



The effect of learning method and discourse markers mastery on students writing skill

Suryadi*

STKIP Situs Banten, Indonesia

**E-mail: suryadiyadi426@yahoo.com*

(Received: 05 January 2024; Accepted: 20 March 2024; Published: 30 April 2024)

ABSTRACT

Developing writing skills is a formidable task and is often regarded as the most intricate and demanding aspect of language acquisition. This study aims to determine the impact of CTL (Contextual Teaching and Learning) and PBL (Problem-Based Learning) on enhancing students' writing proficiency with varying levels of discourse marker. The study was analyzed using two-way ANOVA with a 2 x 3 factorial design, employing inferential analytical methods. The analysis included 250 students from State Islamic Senior High Schools in Serang Regency, Indonesia. The sampling method employed random selection. The research findings showed a notable impact of learning methods (CTL and PBL) on students' writing proficiency. Then, students' mastery of markers substantially impacted their writing proficiency. Furthermore, there was a substantial interaction impact between learning methods and knowledge of discourse markers on students' writing proficiency. A research gap that explicitly investigates the combined impact of educational approaches and proficiency in discourse markers has been identified. The existing literature has concentrated chiefly on teaching methods such as collaborative learning and direct instruction and the specific functions of discourse markers in literary composition. This gap underscores the necessity for a complete examination considering pedagogical techniques and linguistic components in writing training. The findings of this study should also serve as a reminder to schools to adequately equip their students with the necessary English language skills to compete in the global arena effectively. Additionally, schools should offer their students additional chances to engage in English writing activities within the school premises.

Keywords: Discourse markers mastery, students writing skill, the effect of learning method

DOI:

INTRODUCTION

Developing writing skills is a formidable task and is often regarded as the most intricate and demanding aspect of language acquisition (Harmer, 2007; Hyland, 2021). Writing demands various techniques, including advanced grammatical structures, stylistic competence, mechanical proficiency, meticulous vocabulary choice, and critical thinking abilities (Hedge, 2005). Furthermore, many students experience hesitancy in passionately participating in writing tasks (Harmer, 2007). Foreign language authors often encounter substantial obstacles when it comes to strengthening their writing abilities (Evans et al., 2010). In writing, instructors' primary obstacle is ensuring that students learn from their past errors and achieve proficiency and precision in their writing (Hemmati & Soltanpour, 2012). The study of writing has become a subject of extensive global inquiry in recent decades. Students must clearly comprehend their intended content, the rationale behind the chosen writing style, and the ultimate manifestation of the text they will generate to initiate the writing process. Students across all educational levels are required to generate texts, ranging from basic to more intricate. For instance, undergraduate students in higher education are required to compose a synthesis after perusing the material (Ockenburg et al., 2019). While perusing the source material, students must carefully evaluate the pertinent information that is both pertinent to their objective and significant enough to be incorporated into their synthesis text.

An argumentative text is one of the required texts for students to write. Daily assignments or a thesis require students to compose an argumentative text (Hasani, 2016)). However, a typical task for advanced college students, writing an argumentative essay can be extremely challenging (Deane & Song, 2015). According to Hasani (2016), students often encounter challenges such as constructing insufficient arguments, failing to highlight the components of the argument, ambiguously presenting the argument, lacking sufficient evidence to substantiate the argument, and lacking comprehension or response to alternative perspectives.

Teachers must offer substantial support in meaningful situations, foster peer participation, use primary texts, provide valuable comments, and offer direction throughout the writing process (Hyland, 2021). As a result of the challenge of developing writing abilities, educators employ several strategies. This paper examines two learning approaches, specifically Contextual Teaching and Learning (CTL) and Project-Based Learning (PBL). Both educational approaches aim to cultivate reflective practice using social interaction. The Contextual Teaching and Learning approach is a pedagogical model that entails integrating students' learning material with the specific environment in which the material might be used. Aligning material with its surrounding circumstances is crucial to imbuing significance into acquiring knowledge (Risan et al., 2021).

Meanwhile, Project-Based Learning (PBL) emphasizes comprehension through hands-on implementation, using projects or activities as instruments for learning. The PBL method is highly efficient in instructing students on tackling interdisciplinary activities, effectively managing resources, and collaborating with peers (Dinda & Septiana, 2024). Given the inherent challenges of writing as a language skill, using discourse markers (DMs) in academic writing has garnered interest from several research studies. Not only non-native speakers but also native speakers of the language encounter this difficulty (Alahmed et al., 2020).

The existing literature has demonstrated a correlation between it and the writing abilities of students (Arifanita et al., 2019; Ariyanti & Fitriana, 2017; Hasan & Marzuki, 2017; Melissourgou & Frantzi, 2015; Novariana et al., 2018; Rahmatunisa, 2014; Toba et al., 2019; Zhan, 2015). Meanwhile, the contextual learning strategy dramatically enhances students' abilities to produce analytical expositions (Novelti et al., 2022; Rahman & Ekkayokkaya, 2024; Windi & Suryaman, 2022). A research gap that explicitly investigates the combined impact of educational approaches and proficiency in discourse markers has been identified. The existing literature has concentrated chiefly on teaching methods such as collaborative learning and direct instruction and the specific functions of discourse markers in literary composition. This gap underscores the necessity for a complete examination considering pedagogical techniques and linguistic components in writing training. This research introduces an innovative approach that combines teaching modalities with proficiency in discourse markers. It suggests that the efficacy of writing education can be significantly improved by focussing on both aspects simultaneously. The results will enhance the comprehension of how to improve teaching interventions to enhance student's writing abilities, namely in terms of the logical and cohesive structure of their writing.

This study aims to determine the impact of CTL (Contextual Teaching and Learning) and PBL (Problem-Based Learning) on enhancing students' writing proficiency with varying discourse marker knowledge levels and examine the notable disparities between the two approaches. This study is distinct from prior studies since it uses CTL and PBL to teach writing, as seen by the differences in discourse marker competence. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to address the following inquiries:

1. Does using the CTL and PBL methods result in a disparity in students' writing proficiency?
2. Does the level of discourse marker mastery among students differentiate their writing abilities into high, medium, and low levels?
3. Does the use of CTL and PBL learning methods and mastery of discourse markers have an interactive effect on students' writing ability?

RESEARCH METHODS

A total of 250 students took part in the research. One hundred and twenty-five students comprised each group. The whole student body consisted of native Indonesian speakers. The initial experimental group received instruction using the CTL learning approach, whereas the second group received instruction using the PBL learning model. The present study additionally examines the variability in students' proficiency in discourse markers. The analysis included 250 students from State Islamic Senior High Schools in Serang Regency, Indonesia. The sampling method employed random selection. Their writing must be grammatically accurate and have coherence and consistency. Discourse markers are crucial for maintaining text coherence and should be carefully considered while designing training materials. Indeed, the significance of discourse markers in English literature remains uncertain. Undeniably, discourse markers substantially impact the coherence and uniformity of writing. Argue that the generation of coherent discourse markers indicates the connection between discursive units or utterances and extended sections of text, as well as between text and extralinguistic context.

The instruments used for data collection comprised written assessments and Discourse Marker tests. An evaluation was conducted on each instrument throughout the first semester. The experimental sample consisted of eleventh-grade students from Madrasah Aliyah Negeri Serang, Indonesia, whose characteristics accurately represented the actual students. Preliminary normality and homogeneity tests were performed before data analysis using SPSS. The researcher administered a writing test to assess the student's writing abilities. The experimental group participants in this study completed a pretest and a posttest after developing detailed instructions. The second test was explicitly created to assess students' proficiency in using discourse markers. Upon analyzing students' writing projects, the researcher examined their utilization of discourse markers. Fraser's framework (Fraser, 1990) was employed in the discourse marker test. The theory proposed by Fraser aims to elucidate the many classifications of discourse markers (DMs) used by students of Madrasah Aliyah Negeri 1 Serang, Indonesia, in written materials, as well as their purposes and interconnections.

The first step in this study was to administer a writing skills and discourse markers assessment in the experimental and control groups before receiving any intervention. Moreover, the experimental group employed the CTL learning method as an initial phase throughout the treatment. Within the experimental group, the knowledge acquired from the textbook was organized based on their themes or subjects. The experimental group received instruction utilizing the CTL method. During the second phase, the control class received instruction on implementing the PBL learning approach. During the third phase, the researcher elucidated the function of discourse markers in written communication. During each session, the researcher delivered detailed instructions on the unit's five distinct kinds of discourse markers.

Furthermore, the students in the experimental group were partitioned into three groups, each consisting of an equal number of students, specifically when all students were present. By employing the CTL learning method in the experimental class and the PBL learning approach in the control class, the researcher emphasized and promoted collaboration among students to enhance their understanding of the function of discourse markers. In the fourth phase, each group was tasked with composing a text and assigned the responsibility of identifying the discourse markers. In addition, each group was directed to compose a written piece by assuming a distinct character. Furthermore, the discussion was refined to collect input from colleagues and, if needed, from the researcher. The ultimate step was to complete assigned tasks for the upcoming session. By illustration, the researcher instructed the students to peruse a literary work. Subsequently, the narrative had to be condensed using discourse markers for the upcoming session.

While the intervention was provided to students in the experimental group, students in the control group did not get specific instruction on discourse markers. Instead, the students were directed to peruse designated storybooks, listen to written materials, and participate in text composition activities. The therapy was conducted over a series of 15 sessions, each lasting 50 minutes, under the guidance of an English facilitator. The therapy intervention was conducted between February 2024 and April 2024. During the first session, pupils underwent standardization. Students were administered an initial assessment during the second session. For 12 sessions, students were directed to employ discourse markers with the CTL and PBL learning approaches. During the last session, both groups completed a posttest that specifically assessed the students' academic writing abilities.

Moreover, the data were examined to attain the findings. For example, the researcher instructed the students to read narrative literature thoroughly. Subsequently, the following session required a concise story summary using discourse markers. Both cohorts were evaluated in the concluding session utilizing the writing posttest and discourse markers. Researchers and English instructors at Madrasah Aliyah prepared examination questions. The data was then assessed to derive the results.

The data analysis methodology commenced with presenting descriptive-analytical statistics guided by the problem and hypotheses described in this study. The analysis comprised mean scores, measures of variability (standard deviation), lowest and highest scores recorded, and Marginal Mean Estimates, all about the writing proficiency of pupils. The study was analyzed using two-way ANOVA with a 2 x 3 factorial design, employing inferential analytical methods. The present data analysis evaluated the teaching approach's impact on promoting the acquisition of discourse markers and their subsequent use in enhancing students' writing competency. Preceding any analysis, all data underwent verification to confirm compliance with the necessary normality, homogeneity, and correlation criteria.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The present study examines the variations in enhancing students' writing abilities by different learning methods and levels of proficiency in high, medium, and low discourse markers. The present study additionally emphasizes the impact of the interplay between learning methods and proficiency in high, medium, and low discourse markers on students' writing abilities. The study results are categorized into three research findings: (1) disparities in writing abilities among students who received treatment using the CTL and PBL learning approaches, (2) disparities in writing abilities among students with high, medium, and low proficiency in discourse markers, and (3) interactions between learning methods and proficiency in high, medium, and low discourse markers on students' writing abilities, as observed from the average pretest and posttest assessment.

The present study investigates the influence of several learning methods on students' writing proficiency. The control group employed the Problem-Based Learning (PBL) method, whereas the experimental group used the CTL method. The pretest and posttest evaluations were carried out to assess students' writing abilities both before and after the intervention. The findings revealed notable disparities in writing proficiency across the two class cohorts, suggesting that incorporating didactic approaches enhances the acquisition of discourse markers. Significant variations in discourse markers were observed between the two courses. Considerable variations were seen among students with high, medium, and poor proficiency in discourse markers. This is evident from the disparity in mean scores reported by the groups. The results of this preliminary investigation prompt the inquiry of whether there exists a discrepancy in students' writing proficiency when comparing those who received instruction using the CTL learning approach with those who received instruction using the PBL learning approach. The statistics are displayed as the mean value of the pretest and posttest scores and their corresponding standard deviations. Hence, Tables 1 and 2 can depict students' writing proficiency before and after applying the learning approach by incorporating English conversation markers among various groups.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of the Experimental Group

Statistic	Discourse markers	Pretest	N	Posttest	N
Means	High	77.83	50	92.50	50
	Medium	60.42	100	80.00	100
	Low	56.50	100	60.20	100
Std deviation	High	3.041	50	4.056	50
	Medium	7.406	100	7.389	100
	Low	5.200	100	8.075	100

By comparison, the pretest findings in the experimental group indicated that persons with a high level of proficiency in discourse markers had an average writing skill score of 77.83, with a standard deviation of 3.041. Individuals with moderate proficiency in discourse markers attained an average score of 60.42 in writing skills, with a standard deviation of 7.406. Conversely, individuals with little proficiency in discourse markers achieved a mean score of 56.50 in writing skills, with a standard deviation of 5.200. The posttest results of the experimental group indicated that persons with a high level of proficiency in discourse markers had an average writing skill score of 92.50, with a standard deviation of 4.056. Individuals with moderate proficiency in discourse markers achieved an average score of 80.00 in writing skills (SD=7.389). In contrast, those with a low level of proficiency had a score of 60.20 in writing skills (SD=8.075). The findings of this investigation elucidate.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of the Control Group

Statistic	Discourse markers	Pretest	N	Posttest	N
Means	High	60.00	50	65.22	50
	Medium	50.00	100	58.17	100
	Low	40.50	100	50.00	100
Std deviation	High	7.497	50	7.975	50
	Medium	6.174	100	8.389	100
	Low	3.200	100	4.975	100

The pretest results of the control group, as shown in Table 2, indicate the following: the group with the lowest proficiency in discourse markers has the lowest average writing skill score (M=40.50, SD=3.200); the group with moderate proficiency in discourse markers (M=50.00, SD=6.174); and the group with high proficiency in discourse markers (M=60.00, SD=7.497). The results of the posttest indicate that the mean writing skill score in the group with low competency in discourse markers is (M=50.00, SD=4.975), in the group with high proficiency in discourse markers is (M=65.22, SD=7.975), and in the group with moderate proficiency in discourse markers is (M=58.17, SD=4.975).

The present study investigated the effect of different learning methods and variations in proficiency levels of high, medium, and low-level discourse markers on the English writing abilities of students. Data analysis was conducted using two-way ANOVA to assess the correlation between the independent and dependent variables. Study findings indicated that the decision of learning method and the proficiency in discourse markers substantially impacted students' writing abilities.

Table 3. Test of ANOVA 2 ways

Dependent Variable: Writing Skill						
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	
Corrected Model	9127.404a	4	1825.481	27.951	.000	
Intercept	134118.102	2	134118.102	2120.697	.000	
Learning Method	1639.704	1	1639.704	29.915	.000	
Discourse Markers	1252.707	2	626.354	15.899	.000	
Learning Method* Discourse Markers	1782.804	2	891.402	20.088	.000	
Error	5947.596	245	63.272			
Total	393300.000	250				
Corrected Total	15075.000	249				

a. R Squared = .865 (Adjusted R Squared = .884)

Table 3 indicates that the two-way ANOVA analysis reveals a statistically significant disparity in the English writing abilities of students who received instruction utilizing the CTL or PBL learning method. This is demonstrated by the outcomes of the two-way parametric test or analysis of variance (ANOVA), in which the computed F value is contrasted with the predicted F value from the F table at a significance level of 5%. The computed F value ($F = 29.915$) surpasses the critical F value from the F table (3.936), suggesting statistical significance. Furthermore, the significance value (0.000) is lower than the required threshold of significance of 0.05. The present study employed a two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) to examine the differential variance among several groups. This methodology aligns with the researcher's predetermined study goals and problem definitions. Analysis of variance, sometimes referred to as two-way ANOVA, is a statistical method employed to examine the interaction among groups of variables.

Moreover, proficiency in discourse markers significantly impacts students' capacity to write in English. The results of the 2-way parametric test or analysis of variance (ANOVA) demonstrate this phenomenon since the computed F value is compared to the F table value at a significance level of 5%. The calculated F value ($F = 15.899$) exceeds the critical F value from the table (3.936), suggesting statistical significance (Sig. Value = $0.000 < 0.05$). The discovery above aligns with the second research inquiry. The findings of the third study indicate a notable correlation between different learning approaches and students' proficiency in English writing, particularly their understanding of discourse markers. The results of the 2-way parametric test or analysis of variance (ANOVA) demonstrate this phenomenon since the computed F value is compared to the F table value at a significance level of 5%. The calculated F value of 20.08 exceeded the critical F value from the table of 3.936, suggesting statistical significance.

Moreover, the significance value (0.000) is lower than the set significance level of 0.05. Conversely, the R-squared value of 0.865 suggests that the combined impact of learning methods and discourse marker proficiency can explain 86.5% of the variability in students' English writing skills. Furthermore, the effect of learning methods on writing results is contingent upon students' proficiency levels in applying discourse markers. The research results were corroborated by a two-way ANOVA data analysis, which revealed a significant relationship between the utilization of various learning approaches and students' proficiency levels (high, medium, and poor) in discourse markers. This interaction had a substantial impact on the English writing proficiency of the students. The researcher performed a further test using the Scheffe test. This activity aims to enhance the precision of the two-way ANOVA test outcomes and minimize bias in the study's conclusions. The findings shown in Table 3 demonstrate that the two-way ANOVA analysis reveals a statistically significant and advantageous impact of competency in discourse markers at different levels (high, medium, and low) on the English writing skills of students.

Moreover, the two-way ANOVA analysis reveals a statistically significant disparity in students' writing skills who were exposed to the CTL and PBL learning approaches. The findings from the third study, which used two-way ANOVA, demonstrate the interaction effect between the utilization of learning techniques and proficiency in discourse markers on the English writing abilities of students. The present study underscores the need for teachers to exercise caution in providing instructional strategies for acquiring discourse markers. Furthermore, instructors must incorporate a more comprehensive array of technology-based learning approaches.

Table 4. Using Tukey Test

Multiple Comparisons						
Dependent Variable: Writing Skills						
Tukey HSD						
(I) Discourse Markers	(J) Discourse Markers	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	Upper Bound
High	Moderate	9.85*	2.736	.002	2.96	16.63
	Low	3.94	2.631	.125	3.16	11.04
Moderate	High	9.89*	2.736	.002	16.63	-2.96
	Low	3.86	2.523	.153	11.18	1.47
Low	High	3.94	2.631	.145	11.02	1.16
	Moderate	4.56	2.723	.173	1.47	11.18

Based on observed means.
 The error term is Mean Square (Error) = 68.142.
 *. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Table 4 presents the correlation between learning methods and the level of mastery in high, medium, and low discourse markers on students' English writing proficiency. The findings are presented below 1). The correlation coefficient between high and medium proficiency in discourse markers is $M=9.85$. A significance value below 0.05 indicates that the null hypothesis is rejected. The present study establishes a disparity in the English writing proficiency of students with high and medium mastery of discourse markers. 2). The correlation coefficient between high and low proficiency in discourse markers is $M=3.94$. Based on a Sig value greater than 0.05, H_0 is approved. The present study establishes no disparity in the English writing proficiency of students with high and low understanding of discourse markers. 3). The correlation coefficient between moderate and high proficiency in discourse markers is $M=9.89$. A significance level below 0.05 indicates rejection of H_0 . This study concludes that a disparity exists in the English writing proficiency of students with moderate and high mastery of discourse markers. 4). The interaction coefficient between medium and poor discourse marker mastery is $M=4.86$. A Sig value greater than 0.05 indicates that H_0 is accepted. The results suggest no disparity in the English writing proficiency of students with medium and low mastery of discourse markers. 5). There is an interaction coefficient 3.94 between poor and high discourse marker mastery. $Sig>0.05$, then the null hypothesis is accepted. The results indicate no disparity in the English writing proficiency of pupils across low and high levels of discourse marker competence. 6). The interaction coefficient between low and medium discourse marker mastery is 4.56. $Sig>0.05$ indicates that H_0 is accepted. The results suggest no disparity in the English writing proficiency of pupils across low and medium levels of discourse marker competence.

The present study poses three research inquiries. This article analyses the impact of CTL and PBL learning approaches on students' proficiency in discourse markers. The present section examines the outcomes of employing learning methodologies, namely CTL and PBL, and student's proficiency level in using discourse markers. Three primary conclusions are derived from this study, according to the findings on the impact of contextual teaching and learning (CTL) and problem-based learning (PBL) with proficiency in discourse markers on students' writing competency. Based on the proficiency in vocabulary and discourse markers, many high school pupils still lack proper and accurate mastery of these items. Many Indonesian students require assistance in comprehending the intricate grammatical framework of the English language. In addition to grammatical challenges, students typically need assistance in

effectively communicating the substance of their work due to the cultural disparities between their native language and English. Students shall articulate their thoughts in written form by employing the grammatical framework of their native language.

Consequently, the aspects of their writing fail to adhere to the principles of English rhetoric. Conversely, teachers require assistance in instructing writing in large classrooms, which hampers the effectiveness of teaching and learning (Ariyanti, 2016). The research conducted by (Ali & Hasanah, 2024; Kusumahati et al., 2023; Mairani, 2022; Moybeka et al., 2023; Wahyuni, 2017) examines the CTL and PBL learning methods. Existing data indicates that the CTL and PBL approach substantially influence students' writing proficiency. The present study distinguishes itself from prior research by including integrated learning methodologies and assessing students' proficiency in discourse markers, enhancing their writing abilities. Despite being exposed to and able to articulate discourse markers in the procedural text genre, Indonesian students still struggle with mastering this linguistic device.

Concerning the second research question: Does the writing proficiency of students with high, medium, and poor mastery of discourse markers vary? We want to emphasize that our findings suggest that the impact of high, medium, and low proficiency in discourse markers on students' writing abilities differs based on the level of achievement in these markers. Tukey's follow-up test (Table 4) revealed that two groups of students demonstrated proficiency in discourse markers, indicating notable writing performance (High vs. Medium group and Medium vs. High group). Furthermore, the outcomes for the four categories of discourse markers (High vs. low, medium vs. low, low vs. high, and low vs. medium) were insignificant. Furthermore, the statistical analysis using a two-way ANOVA test (Table 3) revealed a significant difference in students' writing abilities with high, medium, and poor proficiency in discourse markers. However, the findings of this study reveal specific issues, particularly the presence of a significant number of students with inadequate proficiency in discourse markers compared to those with advanced proficiency. Despite having already employed discourse markers, students at the State Islamic Senior High School in Serang Regency, Indonesia, were nevertheless required to acquire knowledge of them. These findings are corroborated by several studies that highlight the positive impact of mastering discourse markers on students' writing skills (Al-khazraji, 2019; Al-Qahtani, 2015; Alsaawi, 2022; Fox Tree, 2014; Manan & Raslee, 2018; Mughrabi, 2017; Riznanda, 2021; Vahdat et al., 2016). However, the results of this study contradict the study conducted by Kalajahi & Abdullah (2015), who proposed that there is no significant correlation between writing proficiency and the use of discourse markers (DMs) among Malaysian ESL students. Despite the significance of discourse markers in the education of secondary school students in Indonesia, there is a lack of dedicated study on the mastery of discourse markers. According to our research conducted at Madrasah Aliyah Negeri 1 Serang, Indonesia, a significant challenge in teaching discourse markers is the restricted time allocated for English sessions based on Indonesian language proficiency standards. Hence, incorporating discourse markers (DMs) with other pedagogical methods or instructional materials might augment the educational process and effectively enhance students' writing abilities (Sun, 2013).

The present study investigates the potential relationship between learning methods and the varying degrees of discourse marker mastery among students, depending on their writing proficiency. The objective is to use the obtained data, which demonstrate a correlation between the interplay of learning methods (CTL and PBL) and the varying degrees of proficiency in discourse markers on students' writing proficiency. The research aims to give further empirical evidence that substantiates the efficacy of instructors' instructional techniques in writing proficiency. Moreover, this study aims to investigate the influence of different learning methods on the acquisition of discourse marker abilities during the learning process. It is recommended that future studies investigate the learning methodologies and students' proficiency in discourse markers across all educational levels in Indonesia. Drawing from the analysis of the research

results, this study presents novel insights into the incorporation of learning methods and proficiency in discourse markers on students' writing proficiency. The findings of this study should also serve as a reminder to schools to adequately equip their students with the necessary English language skills to compete effectively in the global arena.

Additionally, schools should offer their students additional chances to engage in English writing activities within the school premises. The present investigation is subject to many constraints. One of the most apparent limitations is the sample size, which is constrained by the relatively brief timeframe of the research and is restricted to high school subjects. Finally, this study was influenced by various issues in the research design, including the imbalanced distribution of students among the groups.

CONCLUSION

The present study investigates the influence of different learning methods (CTL and PBL) and varying proficiency levels in discourse markers (high, medium, and low) on the writing proficiency of eleventh-grade students at a State Islamic Senior High School in Serang Regency, Indonesia. The data indicate that the impact of learning methods on enhancing students' writing abilities is contingent upon the degree of proficiency in discourse markers acquired by students with high, medium, and low proficiency levels. The research findings showed a notable impact of learning methods (CTL and PBL) on students' writing proficiency. Then, students' mastery of markers substantially impacted their writing proficiency. Furthermore, there was a substantial interaction impact between learning methods and knowledge of discourse markers on students' writing proficiency. Future studies should be undertaken at all levels of education in Indonesia to investigate the impact of discourse marker mastery and learning methods on students' writing or speaking proficiencies. The present investigation is subject to many constraints. Most evident is the small sample size, followed by the very brief period of the study and its restriction to just high school-level participants. Ultimately, this study was challenged by various issues in the research design, including the unequal distribution of students throughout the groups.

REFERENCES

- Aidinlou, N. A., & Shahrokhi mehr, H. (2012). The effect of discourse markers instruction on EFL learners' writing. *World Journal of Education*, 2(2), 10–16. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wje.v2n2p10>
- Al-khazraji, A. (2019). Analysis of discourse markers in essays writing in ESL classroom. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(2), 559–572. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.12235a>
- Al-Qahtani, A. A. (2015). The effect of explicit instruction of textual discourse markers on saudi EFL learners' reading comprehension. *English Language Teaching*, 8(4), 57–66. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v8n4p57>
- Alahmed, S., Mohammed, Y., & Kirmızı, Ö. (2020). The use of discourse markers in L2 English writing by Iraqi postgraduate students at Karabuk University. *Eurasian Journal of English ...*, 2(2), 107–115. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/1127154>
- Ali, S. M., & Hasanah, N. (2024). Using problem based learning (PBL) in improving writing skill at boarding school. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, 11(1), 212–221. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v11i1.5276>
- Alsaawi, A. (2022). Use of discourse markers among senior University students. *Arab World English Journal*, 13(1), 161–172. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol13no1.11>

- Arifanita, D., Nurkamto, J., & Suparno, S. (2019). Investigating the writing difficulties on Indonesian second language students in learning English. *Proceedings of the 3rd English Language and Literature International Conference, ELLiC*. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.4108/eai.27-4-2019.2285348>
- Ariyanti, A. (2016). The teaching of EFL writing in Indonesia. *Dinamika Ilmu*, 16(2), 263–277. <https://doi.org/10.21093/di.v16i2.274>
- Ariyanti, A., & Fitriana, R. (2017). EFL students' difficulties and needs in essay writing. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Teacher Training and Education*, 158. <https://doi.org/10.2991/iccte-17.2017.4>
- Deane, P., & Song, Y. (2015). The key practice, discuss and debate ideas: Conceptual framework, literature review, and provisional learning progressions for argumentation. *Research Report*, 2015(2), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ets2.12079>
- Dinda, S. P., & Septiana, A. R. (2024). The impact of project based learning (PBL) method on motivation and interest in English learning among eleventh graders at SMAN 1 Karangrejo. *Transformasi Masyarakat: Jurnal Inovasi Dan Sosial Pengabdian*, 1(3). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.62383/transformasi.v1i3.272>
- Evans, N. W., Hartshorn, K. J., McCollum, R. M., & Wolfersberger, M. (2010). Contextualizing corrective feedback in second language writing pedagogy. *Language Teaching Research*, 14(4), 445–463. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168810375367>
- Fox Tree, J. E. (2014). Discourse markers in writing. *Discourse Studies*, 17(1), 64–82. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445614557758>
- Fraser, B. (1990). An approach to discourse markers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14(3), 383–398. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(90\)90096-V](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(90)90096-V)
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching* (Fourth Edit). Pearson Longman: Harlow.
- Hasan, J., & Marzuki, M. (2017). An analysis of student's ability in writing at Riau University Pekanbaru - Indonesia. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 7(5), 380. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0705.08>
- Hasani, A. (2016). Enhancing argumentative writing skill through contextual teaching and learning. *Academic Journals*, 11(16), 1573–1578. <https://doi.org/10.5897/ERR2016.2806>
- Hedge, T. (2005). *Writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hemmati, F., & Soltanpour, F. (2012). A comparison of the effects of reflective learning portfolios and dialogue journal writing on iranian EFL learners' accuracy in writing performance. *English Language Teaching*, 5(11), 16–28. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n11p16>
- Hyland, K. (2021). *Teaching and researching writing*. books.google.com. <https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=MC5AEAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PT8&dq=writing&ots=6I1wx1AEre&sig=JYAUr2jR0KsktUE5HVc9JdUTgtw>
- Kalajahi, S. A. R., & Abdullah, A. N. (2015). Discourse connectors and cohesion in writing. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(3), 441–447. <https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n3s2p441>
- Kusumahati, A., Adi, A. P. K., & Sumarjo. (2023). The implementation of problem based learning (PBL) in students writing skills on analytical exposition text. *Didaktik : Jurnal Ilmiah PGSD FKIP Universitas Mandiri*, 09(September). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.36989/didaktik.v9i04.1773>
- Mairani, R. (2022). Improving students' writing skill using problem-based learning. *Dialectical Literature and Educational Journal*, 7(2), 71–81. <https://doi.org/10.51714/dlejpancasakti.v7i2.89.pp.71-81>
- Manan, N. A. A., & Raslee, N. N. (2018). Explicit discourse marker instruction to improve coherence and cohesion in academic writing. *International Journal of Academic Research*

- in *Business and Social Sciences*, 8(1), 457–476. <https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v8-i1/3820>
- Melissourgou, M. N., & Frantzi, K. T. (2015). Testing writing in EFL exams: the learners' viewpoint as valuable feedback for improvement. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 199, 30–37. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.483>
- Moybeka, A. M. S., Bosco, F. H., Apalem, C. R., Chandra, D. A., & Efendi, E. (2023). Developing EFL students' writing ability through contextual teaching and learning (a classroom action research study). *Journal of English Culture, Language, Literature and Education*, 11(1), 79–97. <https://doi.org/10.53682/eclue.v11i1.6107>
- Mughrabi, F. M. Al. (2017). Arab learners of English and the use of discourse markers in writing. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 8(4), 715. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0804.10>
- Novariana, H., Sumardi, & Tarjana, S. S. (2018). Senior high school students' problems in writing a preliminary study of implementing writing e-journal as self assessment to promote students' writing skill. *2nd English Language and Literature International Conference (ELLiC) Proceedings*, 2. <https://doi.org/10.18060/15692>
- Novelti, N., Epidarwati, E., & Putri, R. (2022). The effectiveness of CTL on the students' news writing skill. *AMCA Journal of Education and Behavioral Change*, 2(2), 79–83. <https://doi.org/10.51773/ajeb.v2i2.121>
- Ockenburg, L. Van, Weijen, D. Van, & Rijlaarsdam, G. (2019). Learning to Write Synthesis Texts: A Review of Intervention Studies. *Journal of Writing Research*, 10(03). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2019.10.03.01>
- Rahman, A. N. I., & Ekkayokkaya, M. (2024). The use of contextual teaching and learning approach on students' analytical exposition writing skills. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13(3), 455–467. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v13i3.66955>
- Rahmatunisa, W. (2014). Problems faced by Indonesian EFL learners in writing argumentative essay. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 3(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v3i1>
- Risan, R., Hasriani, H., & Muhayyang, M. (2021). The implementation of CTL method in teaching English to the students of MAN 1 Enrekang. *Language Circle: Journal of Language and Literature*, 16(1), 125–136. <https://doi.org/10.15294/lc.v16i1.31158>
- Riznanda, W. A. (2021). Discourse markers in tertiary level students' essay writing: ability and problems. *English Franca : Academic Journal of English Language and Education*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.29240/ef.v5i1.1193>
- Sun, W. (2013). The importance of discourse markers in English learning and teaching. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(11), 2136–2140. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.3.11.2136-2140>
- Toba, R., Noor, W. N., & Sanu, L. O. (2019). The current issues of Indonesian EFL students' writing skills: ability, problem, and reason in writing comparison and contrast essay. *Dinamika Ilmu*, 19(1), 57–73. <https://doi.org/10.21093/di.v19i1.1506>
- Vahdat, S., Bordbar, A., Bardideh, A., & Banari, R. (2016). Discourse markers acquisition in the Iranian students writings at primary and secondary schools. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 7(5), 39–44. <https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2016.v7n51p39>
- Wahyuni, S. (2017). Developing writing materials based on CTL approach for Indonesian EFL learners. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, 7(1), 97. <https://doi.org/10.23971/jefl.v7i1.526>
- Windi, W., & Suryaman, M. (2022). Improving students' ability in writing descriptive text through contextual teaching and learning approach. *Jurnal Ilmiah Profesi Pendidikan*, 7(1), 151–155. <https://doi.org/10.29303/jipp.v7i1.399>
- Zhan, H. (2015). Frequent errors in chinese EFL learners' topic-based writings. *English Language Teaching*, 8(5), 72–81. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v8n5p72>