly valuable because persuasive writing tasks closely resemble authentic promotional communication encountered in students' future professional settings.

In contrast, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics demonstrated comparatively smaller gains. This pattern is expected because FSWT primarily supports planning rather than direct linguistic development. According to the Flower & Hayes, (1981) writing model, planning and linguistic encoding represent different cognitive processes during writing. Therefore, while FSWT may facilitate idea generation and organization, improvement in vocabulary and grammatical accuracy remains dependent on students' existing language proficiency and explicit language instruction. This interpretation is also broadly consistent with the component level patterns reported by Hasanah et al., (2023) and Sartika et al., (2024), although their assessment frameworks and writing contexts differed from those of the present study.

Overall, the findings reinforce the view that graphic organizer-based planning strategies primarily support higher-order writing processes, particularly idea generation, organization, and content development, rather than lower-order linguistic processes. Consequently, the contribution of FSWT may be better understood through its influence on specific writing components instead of overall writing scores alone. From a practical perspective, the findings suggest that FSWT remains a useful pre-writing strategy for vocational EFL classrooms because it provides structured support for organizing and developing ideas before writing. However, to promote more balanced writing development, its implementation should be accompanied by instructional activities that explicitly strengthen students' vocabulary, grammar, and language use. Such integration may better support students in producing persuasive texts that are both well organized and linguistically accurate.

CONCLUSION

This study investigated the effectiveness of the Four-Square Writing Technique (FSWT) in improving vocational EFL students' hortatory exposition writing performance. The findings indicate that, although both the experimental and control groups improved following the instructional period, FSWT did not produce a statistically significant improvement in overall writing performance compared with conventional instruction. Nevertheless, the technique demonstrated differential effects across writing components, with the greatest improvements observed in organization and content, suggesting that its primary contribution lies in supporting idea generation and organization during the planning stage of writing rather than linguistic

accuracy.

These findings extend current understanding of FSWT by demonstrating that its effectiveness may be better interpreted through improvements in specific writing components rather than overall writing scores alone, particularly within vocational EFL contexts. From a practical perspective, FSWT can be implemented as a structured pre-writing strategy to help students organize and develop ideas before composing persuasive texts, while its use should be complemented with explicit instruction targeting vocabulary and grammatical development. Future research is recommended to examine the implementation of FSWT over longer instructional periods, across different vocational contexts and writing genres, and in combination with language-focused instructional strategies to determine whether such integration leads to more balanced improvements across all writing components.

REFERENCES

- Abdi Tabari, M., Zhuang, J., & Farahanynia, M. (2025). Task repetition and L2 written performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 70, 101255. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2025.101255>
- Amri, S. (2019). Teaching Hortatory Exposition Text Through Clustering Technique. *Wiralodra English Journal*, 2(2), 163–175. <https://doi.org/10.31943/wej.v2i2.33>
- Datu, Y. A., & Sulindra, E. (2025). Are Vocational High School Students Ready for Global Competitiveness?: Self-Perception on Their English Proficiency. *Social Science and Humanities Journal*, 9(01), 6383–6394. <https://doi.org/10.18535/sshj.v9i01.1588>
- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A Cognitive Process Theory of Writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 32(4), 365. <https://doi.org/10.2307/356600>
- Gould, E., & Gould, J. (1999). *Four Square: Writing Method for Grades 1-3 (ENHANCED eBook)* (M. Rojas (ed.)). Teaching & Learning Company. https://www.google.co.id/books/edition/_/m7LnFB3FVu0C?hl=id&gbpv=1
- Hasanah, N., Noviasmy, Y., Amalia, N., & Mazhur, M. (2023). Enhancing Content Development in EFL Students' Writing: Leveraging the Four-Square Writing Method. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, 10(12), 188. <https://doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v10i12.5226>
- Hasibuan, A., Pricilia, G. M., & Aritonang, N. M. (2020). An analysis Of Students' Difficulties In Writing Hortatory Exposition Text Ability (A Study at the Eleventh Grade Students of SMA Negeri 1 Pinangsori in 2018/2019 Academic Year). *Jurnal Liner, Institut Pendidikan Tapanuli Selatan*, 3(1), 47–67.
- Hidayat, H. (2017). Graphic Organizer Versus Sentence Combining: Determining A Strategy For Text Writing. *ELT Echo : The Journal of English Language Teaching in Foreign Language Context*, 2(1), 49. <https://doi.org/10.24235/eltecho.v2i1.1593>
- İpek, O., & Karabuğa, H. (2022). The Effect of Four-Square Writing Method on Writing Anxiety of Learners of Turkish as a Foreign Language: A Mixed Method Study. *International Education Studies*, 15(5), 132. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v15n5p132>
- Jacobs, H., Zingraf, S., Wormuth, D., Hartfiel, F., & Hughey, J. (1981). *Testing ESL composition a practical approach*. Newbury House. https://openlibrary.org/books/OL4263791M/Testing_ESL_composition
- Jameel, A. S. (2022). The Effects of Story Mapping and Hortatory Exposition Techniques on Students' Compositions. *Education Research International*, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/4300692>
- Liu, J., & Tang, Y. (2025). The effect of task repetition on L2 learners' writing performance: A

- meta-analysis. *Language Teaching Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688251381268>
- Mayasari, W. (2019). Using Graphic Organizer To Increase Students' Writing Performance in Organizing Idea. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa*, 8(2), 342. <https://doi.org/10.31571/bahasa.v8i2.1626>
- Munawir, A. (2022). Descriptive Writing Skills Utilizing A Fishbone Method: A Practical Approach Towards English Students. *ETDC: Indonesian Journal of Research and Educational Review*, 1(2), 243–252. <https://doi.org/10.51574/ijrer.v1i2.377>
- Pratiwi, N., & Ika Sunardi, A. (2024). Students' Difficulties in Achieving English Learning Skills Effectively. *Lingua*, 20(1), 105–121. <https://doi.org/10.34005/lingua.v20i1.3831>
- Rainsyah, R. M., Yanto, E. S., & Fitriyana, W. (2023). Engaging Vocational High School Students In Word Mapping Strategy In Learning Technical Vocabulary: A Classroom Action Research. *Jurnal Ilmiah Wahana Pendidikan*, Desember, 9(24), 549–558. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10434131>
- Sarnita. (2024). *Challenges In Writing Hortatory Exposition Text Experienced By Tenth Grade Students Of Madrasah Aliyah*. 4(1), 191–202.
- Sartika, D., Fitriati, S. W., Suwandi, & Pratama, H. (2024). Investigating the Effects of Four-Square Writing Technique on EFL Students' Writing Performance in Indonesia. *New Educational Review*, 76(2), 149–161. <https://doi.org/10.15804/TNER.2024.76.2.11>
- Satibi, I. (2024). Excellent Vocational School Development Management in Indonesia. *LITERASI: Jurnal Pendidikan Guru Indonesia*, 2(4), 268–284. <https://doi.org/10.58218/literasi.v2i4.804>
- Simanjuntak, A. P. A., Tobing, A. H., Simbolon, D., & Silaban, T. (2025). an Error Analysis of Using Simple Present Tense in Writing Descriptive. *Journal of English Language Teaching, Literatures, Applied Linguistic (JELTLAL)*, 3(1), 11–16. <https://doi.org/10.69820/jeltlal.v3i1.306>

APPENDIX

APPENDIX 1. Writing Task Instructions

Task Description

The task requires participants to write a hortatory exposition essay based on one of the provided Q-card prompts, consisting of approximately 100 - 120 words.

Guidelines

1. Choose ONE product from the two available options on the selected Q-card that you want to promote.
2. Read the comparison points (e.g. price, material, characteristic, durability) carefully.
3. Use the provided information to develop your essay.
4. Clearly argue why your chosen product is valuable using logical and persuasive reasoning.
5. Organize your writing using an appropriate structure of hortatory exposition (thesis, arguments, recommendation).
6. Complete the task within the allocated time (60 minutes).
7. For the post test, select a different topic from the one chosen in the pre-test.

Important Rules

1. Do not share your Q-card with others during the test.
2. Use only the information provided on the Q-card.
3. Complete the task individually.
4. The use of mobile phones or any external resources is prohibited during the test.

APPENDIX 2. Pre/Post-Test Items

Veloura



Rp. 100.000

Material: 100% Cotton

Claim: Comfortable, absorb sweat well, soft, breathable, slimming look

Best for: Formal to semi formal

Arunika



Rp. 100.000

Material: 100 % Polyester

Claim: Soft, breathable, not easily wrinkle, flowy, durable

Best for: Casual, daily

Kive



Rp. 100.000

Material: 100% Semi wool

Claim: High waist, soft, flowy, comfortable, not easily wrinkle

Best for: Formal to casual

NOIR



Rp. 100.000

Material: 100% Premium scuba

Claim: Elastic, shaped body, soft, not easily wrinkle, thick

Best for: Formal to semi formal

FORMA



Rp. 150.000

Material: 100% Polyester

Claim: Soft, durable, lightweight, breathable, UV resistant

Best for: Running, sports, outdoor activity

MILE



Rp. 200.000

Material: 100% Parachute

Claim: Windproof, UV resistant, quick drying, waterproof, lightweight

Best for: Outdoor activity, sports

Everdenim



Rp. 150.000

Material: 100% Semi wool

Claim: Soft, slim fit look, absorb sweat well, not easily wrinkle,

Best for: Formal to semi formal, smart casual

Armor



Rp. 110.000

Material: 100% Linen

Claim: Lightweight, absorb sweat well, breathable, flowy

Best for: Casual, daily

APPENDIX 3. Modified Analytical Scoring Rubric

Writing Rubric Modified from (Jacob et al., 1981) and (Wilson, 2018).

Aspect	Score	Description
Content (C) 45%	(Excellent to very good) 45 – 39	Thesis is clear, stated explicitly at the opening paragraph, and stating the author's position specifically. Contains 3 different arguments, each argument has 1 sentence of clear and relevant product claims, 1 sentence of concrete/strong evidence (data/specific quotes) that support the claim, and 1 sentence of impact explanation with logical connections to the thesis. Recommendations or CTA (Call to Action) are present and include re-stating the thesis statements and synthesize all arguments.
	(Good to average) 38 – 32	Thesis is clear, stated explicitly at the opening paragraph, and stating the author's position but lack specifics. Contains 2 different arguments, each argument has 1 sentence of product claims, 1 statement of quite relevant evidence, 1 sentence of impact explanation but underdeveloped/does not fully connect to the thesis. Recommendations or CTA (Call to Action) are present and include re-stating the thesis statements and synthesize all arguments.
	(Fair to poor) 31 – 23	Thesis is vague, stated implicitly in the opening paragraph, and lack specificity on author's position. Contains only 1 argument, argument has vaguely stated the product claim, weak

		statement of evidence (generic), and unclear explanatory sentence of the impact that not connect to the thesis. Recommendations or CTA (Call to Action) are partially present, not re-stating the thesis statements and not synthesize all arguments.
	(Very poor) 22 - 0	No thesis stated in the opening paragraph, does not state the author's position. Not contain any arguments. Recommendations or CTA (Call to Action) are not present.
	(Excellent to very good) 20 – 17	Full generic structure containing a thesis, arguments, and a recommendation. Contains 5 body paragraphs with topic sentences in all. Arguments body paragraphs only contain 1 argument/topic sentence. Each body paragraph begins with a topic sentence, sequence markers (firstly, secondly, thirdly, finally) appear in all body paragraph, and use connectives/conjunctions (because, therefore, however, moreover, in addition) ≥ 3 in each body paragraph. All body paragraphs order of ideas are logical (claim → evidence → impacts)
Organization (O) 20%	(Good to average) 16 – 14	Largely complete generic structure containing a thesis, arguments, and a recommendation. Contains 4 body paragraphs, with at most 1 body paragraph mix 2 topic sentences/arguments. Topic sentences appear in at least 2-3 body paragraph, missing at least 1 sequence markers (firstly, secondly, thirdly, finally) in body paragraph, and use

		connectives/conjunctions (because, therefore, however, moreover, in addition) at least 2 in each body paragraph. Order of ideas (claim → evidence → impacts) followed in at least 2 body paragraphs.
	(Fair to poor) 13 – 10	Weak generic structure but recognizable. Contains 3 or less body paragraphs, with at most 1 body paragraph mix 3 or more topic sentences/arguments. Topic sentences only appear in 1-2 body paragraph, missing 2-3 sequence markers (firstly, secondly, thirdly, finally) in body paragraph, and use connectives/conjunctions (because, therefore, however, moreover, in addition) only 1 in each body paragraph. Order of ideas (claim → evidence → impacts) followed in only 1 body paragraphs.
	(Very poor) 9 - 0	Missing or irrelevant generic structure. Contains 1 or less body paragraphs, with a single topic sentences/arguments. No sequence markers (firstly, secondly, thirdly, finally) indicators in body paragraph, and not use connectives/conjunctions (because, therefore, however, moreover, in addition) in body paragraph. No clear order of ideas (claim → evidence → impacts) followed in body paragraphs.
Vocabulary (V) 15%	(Excellent to very good) 15 – 13	Use persuasive marketing technical words ≥ 5 (e.g. benefits, features, value, advantages, recommends, best), word choice is very appropriate & has ≥ 3 varied/synonym words. Use ≥ 5 modal verbs (e.g. should, must, ought to, etc.) to effectively strengthen arguments or

		convince readers. Use ≥ 5 descriptive adjectives/adverbs used for product (strong, durable, affordable) CTA (Call to Action) use ≥ 1 imperatives sentence.
	(Good to average) 12 – 11	Use persuasive marketing technical words at least 3 (e.g. benefits, features, value, advantages, recommends, best), word choice is appropriate & has at least 3 varied/synonym words. Use at least 3 modal verbs (e.g. should, must, ought to, etc.) to effectively strengthen arguments or convince readers. Use at least 3 descriptive adjectives/adverbs used for product (strong, durable, affordable) CTA (Call to Action) use only 1 imperatives sentence.
	(Fair to poor) 10 – 8	Use persuasive marketing technical words 1-2 (e.g. benefits, features, value, advantages, recommends, best), word choice is quite appropriate & has 1-2 varied/synonym words. Use 1-2 modal verbs (e.g. should, must, ought to, etc.) to effectively strengthen arguments or convince readers. Use 1-2 descriptive adjectives/adverbs used for product (strong, durable, affordable) CTA (Call to Action) not use imperatives sentence.
	(Very poor) 7 - 0	No persuasive marketing technical words (e.g. benefits, features, value, advantages, recommends, best), word choice is not

		appropriate & has no varied/synonym words. No modal verbs (e.g. should, must, ought to, etc.) to effectively strengthen arguments or convince readers. No descriptive adjectives/adverbs used for product (strong, durable, affordable). CTA (Call to Action) not use imperatives Sentence
Language Use (L) 15%	(Excellent to very good) 15 – 13	There are only 0–3 grammatical or structural errors in 120 words. The structure and grammar are very accurate, with complete sentences, clear, contextual, and varied.
	(Good to average) 12 – 11	There are 4–6 grammatical or structural errors in 120 words. Sentence structure is generally correct and effective, with a few grammatical errors that do not detract from the meaning.
	(Fair to poor) 10 – 8	There are 7–12 grammatical or structural errors in 120 words. Some sentences are ineffective and inconsistent, and grammatical or tense errors begin to interfere with the meaning of ideas.
	(Very poor) 7 - 0	There are ≥ 12 grammatical or structural errors in 120 words. The structure and grammar are weak, many sentences are incomplete or difficult to understand, and the language is inappropriate for context.
Mechanics (M) 5%	(Excellent to very good) 5	No more than 2 mechanical errors in 120 words. The writing is very neat and accurate, with almost no spelling, punctuation, or capitalization errors, and the formatting is consistent.
	(Good to average) 4	There are 3–5 mechanical errors per 120 words. The writing is generally correct, with only a few minor spelling or punctuation errors that do not affect readability.

	(Fair to poor) 3	There are 6–9 mechanical errors in 120 words. Several spelling, punctuation, or capitalization errors begin to impair readability, although the meaning is still understandable.
	(Very poor) 2 – 0	There are 9+ mechanical errors in 120 words. Numerous spelling, punctuation, or capitalization errors obscure the meaning and significantly degrade the quality of the text.

APPENDIX 4. Four-Square Writing Technique Sample Worksheet

FIRST ARGUMENT (SUPPORTING REASON 1) - Claim : The fabric is soft . - Evidence : Cotton is made of natural fibers that feel smooth and gentle on the skin . - Impact : It gives a pleasant feeling when worn , Prevents skin irritation , and makes the outfit look neat and elegant .	SECOND ARGUMENT (SUPPORTING REASON 2) - Claim : The material is comfortable . - Evidence : Cotton is breathable and absorbs sweat well , keeping the body cool even in hot weather . - Impact : It makes the wearer feel relaxed all day , supports active movement , and enhances daily comfort .
THESIS STATEMENTS I personally choose fit body because soft , comfortable , and suitability for both casual and formal occasions .	
THIRD ARGUMENT (SUPPORTING REASON 3) - Claim : It is suitable for both casual and formal occasions . - Evidence : Cotton fabric can be styled in many ways from simple shirts to formal office wear . - Impact : It gives a flexible impression , looks elegant in formal settings , yet remains casual and simple for everyday use .	CONCLUSION (RECOMMENDATIONS) Cotton is the best material because it is soft , comfortable , and suitable for any occasion . So I recommend choosing 100% cotton for a fabric that combines comfort , elegance , and versatility .