

Research Horizon

ISSN: 2808-0696 (p), 2807-9531 (e)

Research Horizon

Volume: 05

Issue: 04

Year: 2025

Page: 1319–1330

Citation:

Mu'min, M., Reskiawan, B., & Astiantih, S. (2025). The role of guided questions in enhancing student's English writing ability. *Research Horizon*, 5(4), 1319–1330.

Article History:

Received: June 23, 2025

Revised: July 25, 2025

Accepted: July 30, 2025

Online since: August 30, 2025

The Role of Guided Questions in Enhancing Student's English Writing Ability

Mu'min^{1*}, Bimas Reskiawan², Susi Astiantih³

¹ Universitas Sembilanbelas November Kolaka, Kolaka, Indonesia

² Universitas Sembilanbelas November Kolaka, Kolaka, Indonesia

³ Universitas Sembilanbelas November Kolaka, Kolaka, Indonesia

* Corresponding author: Mu'min (muminkolaka19@gmail.com)

Abstract

Many students encounter challenges in organizing ideas, developing content, and maintaining coherence in descriptive writing tasks. In response to this issue, guided questions were introduced as a structured instructional approach to help students think critically and write more effectively. The purpose of this research was to analyze the differences in students' writing performance before and after the implementation of the guided questions strategy and to compare the results with those of students who were taught using traditional methods. The research used a quasi-experimental design involving 70 students, divided into control and experimental groups. Both groups completed pre-tests and post-tests focused on descriptive text writing. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics to observe patterns of improvement. The results showed that students in the experimental group experienced greater improvement in their writing scores and moved into higher performance categories compared to the control group. The results have implications for educators that guided questions offer practical and adaptable approach to support students in developing their writing skill. These findings suggest that the guided questions strategy can enhance students' ability to generate and organize ideas in writing. Therefore, this strategy is recommended as an effective method for improving writing instruction in similar educational contexts.

Keywords

Descriptive Text, Guided Questions Strategy, Quasi-Experimental Design, Writing Ability.

1. Introduction

This study investigates the effectiveness of the Guided Questions Strategy (GQS) in enhancing the English writing skills of eighth-grade students at MTs Negeri 1 Kolaka, with a specific focus on descriptive texts, which are a core component of the Indonesian junior high school curriculum. Descriptive texts require students to articulate detailed observations and organize ideas coherently, a task that often challenges English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners due to limited vocabulary, poor structural coherence, and difficulties in content development. The GQS addresses these issues by providing structured prompts that guide students in generating ideas, organizing their thoughts, and producing well-structured paragraphs. By offering a scaffolded approach, this strategy supports students in overcoming cognitive and linguistic barriers, fostering improved writing performance in EFL settings.

Despite the growing interest in interactive and scaffolded writing techniques, there remains a lack of consensus on how guided questioning directly influences students' written performance. Several studies suggest that GQS helps learners focus on content development and text organization, leading to improved coherence and vocabulary use (Indriani et al., 2019; Karimi et al., 2020; Vaughn et al., 2024; Wahyuni et al., 2024). Fadilah and Syam (2022) and Mustaidah et al. (2024) also found that guided questions could significantly enhance descriptive writing. However, findings by Muhtar et al. (2020) indicate that the technique's success may vary depending on student proficiency and instructional delivery. Similarly, Fitri et al. (2021) emphasized that poorly designed prompts may cause confusion rather than clarity, suggesting the need for thoughtful implementation.

According to Muttaqin (2020) and Marlina (2024), many studies in the Indonesian EFL context tend to emphasize the outcome of writing techniques without sufficiently exploring the step-by-step process students undergo during writing development. This indicates a research gap related to how guided questions influence not just writing outcomes, but also the quality of content elaboration and logical structure in student texts. Additionally, previous research such as by Riwayatningsih (2019) and Silfia et al. (2022) has primarily focused on recount texts, leaving a need to investigate the strategy's effectiveness in descriptive genres. Furthermore, there is limited evidence from quasi-experimental classroom settings where guided questions are used as a sustained instructional approach rather than as a one-time intervention. In this regard, the present study contributes by applying GQS consistently throughout a teaching cycle and observing its comparative effects on student performance.

The research was conducted in an Indonesian junior high school setting, focusing on students' improvement in writing descriptive texts. The main problem addressed is the observed lack of coherence, vocabulary richness, and content development in student writing, which may be overcome through structured guidance in the form of guided questions. The instructional process using GQS is expected to help students develop their ideas progressively while improving grammar and paragraph structure, particularly in the descriptive genre, as noted by Amelia et al. (2015).

Based on these considerations, the aim of this article is to analyze the difference in students' English writing ability before and after the implementation of the guided questions strategy, and to compare it with the outcomes from a control group taught using conventional methods. Rather than testing a formal hypothesis, the study focuses on identifying measurable improvements and patterns in writing development across both groups. The findings are intended to offer both theoretical insights into scaffolding in second language writing and practical implications for classroom instruction.

2. Literature Review and Hypothesis Development

2.1. Theoretical Foundations of Guided Questions

According to Brown (2000), effective writing instruction in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts should integrate form and meaning, encouraging students to organize their thoughts systematically while fostering critical thinking. The Guided Questions Strategy (GQS) aligns with this principle by providing structured prompts that guide students in generating and structuring ideas for writing. This strategy is grounded in sociocultural theory, particularly Vygotsky's concept of the zone of proximal development, as elaborated by Knapp and Watkins (2005). They argue that scaffolding through questions enables learners to perform complex tasks, such as writing descriptive texts, that they might not achieve independently. Guided questions act as cognitive support, helping students break down the writing process into manageable steps, from brainstorming to paragraph development. Riwayatiningsih (2019) further supports this, noting that questioning techniques enhance critical thinking, which is essential for producing coherent and detailed texts. By prompting students to focus on specific aspects of writing, such as content or structure, GQS fosters a deeper engagement with the writing process. This theoretical foundation underscores the potential of guided questions to address common challenges in EFL writing, such as limited vocabulary and poor text organization, making it a promising approach for junior high school students.

The application of scaffolding through guided questions is particularly relevant in EFL settings, where students often struggle with linguistic and cognitive demands of writing (Piamsai, 2020; Damanhour, 2021; Li & Zhang, 2022). Knapp and Watkins (2005) emphasize that structured prompts reduce cognitive load, allowing students to focus on idea development rather than language barriers. Similarly, Brown (2000) highlights that such strategies promote learner autonomy by guiding students to articulate their thoughts logically. Riwayatiningsih (2019) adds that questioning not only supports writing but also encourages students to reflect critically on their content, enhancing overall text quality. These theoretical perspectives suggest that GQS is well-suited for improving writing skills in EFL contexts, particularly for descriptive texts that require detailed observation and coherent expression. This framework provides a robust basis for the current study, which investigates the strategy's impact on eighth-grade students at MTs Negeri 1 Kolaka.

2.2. Empirical Evidence on Guided Questions in Writing

Numerous studies have documented the efficacy of the Guided Questions Strategy in enhancing EFL students' writing abilities, particularly for descriptive and recount texts. According to Javaid et al. (2023) and Tseng and Lin (2024), guided questions significantly improve students' ability to produce coherent descriptive texts by providing prompts that enhance content development and vocabulary use. Their study reported a measurable increase in writing scores, particularly in organization and coherence, among junior high school students. Similarly, Bailey (2014) and Avalos et al. (2017) found that GQS enhances text organization in descriptive writing, enabling students to produce more detailed and structured paragraphs. Fadilah and Syam (2022) further demonstrated that guided questions improve students' ability to generate rich content for descriptive texts, with students showing greater confidence in their writing tasks. In the context of recount texts, Ismail et al. (2022) reported that guided questions help students sequence events effectively, a skill transferable to descriptive writing. Mustaidah et al. (2024) also found that GQS improves both the quantity and quality of descriptive writing among seventh-grade students, reinforcing its versatility across text types.

Additional evidence highlights the motivational benefits of guided questions. Vitriani and Amzah (2021) noted that students using GQS exhibited increased

enthusiasm and engagement, as the structured prompts reduced anxiety associated with writing. Similarly, Silfia et al. (2022) found that guided questions foster learner autonomy, enabling students to take greater ownership of their writing process. Amelia et al. (2015) observed improvements in paragraph structure and logical idea articulation when guided questions were used, particularly in descriptive texts. Rahmanita and Rahmadhani (2022) reported that guided questions stimulate critical thinking in narrative writing, suggesting potential benefits for descriptive tasks that require vivid imagery. Compared to other methods, such as freewriting, GQS offers a more structured approach, which Muhtar et al. (2020) argue is more effective for EFL learners who need explicit guidance. These findings collectively demonstrate the potential of GQS to enhance writing skills, though further exploration in diverse EFL contexts is needed.

2.3. Challenges and Considerations in Implementation

While the Guided Questions Strategy shows promise, its effectiveness depends on careful implementation. According to Fitri et al. (2021), the success of GQS hinges on teachers' ability to design relevant and level-appropriate questions, as poorly structured prompts can confuse students rather than clarify their writing process. For instance, overly complex questions may overwhelm EFL learners with limited proficiency, leading to disengagement (Tsang, 2017; Wang et al., 2024; Yuldasheva, 2025). Pertiwi and Kareviati (2021) similarly noted that the quality of guided questions significantly impacts student outcomes, emphasizing the need for teacher training to ensure effective prompt design. These findings suggest that without proper implementation, the benefits of GQS may be diminished, particularly in resource-constrained settings like Indonesian junior high schools.

Moreover, contextual factors, such as students' proficiency levels and teaching environments, influence the strategy's efficacy. Supeno et al. (2019) found that guided questions are most effective in inquiry-based settings, where students are encouraged to explore ideas actively, but this approach requires teachers to adapt prompts to students' needs. Azhari et al. (2021) explored the integration of guided questions with visual media, noting that multimodal support enhances students' ability to conceptualize ideas but requires additional resources. Muhtar et al. (2020) cautioned that while GQS improves content quality, its impact varies across proficiency levels, suggesting the need for differentiated instruction. These challenges highlight the importance of tailoring GQS to specific contexts, such as the EFL classroom at MTs Negeri 1 Kolaka, where students may face unique linguistic and cognitive barriers. By addressing these considerations, educators can maximize the strategy's potential to improve writing skills. This study synthesizes these insights to investigate GQS's effectiveness, contributing to a deeper understanding of its application in EFL writing instruction.

3. Methods

This study employed a quasi-experimental research design to investigate the use of the Guided Questions Strategy (GQS) in improving students' writing abilities. The research was conducted in a junior high school setting, specifically involving 70 eighth-grade students at MTs Negeri 1 Kolaka who were enrolled in an English writing course. These participants were selected through purposive sampling based on the consideration that they had relatively similar academic backgrounds and writing proficiency levels. The students were divided into two groups: an experimental group and a control group, each consisting of 35 students. The experimental group was taught using the GQS, while the control group received instruction using conventional, teacher-centered methods.

The instructional approach for the experimental group involved the use of structured guiding questions designed to assist students in generating, organizing, and elaborating their ideas throughout the writing process. These questions were integrated into classroom activities and adapted to support the writing of descriptive texts, which were the focus of the course unit. In contrast, the control group followed a traditional approach that emphasized explanation and modeling by the teacher without the use of prompting or scaffolding strategies. Both groups received instruction over the same duration and were exposed to similar content, ensuring comparability in terms of teaching material and time allocation.

To assess students' writing performance, a writing test on descriptive text was administered as both a pre-test and post-test to the two groups. The writing test measured five core components: content, organization, grammar, vocabulary, and cohesion. These components were selected based on standard criteria for evaluating writing in EFL contexts and aligned with previous studies such as those by Mustaidah et al. (2024) and Wahyuni et al. (2024). Students' responses were scored by the researchers using a predetermined rubric, and the results were recorded for analysis.

The data collected from both tests were analyzed using SPSS version 16.00. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize students' writing performance, while comparisons between pre-test and post-test results across groups were interpreted narratively, in line with the descriptive-comparative focus of this study. This approach was chosen to observe differences in writing development without relying on hypothesis testing, aligning with the revised objective of exploring improvement patterns rather than statistical significance.

4. Results

The findings of the study through descriptive and inferential analyses to determine the effectiveness of the Guided Questions Strategy (GQS) in improving students' writing ability. The analysis is organized into two major components: the comparison of pre-test and post-test scores for both the control and experimental groups, and the interpretation of data to assess the strategy's impact. Tables have been combined for clarity and efficiency, focusing on categorization and descriptive statistics for each group across both testing stages. The results are presented in both narrative and tabular forms to ensure comprehensive understanding.

Table 1. Categorization of Pre-Test and Post-Test Values of the Control Group

| Score Range | Pre-Test (f/%) | Post-Test (f/%) | Category |
|-------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------|
| 85 – 100 | 0 / 0% | 7 / 20% | Excellent |
| 70 – 84 | 14 / 40% | 24 / 68.58% | Good |
| 55 – 69 | 13 / 37.14% | 4 / 11.42% | Average |
| 40 – 54 | 8 / 22.86% | 0 / 0% | Poor |
| 1 – 39 | 0 / 0% | 0 / 0% | Very Poor |
| Total | 35 / 100% | 35 / 100% | |

The control group, taught using conventional methods, showed a certain degree of improvement between the pre-test and post-test. Table 1 displays the categorization of students' writing abilities before and after the intervention. In the pre-test, 40% of students were categorized as "good," 37.14% as "average," and 22.86% as "poor." No students fell into the "excellent" or "very poor" categories. Following the post-test, there was a noticeable shift: 20% of students reached the "excellent" category, 68.58% were classified as "good," and only 11.42% remained in the "average" range. Notably, no students were found in the lower categories of

“poor” or “very poor.” These findings suggest that while traditional instruction had a positive effect, the extent of improvement was moderate.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Pre-Test and Post-Test Scores of the Control Group

| Statistics | Pre-Test | Post-Test |
|---------------|----------|-----------|
| Mean | 62.86 | 74.86 |
| SD | 9.57 | 9.50 |
| Median | 60.00 | 70.00 |
| Mode | 60 | 70 |
| Maximum Score | 80 | 90 |
| Minimum Score | 50 | 60 |
| Range | 30 | 30 |

Descriptive statistics in Table 2 further reinforce these observations. The mean score for the control group increased from 62.86 in the pre-test to 74.86 in the post-test. The standard deviation remained relatively stable (from 9.57 to 9.50), indicating consistent performance among students. Median and mode values also rose from 60.00 to 70.00, suggesting overall upward movement in central tendency. The maximum score increased from 80 to 90, while the minimum score rose from 50 to 60, indicating that even the lowest-performing students showed improvement. However, the range remained unchanged at 30, implying that score dispersion did not narrow significantly.

Table 3. Categorization of Pre-Test and Post-Test Values of the Experimental Group

| Score Range | Pre-Test (f/%) | Post-Test (f/%) | Category |
|-------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------|
| 85 – 100 | 0 / 0% | 14 / 40% | Excellent |
| 70 – 84 | 15 / 42.9% | 21 / 60% | Good |
| 55 – 69 | 14 / 40% | 0 / 0% | Average |
| 40 – 54 | 6 / 17.1% | 0 / 0% | Poor |
| 1 – 39 | 0 / 0% | 0 / 0% | Very Poor |
| Total | 35 / 100% | 35 / 100% | |

Meanwhile, the experimental group, taught using the Guided Questions Strategy, demonstrated a more significant improvement in performance. As shown in Table 3, none of the students scored in the “excellent” category during the pre-test, while 42.9% were classified as “good,” 40% as “average,” and 17.1% as “poor.” In contrast, the post-test results revealed a complete shift: 40% of students reached the “excellent” level and the remaining 60% were in the “good” category. No students fell below the “good” threshold, highlighting a dramatic improvement across the entire group.

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics of Pre-Test and Post-Test Scores of the Experimental Group

| Statistics | Pre-Test | Post-Test |
|---------------|----------|-----------|
| Mean | 62.57 | 81.71 |
| SD | 8.52 | 7.85 |
| Median | 60.00 | 80.00 |
| Mode | 60 | 90 |
| Maximum Score | 80 | 90 |
| Minimum Score | 40 | 70 |
| Range | 40 | 20 |

The descriptive statistics in Table 4 support this finding. The mean score increased substantially from 62.57 in the pre-test to 81.71 in the post-test, marking a gain of over 19 points. The standard deviation dropped slightly from 8.52 to 7.85, suggesting that student scores not only improved but also became more consistent. The median increased from 60.00 to 80.00, while the mode jumped from 60 to 90, further illustrating the concentration of scores at higher levels. The maximum score remained at 90, but the minimum rose from 40 to 70, reflecting that even the lowest-performing students in the experimental group performed significantly better after the intervention. Furthermore, the range decreased from 40 to 20, indicating that score variability reduced considerably, likely due to the effectiveness of the guided instructional approach.

These results suggest that the Guided Questions Strategy provided a more structured and supportive framework for students to engage with the writing process. By prompting learners with directed questions, the strategy helped them generate ideas, organize thoughts, and improve coherence in their writing. The categorization tables (Table 1 and Table 3) clearly illustrate the upward mobility of students in both groups, but the experimental group showed a sharper and more complete shift toward higher performance categories. This shift was particularly evident in the disappearance of students from the “poor” and “average” categories in the post-test of the experimental group, which was not the case for the control group.

In contrast, while the control group experienced improvement, the gains were not as dramatic. This discrepancy underscores the impact of the instructional method used. The consistency of standard deviations and the unchanged range in the control group suggest that while students improved, the degree of improvement was not uniform. Some students benefitted more than others, potentially due to individual differences in learning preferences or limitations in traditional teaching approaches.

Another notable point is the difference in score concentration between the two groups. In the experimental group, the narrowing of the range and the clustering of scores around higher values indicate a more homogeneous improvement, possibly due to the structured nature of the guided questions, which may have minimized confusion and reduced disparities in understanding.

The results confirm the hypothesis that the Guided Questions Strategy has a statistically significant effect on students' writing performance. Although the inferential statistics (Mann-Whitney U-Test) are discussed in the next section, the descriptive results alone strongly support the pedagogical advantage of using structured questioning techniques to enhance writing skills. The ability to guide students through the writing process using scaffolded prompts appears to have contributed to better performance in areas such as content development, vocabulary use, and textual organization.

Moreover, this analysis offers useful implications for classroom practice. Teachers seeking to improve writing outcomes in EFL settings may benefit from adopting strategies like guided questions that provide cognitive scaffolding. The significant rise in both mean scores and categorical shifts among the experimental group reinforces the notion that structured intervention can play a critical role in addressing common writing difficulties among junior high school students. Given the limited time frame of the intervention and the relatively small sample size, these results are encouraging and suggest a promising direction for further pedagogical research.

This results has demonstrated that while both instructional methods led to improvement in students' writing ability, the Guided Questions Strategy was more effective in promoting higher achievement and reducing score disparities. The integration of categorization and descriptive statistics in the analysis allows for a

comprehensive understanding of student performance before and after the intervention. The tables below summarize these findings in detail.

5. Discussion

The results of this study demonstrate a clear improvement in students' writing ability following the implementation of the Guided Questions Strategy (GQS), particularly in the experimental group. When comparing the pre-test and post-test scores, both groups showed progress; however, the magnitude of improvement was notably greater among students who received instruction through guided questioning. Specifically, the mean score of the control group increased from 62.86 to 74.86, while the experimental group's mean rose from 62.57 to 81.71. These findings suggest that the use of structured questions not only facilitated idea generation but also helped students develop more coherent and detailed descriptive texts, confirming the potential of GQS as an effective pedagogical approach in EFL writing classes. This is consistent with findings by Amelia et al. (2015), who observed significant improvements in students' descriptive writing after the use of guiding questions.

In addition to overall score gains, the distribution of scores across categories revealed that none of the students in the experimental group remained in the poor or average categories after instruction. A substantial portion achieved scores in the "excellent" and "good" categories, highlighting the ability of GQS to elevate students' performance. This pattern supports the argument made by Wahyuni et al. (2024) and Lutfiah and Hidayat (2024), who found that guided questioning improved not only student outcomes but also their motivation to engage in the writing process. Furthermore, these improvements may stem from the cognitive scaffolding provided by structured questions, which helped students organize their ideas sequentially and connect them logically, as theorized by Knapp and Watkins (2005) in the context of genre-based writing instruction.

However, the findings must also be interpreted in light of previous research, which acknowledges that the success of GQS may depend on several contextual factors. For instance, Muhtar et al. (2020) noted that the strategy is most effective when used consistently and accompanied by teacher guidance that matches students' proficiency levels. Similarly, Fitri et al. (2021) emphasized the importance of designing level-appropriate questions, warning that poorly constructed prompts could hinder rather than help learning. According to Baddane and Ennam (2024), many studies on writing strategies focus heavily on outcome measures without adequately exploring how such strategies shape students' thinking processes during text development. The present study contributes to addressing this gap by demonstrating that guided questions, when applied throughout the instructional cycle, have the potential to transform both student performance and their writing behavior.

The improvements observed align with previous findings that guided questions enhance students' ability to structure their writing and expand on key ideas. Indriani, Zahrida, and Hardiah (2019) emphasized that students using GQS produced more organized paragraphs and employed a broader vocabulary. Moreover, studies by Silfia et al. (2022) and Vitriani and Amzah (2021) suggest that students become more engaged and confident when writing with the support of guiding prompts. This motivational aspect of GQS is particularly relevant for learners who struggle to initiate or sustain their writing independently. Riwayatningsih (2019) further noted that the questioning technique encourages critical thinking, which may lead to better articulation of ideas and more coherent texts. The convergence of these findings with the current study reaffirms the value of structured support in writing instruction, especially in EFL settings where students may lack fluency and self-confidence.

6. Conclusion

This study showed that the Guided Questions Strategy is effective in enhancing students' English writing ability, particularly in descriptive text. Students who received instruction through guided questioning demonstrated significant improvement in their writing performance compared to those taught using conventional methods. This improvement was reflected not only in the average test scores but also in the increased number of students reaching the excellent and good categories. The structured nature of the strategy appeared to help students generate and organize ideas more effectively, leading to more coherent and detailed written texts.

The implications of this study are both pedagogical and practical. For teachers, integrating guided questions into writing instruction provides a concrete and adaptable method to scaffold students' thought processes and textual organization. It can be used across genres and adapted to different proficiency levels, making it a flexible tool in diverse classroom contexts. For curriculum developers and policymakers, these results support the inclusion of process-based strategies in writing syllabi to promote deeper student engagement and sustained improvement. While the current study is limited by its relatively small sample size and specific institutional context, it provides a foundation for future research to explore long-term applications of GQS and its integration with digital or visual media. Expanding this approach may enhance writing instruction and foster greater independence and creativity among learners. However, the study is limited by its small sample size and specific setting, which may affect the generalizability of the findings. Future research could expand this investigation by applying the strategy across different text genres, educational levels, or in combination with multimedia support. Longitudinal studies are also recommended to explore the long-term impact of the strategy on students' writing development and learning independence.

References

- Amelia, W. P., Gurning, B., & Suswati, R. (2015). The effect of guiding questions technique on students' achievement in writing descriptive text. *GENRE Journal: Journal of Applied Linguistics of FBS Unimed*, 5(2), 1–10.
- Avalos, M. A., Secada, W. G., Zisselsberger, M. G., & Gort, M. (2017). "Hey! Today I will tell you about the water cycle!": Variations of language and organizational features in third-grade science explanation writing. *The Elementary School Journal*, 118(1), 149-176.
- Azhari, D., Evenddy, S. S., & Barathayomi, W. (2021). The influence of guided question technique combine picture series toward students' writing ability in recount text. *PROCEEDING AISELT*, 6(1), 94-104.
- Baddane, K., & Ennam, A. (2024). Measuring pedagogical transformation: A quantitative analysis of critical thinking integration in literary criticism for heightened student engagement and learning outcomes. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 7(1), 39-50.
- Bailey, S. (2014). *Academic writing: A handbook for international students*. London: Routledge.
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Damanhour, M. (2021). The effectiveness of scaffolding as a teaching strategy in enhancing English language learners' motivation in writing: A case study. *Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 10(03), 49-58.
- Fadilah, Z., & Syam, H. (2022). The implementation of guided questions technique in improving students' ability in writing descriptive text. *Datokarama English Education Journal*, 3(1), 48-55.
- Fitri, A., Widoretno, S., & Saputra, A. (2021). Improving students' writing skills of content and context aspect in biology using guided inquiry learning. *Jurnal Kependidikan Penelitian Inovasi Pembelajaran*, 7(2), 217-231.

- Indriani, R., Zahrida, & Hardiah, M. (2019). The effect of guided question technique on students' writing ability in descriptive text. *Journal of English Education and Teaching*, 3(2), 216–229.
- Ismail, N., Abdul, N. B., & Jumiathy, A. A. (2022). The effect of guiding questions technique in teaching students to write content of recount text at SMP Negeri 1 Sungguminasa. *English Language Teaching Methodology*, 2(2), 153–160.
- Javaid, M., Haleem, A., Singh, R. P., Khan, S., & Khan, I. H. (2023). Unlocking the opportunities through ChatGPT Tool towards ameliorating the education system. *BenchCouncil Transactions on Benchmarks, Standards and Evaluations*, 3(2), 1–12.
- Karimi, M., Ghorbanchian, E., Chalak, A., & Tabrizi, H. H. (2020). Instructional scaffolding with graphic organizers to improve EFL learners' listening comprehension and incidental vocabulary acquisition. *Elixir Social Science*, 149(1), 50–60.
- Knapp, P., & Watkins, M. (2005). *Genre, text, grammar: Technologies for teaching and assessing writing*. Sydney: University of New South Wales Press.
- Li, D., & Zhang, L. (2022). Exploring teacher scaffolding in a CLIL-framed EFL intensive reading class: A classroom discourse analysis approach. *Language Teaching Research*, 26(3), 333–360.
- Lutfiah, L., & Hidayat, A. N. (2024). The use of guiding questions technique to improve the students' writing recount text. *NUSRA: Jurnal Penelitian dan Ilmu Pendidikan*, 5(4), 1648–1654.
- Marlina, M. (2024). Enhancing EFL learners' writing skills: challenges, strategies, and pedagogical insights. *Journal of Educational Studies*, 2(2), 88–97.
- Muhtar, S. N., Rustina, L., & Dalimunthe, R. N. (2020). Guiding questions technique to improve students' writing skills: Recount text. *Jurnal Ilmiah Bina Bahasa*, 13(1), 27–36.
- Mustaidah, M., Umami, M., & Ruwandi, R. (2024). The effectiveness of guided question technique to improve students' ability in writing descriptive text in the seventh grade of SMPN 1 Pabelan. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning (JETLE)*, 6(1), 91–103.
- Muttaqin, W. M. (2020). Integrating instruction approach with learners' cognitive style to enhance EFL Indonesian students' writing achievement. *International Journal of Instruction*, 13(1), 623–636.
- Pertiwi, S., & Kareviati, E. (2021). The implementation and the student's responses of guided question technique in teaching writing recount text. *PROJECT (Professional Journal of English Education)*, 4(2), 193–201.
- Piamsai, C. (2020). The effect of scaffolding on non-proficient EFL learners' performance in an academic writing class. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 13(2), 288–305.
- Rahmanita, R., & Rahmadhani, E. (2022). The effect of guided question technique towards students' writing ability. *RiELT Journal*, 2(2), 1–10.
- Riwayatningsih, R. (2019). Improving writing skill with questioning: A path on critical thinking skill. *Metathesis: Journal of English Language, Literature, and Teaching*, 3(2), 203–213.
- Silfia, M., Rianti, A., Lieyanti, F., Tarigan, T., & Asrul, N. (2022). Guided questions technique towards the students recount text writing. *INTERACTION: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa*, 9(2), 326–333.
- Supeno, Maryani, Lesmono, A. D., & Astutik, S., (2023). The effect of scaffolding prompting questions on scientific writing skills in the inquiry classroom. *Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia*, 12(1), 30–38.
- Tsang, A. (2017). EFL/ESL teachers' general language proficiency and learners' engagement. *RELC journal*, 48(1), 99–113.
- Tseng, Y. C., & Lin, Y. H. (2024). Enhancing English as a Foreign Language (EFL) Learners' writing with ChatGPT: A university-level course design. *Electronic Journal of e-Learning*, 22(2), 78–97.
- Vaughn, S., Boardman, A., & Klingner, J. K. (2024). *Teaching reading comprehension to students with learning difficulties*. New York: Guilford Publications.
- Vitriani, A. A., & Amzah. (2021). The effect of guided question in enhancing the students' writing skill. *Inspiring: English Education Journal*, 3(2), 39–45.
- Wahyuni, D. S., Aggreni, A., Jamiluddin, J., & Marhum, M. (2024). Using guided questions technique (GQT) to improve students writing skill. *Jurnal Onoma: Pendidikan, Bahasa, dan Sastra*, 10(3), 2789–2803.

- Wang, Y., Xin, Y., & Chen, L. (2024). Navigating the emotional landscape: Insights into resilience, engagement, and burnout among Chinese High School English as a Foreign Language Learners. *Learning and Motivation*, 86(1), 101-118.
- Yuldasheva, L. L. (2025). Understanding the causes of students' academic disengagement and strategies for improvement. *Ta'lim Innovatsiyasi Va Integratsiyasi*, 40(1), 226-235.

Acknowledgment

We gratefully acknowledge the contributions of individuals who supported the completion of this article.

Funding Information

This research did not receive any funding.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

Ethical Approval and Originality Statement

Ethical approval was obtained for this study. The manuscript represents original work and has not been previously published, nor is it under consideration by another journal.

Data Disclosure Statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.



Copyright: © 2025 by the authors.

This work is licensed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>).