

Teaching English Language Journal

ISSN: 2538-5488 – E-ISSN: 2538-547X – <http://tel.journal.org>

© 2026 – Published by Teaching English Language and Literature Society of Iran

TELL
SI



Please cite this paper as follows:

Limpariwatthana, K., Tassawa, P., & Kommoonkaew, S. (2026). Reimagining EFL writing pedagogy: Enhancing writing skills and motivation through the multimodal writing process in Thai higher education. *Teaching English Language*, 20(1), 107-137. <https://doi.org/10.22132/tel.2025.482245.1705>

Research Paper

**Reimagining EFL Writing Pedagogy: Enhancing
Writing Skills and Motivation through
the Multimodal Writing Process
in Thai Higher Education**

Kittika Limpariwatthana¹

*Ph.D., Department of English, Faculty of Education,
Lampang Rajabhat University*

Pongtawee Tassawa

*Assistant Professor, Department English, Faculty of Education,
Lampang Rajabhat University*

Sombat Kommoonkaew

*Assistant Professor, Department English, Faculty of Education,
Lampang Rajabhat University*

Abstract

This study reimagines EFL writing pedagogy by introducing the Multimodal Writing Process (MWP), a curriculum-based instructional model designed to enhance English writing proficiency and motivation among Thai undergraduate students. Drawing on multimodality theory, process writing pedagogy, and achievement motivation theory, the MWP integrates five communication modes—visual, gestural, spatial, auditory, and linguistic—across seven recursive stages of writing instruction. Using a mixed-methods, one-shot case study design, the research involved fifty third-year English majors enrolled in a writing course at a Thai public university. Quantitative data from rubric-based writing assessments and a post-intervention motivation questionnaire revealed marked improvement in writing

¹ Corresponding author: Kittikalim@gmail.com

performance (mean = 73.76%) and high levels of student motivation across four dimensions: diligence, risk-taking, responsibility, and perceived learning outcomes. Qualitative data were analyzed through thematic analysis, revealing that multimodal prewriting activities helped reduce writing anxiety, peer collaboration promoted deeper audience awareness and revision strategies, and emotionally relevant topics fostered stronger engagement and a sense of authorship. Students reported increased confidence and ownership in their writing, demonstrating both cognitive and emotional growth. The findings suggest that the MWP model offers a culturally responsive and pedagogically flexible alternative to traditional writing instruction in Thai EFL classrooms. By foregrounding creativity, collaboration, and student-centered meaning-making, the study contributes to the advancement of inclusive and innovative writing pedagogy in global EFL education.

Keywords: Multimodal Writing, Writing Process, English Language Writing, Achievement Motivation, EFL Students

Received: October 07, 2024

Accepted: May 18, 2025



1. Introduction

In the context of globalization, digital transformation, and the internationalization of higher education, English academic writing has emerged as a critical competency for students in non-native English-speaking countries. Particularly in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context, writing proficiency is increasingly recognized as key to accessing global knowledge, succeeding in academic communities, and participating in professional networks. However, writing in a second or foreign language is a cognitively complex and culturally situated task, requiring learners not only to master linguistic structures but also to engage in meaning-making, rhetorical organization, and self-expression.

In Thailand, English is positioned as a strategic tool for national development and international competitiveness. Educational policies have long promoted English instruction across levels, aligning outcomes with frameworks such as the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR)

(Office of the Education Council, 2015). Despite these efforts, Thailand continues to score low on international English proficiency rankings, particularly in productive skills like writing. The 2024 EF English Proficiency Index ranked Thailand 106th out of 116 countries, underscoring persistent challenges in EFL instruction. Writing, in particular, is often perceived as the most difficult skill to master, requiring higher-order thinking, sustained effort, and confidence—attributes that are not easily cultivated in traditional, exam-oriented classrooms.

Current approaches to writing instruction in Thai universities are predominantly monomodal and product-oriented, emphasizing grammatical correctness and fixed templates. These pedagogies often discourage creativity, limit students' sense of authorship, and overlook the affective dimensions of learning such as confidence and motivation (Chamcharatsri, 2013; Limpariwatthana, 2022). Furthermore, writing is frequently treated as an individual task, divorced from social interaction, multimodal resources, and meaningful personal experiences. As a result, many learners report high levels of writing anxiety, low confidence, and disengagement from writing tasks.

In response to these issues, this study introduces the *Multimodal Writing Process* (MWP), a student-centered instructional model that integrates multiple modes of communication—visual, auditory, gestural, spatial, and linguistic—across recursive stages of the writing process. Grounded in multimodality theory, process writing pedagogy, and achievement motivation theory, the MWP seeks to transform writing from a technical exercise into a creative, collaborative, and emotionally engaging process. It offers a culturally responsive alternative to traditional instruction by allowing learners to draw on personal experiences, engage in peer interaction, and express meaning through multiple semiotic resources.

The current study aims to explore how the MWP model can improve writing outcomes and learner motivation in a Thai EFL context. Specifically, it addresses the following research questions:

1. How does the Multimodal Writing Process model affect Thai undergraduate students' English writing proficiency?
2. To what extent does the MWP model influence students' achievement motivation in writing?

By investigating these questions, this study contributes to the ongoing conversation on curriculum innovation in EFL education, particularly in regions where English writing instruction remains rigid, form-focused, and disconnected from learners' lived experiences.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Quantitative Results

The development of effective writing instruction has long been a focus of second language education, with teaching practices evolving from traditional, teacher-centered paradigms to more communicative and learner-centered approaches. Historically, early L2 writing instruction was grounded in the structuralist and behaviorist traditions, often linked with the Audio-lingual Method. Writing in this context served primarily to reinforce grammar and vocabulary, emphasizing accuracy through imitation and drill-based activities (Hinkel, 2003). This focus on correctness, however, came at the expense of meaning-making, expression, and audience awareness.

The emergence of the Process Writing Approach in the late 20th century marked a significant shift in the perception of writing as a dynamic and recursive process. Scholars such as Emig (1982) and Raimes (1985) advocated for instructional practices that emphasized planning, drafting, revising, and reflecting, allowing students to develop writing fluency and critical thinking through multiple drafts. In this model, writing was not

simply about producing grammatically correct texts but about exploring ideas and shaping meaning over time. Despite this pedagogical shift, the implementation of process-based instruction in EFL contexts has been uneven.

In many Asian educational systems, including Thailand, writing instruction continues to follow a product-oriented model, where students are evaluated based on final written output, often composed under exam conditions. Writing is frequently taught through rigid templates or translation-based activities, emphasizing grammatical correctness and fixed structures rather than creativity or communicative intent (Chamcharatsri et al, 2021; 2022). This instructional approach often neglects the cognitive and emotional aspects of writing, such as idea generation, personal voice, and confidence-building. As a result, learners tend to perceive writing as a formulaic exercise rather than a means of authentic expression.

These challenges are echoed in other EFL contexts as well. For instance, Zohrabi and Khalili (2024), in their cross-cultural study of feedback strategies in ESP writing courses, found that students often disengaged from writing when instruction focused solely on surface-level accuracy or instructor-dominated evaluation. The study emphasized the need for pedagogical approaches that support learner autonomy, varied forms of feedback, and writing as a process of exploration and construction. Such research underscores the importance of adopting writing pedagogies that are context-sensitive, developmentally appropriate, and responsive to learners' diverse communicative needs.

In this context, the need to reimagine writing instruction becomes urgent. Rather than viewing writing as a purely academic requirement, there is increasing recognition of its role in shaping identity, promoting agency, and supporting learners' integration into broader academic and professional

communities. Reframing writing pedagogy in this way opens possibilities for inclusive and transformative teaching practices that value learners' voices and lived experiences. To move beyond these limitations, scholars have increasingly turned to multimodal pedagogy as a way to revitalize writing instruction and expand expressive possibilities for learners.

2.2 The Role of Multimodality in Writing Development

To broaden the expressive possibilities available to EFL learners, multimodality has emerged as a compelling pedagogical framework. Rooted in social semiotics and the work of Kress and Van Leeuwen (2001), Multimodality Theory posits that communication does not occur through language alone. Rather, it involves the interplay of various semiotic resources—including visual, gestural, spatial, and auditory elements—each of which contributes to how meaning is constructed and interpreted. In classroom practice, this means that learners should not be limited to traditional print-based tasks but should be encouraged to use multiple modes to generate and share ideas.

The potential of multimodal strategies in writing instruction has been widely recognized. Visual prompts, drawing, collage, oral narratives, role-playing, and digital tools can help students externalize their thoughts and reduce the anxiety often associated with writing in a second language. Jewitt (2013) argues that multimodal learning environments support deeper cognitive engagement and allow learners to connect abstract concepts with tangible experiences. These strategies are particularly useful in the prewriting and planning phases, where students often struggle to find a starting point or organize their ideas linguistically.

In EFL settings, where learners may lack confidence in their ability to articulate complex ideas in English, multimodal scaffolds serve as a bridge between conceptual thinking and language production. For example, a

student who draws a picture representing a personal literacy memory may find it easier to later describe that event in writing. This layered process supports language development while honoring the learner's unique way of seeing and constructing meaning.

Recent studies have demonstrated the pedagogical value of such approaches. Cho and Kim (2021) found that multimodal storytelling activities helped Korean EFL students develop more cohesive narratives and increased their willingness to revise drafts. These results align with Pardede (2025), who emphasized that multimodal strategies can reduce learner anxiety and foster a collaborative learning environment, particularly when combined with peer interaction and digital platforms. Together, these studies highlight how multimodal instruction can enrich the writing process by supporting engagement, fluency, and expressive freedom in EFL learners.

By allowing learners to access and represent their knowledge in different ways, multimodality validates diverse learning styles and strengthens cognitive connections. It moves writing instruction beyond the narrow boundaries of linguistic correctness and instead supports writing as a creative, situated, and purposeful act. This pedagogical shift is particularly vital in Thai EFL classrooms, where students may have limited prior exposure to expressive writing or opportunities to engage in meaning-making beyond textbooks and grammar drills.

2.3 Writing as a Social and Motivational Act

Building on the expressive and cognitive benefits of multimodal writing discussed earlier, it is equally important to consider writing as a socially situated and emotionally charged activity. Writing—especially in a second or foreign language—is not only a linguistic or cognitive task, but also a psychological and affective process. Students' beliefs about their capabilities, their prior experiences with writing, and their emotional responses to

114 Teaching English Language

Reimagining EFL Writing ...

classroom tasks significantly influence how they engage with writing instruction. As such, effective pedagogy must address not only what learners write, but also how they feel about writing and how they see themselves as writers.

Drawing from McClelland's (1988) Achievement Motivation Theory, learners with a high need for achievement (nAch) are intrinsically motivated to take on challenging tasks, persist through difficulties, and pursue mastery. In EFL contexts, however, such motivation is often undermined by rigid instruction, test-driven evaluation, and fear of making mistakes—particularly when writing is treated as a one-shot product rather than a developmental process. This creates a high-stakes environment where learners may disengage or write only to comply with perceived expectations, not to communicate or reflect.

To address this, Self-Determination Theory (SDT) developed by Deci and Ryan (2000) offers a nuanced understanding of learner engagement. According to SDT, students are most likely to be motivated when their learning environment satisfies three core psychological needs: autonomy (having a sense of control), competence (feeling capable), and relatedness (feeling connected to others). When these needs are supported, students are more likely to persist, take intellectual risks, and invest emotionally in their work. This framework is particularly relevant to writing instruction, where the affective dimensions of learning can significantly shape performance and long-term development.

In writing classrooms, cultivating these motivational conditions involves more than assigning topics or correcting errors. It requires designing tasks that are personally meaningful, allowing room for self-expression, encouraging collaborative reflection, and providing feedback that builds rather than diminishes learner confidence. Dörnyei and Ushioda (2021)

emphasize that motivation in language learning is dynamic, context-dependent, and shaped by ongoing interactions between learners and their environment.

These principles are supported by a growing body of research. For instance, Pajares (2003) found that students' beliefs about their writing ability are strong predictors of actual writing achievement. Similarly, Choi and Yi (2016) observed that opportunities for peer discussion and emotional investment in writing topics enhance students' engagement and performance. In their cross-cultural study, Zohrabi and Khalili (2024) reported that EFL learners were more responsive to dialogic, collaborative forms of feedback than to traditional, top-down corrections. These findings reinforce the idea that writing success is not merely a function of language proficiency, but also of motivational climate and learner identity. Additional support for the effectiveness of dialogic feedback can be found in Taheri and Nazmi's (2021) study, which compared teacher and peer scaffolding in EFL writing classes and found that both forms significantly enhanced students' writing performance—particularly when used together. Their findings further underscore the pedagogical value of reciprocal interaction in fostering motivation and ownership in writing.

The Multimodal Writing Process (MWP) model implemented in this study was intentionally designed to foster these motivational dynamics. By allowing students to select writing topics grounded in personal literacy experiences, the model promotes autonomy and emotional investment. Through collaborative stages—such as peer interviews, story-sharing, and reciprocal feedback—students experience relatedness and build community in the writing classroom. The use of multimodal tools like drawing, oral narratives, and mind mapping creates accessible entry points into writing, helping students feel more competent and capable of success.

Importantly, the MWP extends the scope of earlier multimodal writing research by not only improving writing performance but also supporting students' evolving writer identities. It positions learners as meaning-makers who are capable of shaping, refining, and expressing their ideas with agency. In doing so, it transforms writing from a mechanical or anxiety-inducing task into a personally resonant and socially supported act of communication. This holistic view of writing—as cognitive, emotional, and social—provides the foundation for the present study and the MWP's potential contribution to EFL pedagogy in Thailand and beyond.

2.4 Conceptual Foundations of the Multimodal Writing Process

At the intersection of contemporary language pedagogy and learner-centered curriculum design lies the imperative to address not only what students write, but how and why they write. The Multimodal Writing Process (MWP) model introduced in this study is grounded in a synthesis of three interrelated theoretical perspectives: Multimodality Theory, Process Writing Pedagogy, and Achievement Motivation Theory. Each framework informs the instructional, cognitive, and affective dimensions of the MWP, offering a comprehensive approach to reimagining writing instruction in EFL contexts such as Thailand.

Multimodality Theory, as conceptualized by Kress and Van Leeuwen (2001), reframes communication as a richly layered phenomenon in which meaning is constructed through a range of semiotic modes—not only language, but also visual imagery, gesture, spatial arrangement, and sound. In classroom contexts, this perspective challenges the dominance of print literacy and advocates for instructional strategies that allow students to access and express knowledge through diverse, culturally resonant forms. The MWP model operationalizes this theory by integrating visual prompts, oral storytelling, music, drawing, and mind mapping into the prewriting and

drafting stages. This not only supports learners with varied cognitive styles but also provides entry points into the writing process that feel more personal and less intimidating than starting with a blank page in English. As Pardede (2025) noted in a recent review of technology-enhanced collaborative writing, multimodal strategies promote learner agency and engagement by making abstract ideas more tangible and by opening up new avenues for participation and creativity in writing.

Process Writing Pedagogy complements this multimodal foundation by emphasizing writing as a recursive, developmental practice. Unlike product-based models that focus on the correctness of final output, process-based instruction encourages students to explore ideas, revise drafts, and reflect on their communicative intent. This shift from evaluation to exploration fosters a classroom culture where risk-taking and iterative learning are normalized. In the MWP, the writing process unfolds through seven recursive stages—observing, reflecting, expressing, organizing, drafting, revising, and finalizing—each of which is supported by collaborative dialogue, peer feedback, and opportunities for revision. This design aligns with Emig’s (1982) view of writing as an act of cognition and discovery, and with Raimes’ (1985) assertion that skilled writing instruction must allow students to revisit and reshape their thinking. Moreover, by encouraging movement between expressive and academic modes, the model allows students to gradually refine their rhetorical strategies while maintaining a sense of authorship and narrative coherence. These motivational supports are built directly into the MWP model, which was implemented in this study through a series of scaffolded, collaborative activities aligned with students’ interests and needs.

While process writing facilitates cognitive engagement, sustaining student effort requires attention to motivation—a factor often overlooked in

traditional writing instruction. Grounded in McClelland's (1988) Achievement Motivation Theory and Self-Determination Theory by Deci and Ryan (2000), the MWP incorporates design elements that foster students' intrinsic motivation by addressing their psychological needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness. By allowing learners to choose personally meaningful writing topics—such as literacy narratives rooted in family or school experiences—the model nurtures autonomy and a sense of ownership over writing tasks. Collaborative activities such as peer interviews and group feedback sessions promote relatedness, reducing the isolation often associated with writing. Structured scaffolding, checklists, and feedback loops help build perceived competence, especially for students with low writing confidence.

These motivational supports are essential in EFL contexts, where learners often struggle with fear of failure or negative prior experiences. As Zohrabi and Khalili (2024) demonstrated in their cross-cultural study, learners' responses to writing instruction and feedback are deeply influenced by cultural and institutional norms. When feedback is purely corrective or instruction remains rigidly monologic, students may disengage. The MWP counters this by positioning feedback as formative, collaborative, and dialogic—aligning with findings from Krongyut and Srijongjai (2024), who reported that a multimodal project-based writing approach enhanced student behavioral engagement and motivation in a Thai EFL context. Their study reinforces the importance of incorporating multimodal strategies into writing instruction that values learner agency, cultural relevance, and classroom interaction.

Taken together, these theoretical strands converge in the design of the Multimodal Writing Process model. Multimodality provides the expressive flexibility needed to accommodate diverse learner profiles; process pedagogy

offers the recursive structure necessary for growth and fluency; and achievement motivation theory ensures that learners remain emotionally engaged and resilient throughout the writing process. Together, these frameworks position the learner not merely as a passive receiver of instruction but as an active, reflective writer—capable of constructing meaning, negotiating identity, and participating in a broader community of discourse.

In light of these conceptual foundations, the present study seeks to examine how the MWP model can enhance English writing proficiency and achievement motivation among Thai undergraduate students. The following section describes the research methodology employed to implement and evaluate the model within a university-level EFL writing course.

3. Methodology

This study employed a mixed-methods, one-shot case study design to examine the effectiveness of the Multimodal Writing Process (MWP) in enhancing English writing proficiency and achievement motivation among Thai undergraduate students. By integrating both quantitative and qualitative data sources, the research aimed to capture not only the measurable outcomes of the intervention but also the lived experiences and perceptions of learners. This design was particularly suitable given the pedagogical nature of the study and its emphasis on curriculum innovation in an EFL context.

3.1 Research Context and Participants

The study was conducted during the first semester of the 2024 academic year at a public university in Northern Thailand. The research site serves a diverse student body, many of whom come from rural or semi-urban backgrounds and are first-generation college attendees. English majors at the institution typically have intermediate proficiency levels (CEFR A2–B1) and report low confidence in academic writing.

A total of 50 third-year English Education majors participated in the study. All were enrolled in an English writing course designed to strengthen reflective writing and narrative composition. Participants were selected through purposive sampling, based on their enrollment in the course and willingness to engage in all study components. Ethical approval was obtained from the Institutional Review Board (IRB), and all participants provided written informed consent prior to the study's commencement.

3.2 Instructional Intervention: The MWP Model

The instruction intervention consisted of a structured implementation of the Multimodal Writing Process (MWP) model, which unfolded over eight instructional periods (32 hours total). The model in Table 1. comprises seven recursive stages: Observing, Reflecting, Expressing, Organizing, Drafting, Revising, and Finalizing. Each stage integrates multimodal tasks—such as drawing, storytelling, mind mapping, peer sharing, and AI-assisted editing—to scaffold the development of personal literacy narratives.

Table 1.
Multimodal Writing Process (MWP) Activity Plans

Stage	Instructional Focus	Multimodal Elements	Objectives
1. Observing	Students identify a personal literacy event (e.g., learning to read/write).	Visual prompts, teacher questioning, symbolic stimuli	Stimulate memory and connect writing to lived experience.
2. Reflecting	Students express thoughts/emotions using non-verbal modes.	Drawing, painting, collage, music, freewriting	Externalize internal reflections and reduce writing anxiety.
3. Expressing	Peer sharing of literacy events, first in L1, then in English.	Spoken narrative, gestures, translation strategies	Build audience awareness and deepen content through discussion.
4. Organizing	Teacher conferencing and outline development using mind maps.	Spatial diagrams, visual organizers	Support planning and coherence before writing.
5. Drafting	Students produce first drafts, transitioning from L1 to English.	Bilingual writing, rhetorical structure scaffolds	Encourage fluency and rhetorical control in essay form.
6. Revising	Peer review and teacher feedback sessions (content-focused first, then grammar).	Group negotiation, error analysis, AI-based editing tools, and Self-correction	Improve coherence, logic, and clarity through revision; promote collaborative problem-solving.
7. Finalizing	Final draft formatting, citation checks, and reflective submission.	APA formatting tools, checklist rubrics	Ensure academic quality, citation integrity, and presentation standards.

To support translanguaging and lower the affective filter, instructors intentionally encouraged the use of both Thai and English during the initial, exploratory phases of the writing process (Stages 1–3). For instance, while students observed personal literacy events and reflected through multimodal elements like drawing and freewriting, they were encouraged to use their L1 to externalize complex thoughts and reduce early writing anxiety. During the 'Expressing' stage, spoken narratives and peer sharing began in Thai to build confidence and audience awareness before deliberately scaffolding into English.

As the process shifted toward academic structure (Stages 4–5), students transitioned from bilingual ideation to applying specific English rhetorical frameworks. They utilized spatial diagrams and mind maps to organize their narratives before producing their first drafts.

By the latter phases of the process (Stages 6–7), students operated predominantly in English. They engaged in collaborative peer review, utilized AI-based editing tools, and participated in teacher conferencing to refine logical coherence, grammatical accuracy, and APA presentation standards. Ultimately, this scaffolded progression—from L1-supported ideation to L2 academic production—was seamlessly integrated into the curriculum, with all sequential instructional activities directly contributing to the students' comprehensive course assessment.

3.3 Research Instruments

Three key instruments were used to collect data:

MWP Activity Plans: The teaching model was operationalized through a series of activity plans, each aligned with learning objectives and multimodal strategies. These plans were validated by three experts in English language teaching, using a 5-point Likert scale. The overall score indicated high appropriateness ($M = 4.53$, $SD = 0.38$).

Writing Assessment Rubric: Students' final literacy narrative essays were evaluated using a rubric adapted from Gardner (2013). The rubric assessed five criteria: (1) task completion and relevance, (2) creativity and originality, (3) rhetorical strategies (ethos, pathos, logos), (4) organization and coherence, and (5) academic correctness. Three experienced EFL instructors independently rated each paper.

Motivation Questionnaire and Interview Protocol: A 14-item Likert-scale questionnaire was developed to measure four motivation dimensions: (a) learning diligence, (b) risk-taking and participation, (c) work planning and perseverance, and (d) perceived learning outcomes. The instrument was adapted from Pajares (2003) and Deci & Ryan (2000) and reviewed for content validity. To enrich the data, semi-structured interviews were conducted with a subsample of 10 students, selected to reflect varying levels of engagement and performance.

3.4 Data Collection Procedures

Data were collected across a four-week period following the full implementation of the MWP model:

- **Weeks 1–2:** Instructional intervention delivered in class; observation notes recorded; students participated in all MWP stages.
- **Week 3:** Students submitted final narrative essays; three evaluators independently scored essays using the rubric.
- **Week 3:** Students completed the motivation questionnaire via Google Forms.
- **Week 4:** Semi-structured interviews conducted with 10 students in Thai, then translated into English for analysis. Interviews explored students' experiences, challenges, confidence levels, and perceptions of writing and motivation post-intervention.

3.5 Data Analysis

Quantitative Analysis: Scores from the writing assessment and motivation questionnaire were analyzed using descriptive statistics—means, percentages, and standard deviations. Writing proficiency was categorized as Excellent (80–100%), Good (70–79%), Fair (60–69%), Poor (50–59%), and Needs Improvement (<50%). Motivation scores were interpreted using a 5-level scale, with particular focus on post-intervention trends across the four dimensions.

Qualitative Analysis: Interview transcripts were analyzed using thematic analysis, identifying patterns related to multimodal engagement, motivation, identity, and emotional experience. Coding was inductive, allowing for emerging themes that reflected student voices and contextualized the quantitative data. Findings were triangulated across instruments to ensure validity and credibility.

3.6 Ethical Considerations

Ethical approval was granted by the Institutional Review Board of Chiangmai Rajabhat University (Reference Code: IRB-EDU-2024-041). Participants were briefed on the purpose, procedures, confidentiality measures, and their right to withdraw without penalty. Data were anonymized and securely stored, and only aggregated findings were reported. The study posed no known physical or psychological risks and was conducted in accordance with university ethical guidelines for human subject research.

4. Results

This section presents the findings related to students' English writing performance and achievement motivation following the implementation of the Multimodal Writing Process (MWP) model. The results are based on rubric-based writing assessment, a post-intervention motivation

questionnaire, and qualitative data from student interviews. These findings provide evidence for both research questions

4.1 Writing Performance

After completing the MWP intervention, students demonstrated measurable improvement in English writing proficiency. Table 2 presents the average scores of three independent evaluators, assessed on a 25-point scale. The total mean writing score across all 50 students was 18.44 points, equivalent to 73.76%, with a standard deviation of 0.71—placing the overall performance in the *Good* range.

Table 2.
Average Writing Scores from Three Evaluators

Student Number	Evaluator 1 (25 points)	Evaluator 2 (25 points)	Evaluator 3 (25 points)	Average Score	Percentage (%)	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
1	21	20	19	20.00	80.00	1.00	Passed
2	19	20	18	19.00	76.00	1.00	Passed
3	16	17	16	16.33	65.33	0.58	Passed
...
50	19	21	21	20.33	81.33	1.15	Passed
Overall Mean	18.28	18.46	18.58	18.44	73.76	0.71	Good

The rubric scores revealed that students particularly excelled in creativity, rhetorical structure, and content development, while some continued to struggle with grammar accuracy and punctuation. Evaluator comments highlighted that student displayed “a strong personal voice,” “thoughtful organization,” and “clear connection between personal experience and broader themes.” This suggests that the MWP model encouraged expressive writing and helped students link form to function in meaningful ways. An analysis of score ranges indicated that:

12 students scored in the *Excellent* range ($\geq 80\%$)

28 students were rated *Good* (70–79%)

10 students were *Fair* (60–69%)

None of the students fell below the passing threshold, reflecting the model's inclusivity and scaffolding design.

These results demonstrate the MWP model's effectiveness in fostering expressive, organized writing and its capacity to support learners across a range of abilities. The consistent performance above the minimum threshold highlights the model's inclusive design, which allowed students to engage meaningfully with the writing process and build confidence in their written English.

4.2 Motivation Scores

The post-intervention achievement motivation questionnaire showed generally high levels of motivation across four dimensions. The results are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3.
Motivation Questionnaire Results (N = 50)

Achievement Motivation Dimension	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Learning Motivation/Diligence and Commitment			
1. I enjoy writing English essays through the Multimodal Writing Process.	3.89	0.74	Passed
2. I am confident in writing English essays through the Multimodal Writing Process.	3.54	0.88	Passed
3. I am enthusiastic about writing English essays through the Multimodal Writing Process.	3.96	0.84	Passed
Risk-Taking/Decision-Making/Participation and Collaboration			
4. I am willing to experiment and make mistakes in writing English essays using the Multimodal Writing Process.	4.25	0.80	Passed
5. I confidently share my thoughts and provide feedback on peers' writing after learning through the Multimodal Writing Process.	3.82	0.94	Passed
6. I am confident in presenting my own ideas in writing (Making Argument)	3.93	0.72	Passed

Achievement Motivation Dimension	Mean	SD	Interpretation
through the Multimodal Writing Process.			
Work Planning/Responsibility/Perseverance			
7. I allocate consistent time for writing assignments.	3.64	0.91	Passed
8. I make efforts to revise and improve my writing whenever I encounter errors.	4.11	0.79	Passed
9. I understand the process of writing English essays through the Multimodal Writing Process.	3.68	0.72	Passed
Learning Outcomes			
10. The Multimodal Writing Process helps me learn how to improve and revise my English essays.	4.21	0.83	Passed
11. The Multimodal Writing Process enables me to effectively convey my stories in English essays.	4.00	0.82	Passed
12. The Multimodal Writing Process assists me in developing others' English writing skills.	3.82	0.90	Passed
13. The Multimodal Writing Process makes writing English essays easier.	3.89	0.83	Passed
14. The Multimodal Writing Process promotes my future English language skills.	4.29	0.76	Passed
Overall Mean	3.93	0.82	Passed

The post-intervention achievement motivation questionnaire revealed a high overall level of student motivation, with a mean score of 3.93 (SD = 0.82)—well above the benchmark of 3.50. As shown in Table 3, students responded positively across all four dimensions assessed.

- **Learning Motivation, Diligence, and Commitment:** Students consistently expressed enthusiasm and commitment to writing through the MWP model, with item scores ranging from 3.54 to 3.96. This suggests that the process fostered sustained engagement and enjoyment in learning to write.
- **Risk-Taking, Participation, and Collaboration:** This dimension received strong ratings, especially for willingness to experiment and share ideas, with a peak score of 4.25. The findings indicate that the

MWP model created a collaborative and supportive environment that encouraged peer feedback and confident expression.

- **Work Planning, Responsibility, and Perseverance:** Students reported effective time management and persistent effort in revising their work, with scores ranging from 3.64 to 4.11. This reflects the model's role in developing independent writing habits.
- **Learning Outcomes:** The highest average was in this category, with a top score of 4.29, highlighting students' perceived improvement in English writing skills, revision ability, and peer support. Many students found the writing process more manageable and meaningful through the MWP.

These results suggest that the Multimodal Writing Process does more than facilitate writing outcomes—it actively cultivates the psychological conditions necessary for long-term learner development. The positive response across all motivation categories underscores the model's potential to support both academic success and learner autonomy in EFL writing instruction.

4.3 Thematic Insights from Interviews

To deepen the understanding of how the Multimodal Writing Process (MWP) impacted students, interview transcripts were analyzed using thematic analysis. Four major themes emerged, illustrating the emotional, social, and cognitive effects of the intervention.

4.3.1 Multimodal Expression Reduced Anxiety

Many students described the early MWP stages—*Observing* and *Reflecting*—as crucial in reducing anxiety about writing in English. Non-verbal modes such as drawing, collage, or music selection provided accessible ways to explore ideas before shifting into linguistic form.

“Drawing first helped me not be afraid. It was like I could think in Thai, feel it, then write in English later.” (Participant #2, Interview, August 2024)

“Using visual art helps us understand what we need to write. Sometimes we can’t explain well in words, but we know what we mean through drawing.” (Participant#1, Interview, August 2024)

These prewriting strategies helped students shift their focus from correctness to meaning, offering a low-stakes entry point into the writing process and lowering the fear of making mistakes.

4.3.2 Peer Collaboration Enhanced Writing Quality

Collaborative elements—especially during the *Expressing* and *Revising* stages—were frequently identified as beneficial for improving both content and structure. Students noted that peer feedback offered them new perspectives and made them feel more supported as writers.

“My partner helped me see the story clearer. I changed the ending because she said it was too short.” (Participant #3, Interview, July 2024)

“We exchanged ideas on what topics to choose and how to write them. Friends might say, ‘This part is confusing’ or ‘Try organizing it this way.’ It made my writing more logical.” (Participant#4, Interview, July, 2024)

“Discussing drafts helped me notice my mistakes. When I gave feedback to friends, I also realized what I could improve in my own work.” (Participant#5, Interview, July 2024)

The data suggests that the MWP’s collaborative structure enhanced both writing fluency and metacognitive awareness.

4.3.3 Emotional Investment Promoted Effort

Students consistently reported that personal relevance increased their motivation to write. When they selected meaningful topics—often related to

early literacy, family, or identity—they were more willing to revise and refine their work.

“I wrote about my parent teaching me to read Thai. It made me want to do my best in English too.” (Participant #4, Interview, July 2024)

“When the topic is something from your life, you care more. I didn’t want my essay to just be correct—I wanted it to be meaningful.” (Participant#5, Interview, July 2024)

These emotionally resonant topics served as motivational anchors, encouraging students to see writing as more than a graded task.

4.3.4 Perceived Growth Increased Confidence

Several participants expressed pride in their development as writers, noting that the MWP helped them shift their self-perception. For many, this was the first time they saw themselves as capable of producing meaningful English texts.

“This is the first time I finished an essay and liked it. I never felt that before.” (Participant #2, Interview, August 2024)

“I used to think I couldn’t write in English. After this project, I feel like my ideas actually matter.” (Participant#6, Interview, July 2024)

“When I got teacher feedback saying I improved, I felt proud—not just because of the score, but because I saw myself grow.” (Participant#7, July 2024)

These insights suggest that the MWP model not only built technical skills, but also fostered writer identity and confidence—key outcomes for sustainable writing development.

5. Discussion

The findings of this study provide strong evidence that the Multimodal Writing Process (MWP) model is an effective pedagogical approach for enhancing both English writing proficiency and achievement motivation

among Thai undergraduate students. Drawing from both quantitative and qualitative data, including rubric-based writing assessments, motivation questionnaires, and student interviews, the study demonstrates how a multimodal, process-based, and student-centered model can address long-standing challenges in Thai EFL writing instruction.

To begin with, the improvement in students' writing performance—evidenced by rubric scores and qualitative observations—suggests that the integration of multimodal resources supported learners in organizing ideas, expressing themselves creatively, and engaging in purposeful communication. Many students excelled in creativity, rhetorical coherence, and content development, indicating that the model helped bridge the gap between abstract thinking and structured writing. This finding reinforces key principles of Multimodality Theory, particularly the idea that meaning is made not solely through linguistic form, but through the interplay of visual, oral, and spatial modes (Kress & Van Leeuwen, 2001). When students were invited to draw, map, or narrate their experiences before writing, they reported feeling less anxious and more connected to their ideas—confirming that multimodal scaffolding can function as both a cognitive and emotional support system.

Moreover, the structure of the MWP, which emphasized recursive stages of writing—from observing and reflecting to drafting and revising—allowed students to view writing as an evolving process rather than a final product. Unlike traditional writing instruction in Thailand, which often prioritizes correctness and fixed templates, this approach encouraged students to revise based on peer and teacher feedback and to refine their ideas over multiple drafts. The observed increase in student confidence and rhetorical control aligns with Process Writing Pedagogy (Emig, 1982; Raimes, 1985), which frames writing as a nonlinear and developmental act. From this perspective,

revision is not merely a corrective step, but a site of creativity, exploration, and reflection. This echoes Hyland's (2015) emphasis on the importance of contextualized, purposeful writing instruction—where learners engage with audience, genre, and voice in ways that support both linguistic development and critical thinking. Similarly, Alehegn et al. (2024) highlights how reciprocal pedagogy—emphasizing shared learning responsibilities between students and instructors—significantly enhances writing proficiency in EFL classrooms by fostering active participation and greater ownership of learning.

Equally important, the study found that the MWP model significantly influenced students' motivation to write. Quantitative results showed high levels of motivation across four key dimensions: diligence, risk-taking, responsibility, and perceived learning outcomes. Qualitative data confirmed that students felt more invested in their work, particularly when writing about personally meaningful topics such as family, early literacy memories, or formative experiences. This emotional engagement is consistent with the tenets of Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000), which holds that autonomy, competence, and relatedness are essential to sustaining intrinsic motivation. In the MWP classroom, these needs were met through flexible topic selection, peer collaboration, and scaffolded support—creating a writing environment where students could take intellectual risks without fear of failure.

Additionally, many students described a shift in how they viewed themselves as writers. For some, this course represented the first time they felt proud of their English writing. Rather than seeing writing as a test of grammar or vocabulary, they began to recognize it as a form of personal expression and connection. This shift reflects not only the impact of instructional design, but also the deeper identity work enabled by the model.

As learners engaged with their own narratives and saw their stories valued by peers and instructors, they began to internalize a new sense of authorship. This identity transformation supports recent scholarship emphasizing the role of emotional resonance and narrative ownership in L2 writing development (Pajares, 2003; Choi & Yi, 2016).

Furthermore, the study contributes to a growing body of literature advocating for pedagogical innovation in Southeast Asian EFL contexts. While models such as MWP have been widely implemented in Western education systems, their adoption in Thai classrooms remains limited. This study shows that with careful adaptation—such as allowing translanguaging in early stages, using culturally relevant prompts, and promoting feedback as dialogue—multimodal, process-based approaches can be both effective and contextually appropriate. These findings echo those of Krongyut and Srijongjai (2024), who reported that a multimodal project-based writing approach enhanced student behavioral engagement and motivation in a Thai EFL context. Their study reinforces the importance of incorporating multimodal strategies into writing instruction that values learner agency, cultural relevance, and classroom interaction.

Taken as a whole, the findings underscore that writing is not merely a linguistic activity, but a holistic process that involves emotion, identity, interaction, and creativity. The MWP model succeeds not only in improving writing performance, but in positioning students as reflective and motivated writers who are capable of shaping and expressing their own ideas. By weaving together multimodal design, recursive learning, and motivational support, this model offers a promising framework for transforming EFL writing instruction in Thai higher education and comparable settings.

6. Conclusion and Implications

This study set out to explore the impact of the Multimodal Writing Process (MWP) on English writing proficiency and achievement motivation among Thai undergraduate students. Through a carefully designed curriculum intervention and mixed-methods inquiry, the study found that the MWP model not only improved students' writing performance but also nurtured their motivation, confidence, and engagement with the writing process. The integration of multimodal tools, recursive writing stages, and meaningful content selection created a supportive and dynamic learning environment in which learners could express themselves more fully and develop a sense of authorship in English.

One of the most significant takeaways from the study is the pedagogical value of combining visual, oral, and collaborative strategies with structured academic writing. Students who began the course with limited confidence and a history of form-focused instruction responded positively to activities that allowed them to draw, map, tell stories, and share personal experiences before translating their thoughts into written form. This multimodal foundation did not replace writing but enriched it—serving as a bridge between internal thought and linguistic expression. The findings reinforce the argument that writing in a second language must be taught not only as a mechanical skill, but as a process of meaning-making that engages the whole learner—emotionally, socially, and cognitively.

Moreover, the study highlights the importance of motivation as both a means and an outcome of effective writing pedagogy. When students were given space to choose their topics, work collaboratively, and receive formative feedback, they demonstrated greater effort, risk-taking, and perseverance. These behaviors are not incidental to writing success; they are fundamental. The MWP model, by attending to students' autonomy,

134 Teaching English Language

Reimagining EFL Writing ...

competence, and sense of relatedness, created conditions that fostered sustained engagement and pride in writing. As learners began to see themselves as capable writers, their attitudes shifted, and their writing reflected greater depth, clarity, and originality.

The implications of these findings are wide-ranging. For English language teachers, the study offers practical insight into how multimodal strategies can be incorporated into classroom routines. Even in contexts with limited technology or time, teachers can adapt prewriting activities, encourage peer feedback, and allow for flexible topic development to promote deeper student engagement. The model also calls for a rethinking of assessment practices, suggesting that writing should be evaluated not only for linguistic accuracy but for rhetorical strategy, creativity, and personal voice.

For curriculum designers, the success of the MWP points to the need for more inclusive, process-oriented writing programs—especially in teacher education, where future educators are learning not just how to write, but how to teach writing. Embedding multimodal composition into university writing courses could help bridge the gap between traditional instruction and contemporary literacy demands, preparing students to communicate effectively in multilingual and multimodal environments.

From a policy perspective, this study suggests that national curricula should support writing instruction that begins early and builds recursively. Rather than relegating writing to upper-level courses or treating it as a test of grammar and vocabulary, curriculum frameworks should emphasize writing as a mode of thinking, inquiry, and personal expression. Assessment systems, too, may need to evolve to capture the process of writing development—not just the final product. In line with the findings of recent scholarship in global EFL contexts, including Zohrabi and Khalili (2024), this research calls for

performance-based, student-centered approaches that value diversity of thought, language, and learning style.

In conclusion, the Multimodal Writing Process offers a compelling vision for reimagining EFL writing pedagogy in Thailand and beyond. It shows that when writing instruction is grounded in meaningful content, multiple modes of expression, and attention to learner motivation, students are not only able to write more effectively—they begin to see themselves as writers. This transformation is perhaps the most powerful outcome of all, and one that lays the foundation for lifelong learning, academic achievement, and communicative empowerment in a globalized world.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- Alehegn, A., Yigzaw, A., & Shifere, K. (2024). The reciprocal pedagogy: Effects on students' writing proficiency development in an EFL classroom. *Teaching English Language, 18*(1), 317-339.
- Archer, A., & Breuer, E. (2015). *Multimodality in writing: The state of the art in theory, methodology and pedagogy*. Brill.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101.
- Chamcharatsri, P. (2013). Perceptions of Thai English: A study of Thai English users in Bangkok. *Journal of English as an International Language, 8*(1), 21–36.
- Chamcharatsri, P., Limpariwatthana, K., & Saengngoen, J. (2021, August). Research on English writing in Thailand: A systematic review. Paper presented at *Preparing 21st Century Learners for a Dynamic Future Conference*, Bangkok, Thailand.
- Chamcharatsri, P., Limpariwatthana, K., & Saengngoen, J. (2022, February). Publishing trends in English writing research in Thailand. Paper presented at the *18th Annual CamTESOL Conference (Virtual)*, Cambodia.
- Cho, H., & Kim, Y. (2021). Comparing the characteristics of EFL students' multimodal composing and traditional monomodal writing: The case of a reading-to-write task. *Language Teaching Research, 28*(6), 2487–2512. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688211046740>

- Choi, J., & Yi, Y. (2016). Teachers' integration of multimodality into classroom practices for English language learners. *TESOL Journal*, 7(2), 304–327. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.210>
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227–268.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2021). *Teaching and researching motivation* (3rd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/97813151006743>
- Emig, J. (1982). Inquiry paradigms and writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 33(1), 64–75. <https://doi.org/10.2307/357624>
- Ferris, D., Liu, H., Sinha, A., & Senna, M. (2013). Written corrective feedback for individual L2 writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 22(3), 307–329. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2013.03.010>
- García, O., & Li Wei. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137385765>
- Gardner, T. (2013). *English 1105: Assignment rubric*. Traci's Teaching Portfolio. <https://tracigardner.com/English1105/docs/01-Rubric.pdf>
- Hinkel, E. (2003). *Teaching academic ESL writing: Practical techniques in vocabulary and grammar*. Routledge.
- Hyland, K. (2015). *Teaching and researching writing* (3rd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315717203>
- Jewitt, C. (2013). Multimodal methods for researching digital technologies. In S. Price, C. Jewitt, & B. Brown (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of digital technology research* (pp. 250–265). SAGE.
- Kress, G. (2010). *Multimodality: A social semiotic approach to contemporary communication*. Routledge.
- Kress, G., & Van Leeuwen, T. (2001). *Multimodal discourse: The modes and media of contemporary communication*. Arnold.
- Krongyut, W., & Srijongjai, A. (2024). Unlocking student behavioral engagement in a Thai EFL writing class with a multimodal project approach: Students' perspectives. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 17(1), 572–598.
- Limpariwatthana, K. (2022). *Writer identity construction of Thai EFL students: A phenomenological study* [Doctoral dissertation, University of New Mexico]. UNM Digital Repository.
- McClelland, D. C. (1988). *Human motivation*. Cambridge University Press.
- Office of the Education Council. (2015). *Education in Thailand 2015*. Ministry of Education, Thailand.
- Pajares, F. (2003). Self-efficacy beliefs, motivation, and achievement in writing: A review of the literature. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 19(2), 139–158. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10573560308222>

- Pardede, P. (2025). Exploring recent research methodology on technology-enhanced collaborative writing in EFL setting: A systematic review. *International Journal of Social Sciences & Educational Studies*, 12(2), 16–36. <https://doi.org/10.23918/ijsses.v12i2p16>
- Raimes, A. (1985). What unskilled ESL students do as they write: A classroom study of composing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19(2), 229–258. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3586828>
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68–78.
- Taheri, P., & Nazmi, R. (2021). Improving EFL learners' argumentative writing ability: Teacher vs. peer scaffolding. *Teaching English Language*, 15(2), 299–333. <https://doi.org/10.22132/TEL.2021.143348>
- Yi, Y. (2014). Possibilities and challenges of multimodal literacy practices in teaching and learning English as an additional language. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 8(4), 158–169. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lnc3.12076>
- Zohrabi, M., & Khalili, A. (2024). A cross-cultural study into the utility of diverse written corrective feedback strategies in medicine students' ESP writing courses. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 12(2), 150–169. <https://doi.org/10.22034/ijsc.2024.2025600.3436>



2026 by the authors. Licensee Journal of Teaching English Language (TEL). This is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0 license). (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0>).