

Beyond Boundaries: Assessment of Writing Performance of Students in a Modified Flipped Classroom at Dugong National High School

Catherine V. Rendon ¹

1 – Abra State Institute of Sciences and Technology
catherine.rendon001@deped.gov.ph

Publication Date: May 2, 2026

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19970062

Abstract

Writing is a core academic skill that requires clarity, organization, and creativity, and innovative approaches. The flipped classrooms are increasingly being explored to enhance students' writing performance. With this regard, the study aimed to assess the writing outputs of Grade 8 students at Dugong National High School after exposure to a modified flipped classroom strategy using multimodal pre-class resources. Specifically, it sought to evaluate students' performance in informative, descriptive, and argumentative essays. The study employed a quantitative-descriptive research design where students engaged with pre-class materials delivered through printed texts, audio recordings, and video presentations prior to in-class activities. Their written outputs were assessed using a rubric measuring clarity, organization, depth, language use, and word count. Descriptive statistics, particularly mean scores, were applied in the analysis. Results revealed an overall composite mean of 88.59, corresponding to a "Very Satisfactory" performance. Word Count and Language and Mechanics consistently obtained the highest scores across all essay types, indicating strong fluency and grammatical accuracy. Descriptive essays reflected effective use of sensory details and imagery, while argumentative essays showed strength in supporting evidence and reasoning. However, lower scores were recorded in Depth of Explanation for informative essays and in Counterargument and Refutation for argumentative essays, pointing to areas where critical analysis and perspective-taking need further improvement. These findings suggest that a modified flipped classroom strategy supported by multimodal pre-class resources can effectively enhance students' writing skills, particularly in fluency, organization, and argumentation. To maximize its benefits, future applications may integrate targeted instruction on critical thinking and analytical writing. Overall, the study affirms the value of differentiated and autonomous learning in improving the academic writing performance of secondary students.

Keywords: *Flipped classroom, multimodal resources, writing performance, informative, argumentative and descriptive type of essay, descriptive statistics, mean scores*

I. INTRODUCTION

The flipped classroom model represents a significant shift in the teaching system by inverting the traditional roles of classroom instruction and homework. By norm, new concepts are learned during classes in the form of lectures while practice and understanding are earned from outside class independently. The flipped classroom does the opposite by introducing new material through at-home study, using resources such as readings, videos, or audio. By using this approach, students familiarize themselves with the content covered in lectures before the class meeting, making class time a chance for application and collaborative learning. With this approach where students engage directly with the instructors and peers in class for explanations and answers, it was noticed that the flipped classroom improves student engagement, independence, and understanding (Akçayır & Akçayır, 2018; Leatherman & Cleveland, 2020).

A flipped classroom can be a promising avenue for modeling systems to diverse educational needs with the assistance of multimodal pre-class resources, such as printed texts, audio, and video. The significant benefits of this model are that it allows for different learning styles to be accommodated in conducting activities that cater to multiple formats, aligning students with their preferred learning styles. The majority of these exposures can better help students prepare for in-class tasks, leading to more prepared individuals with a deeper understanding of reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills (Ozdamli & Asiksoy, 2016; Bognar et al., 2020). This way, class time becomes an interactive space, where students practice and refine their communicative abilities through pronunciation exercises, group discussions, and interactive language use exercises. These enable learners to deepen their language skills through feedback in a collaborative process, thereby developing language competence and building confidence (Adnan, 2017; Alizadeh, 2021).

Language performance, therefore, is a significant measure of effectiveness in the evaluation of how well a language program works, as it entails how effectively the learner uses the language meaningfully and appropriately in real-life situations. Effective performance in language education means going beyond the mere knowledge of grammar and vocabulary; it involves being fluent in communication for conversations. In this performance, the modified flipped classroom approach is implemented through structured pre-class preparation provided to students, enabling them to be active participants during class events and collaborate with their peers. This translated into more confident and competent communicative skills, hence better language performance in general (Ceylan & Kesici, 2017; Mehring, 2018).

Recent research holds great promise in providing insights into the flipped classroom model, particularly within the language classroom. For example, Zainuddin and Perera-Liyanage (2020) took flipped classrooms to analyze the teaching of the English language; they concluded that pre-class video assignments resulted in active engagement and better retention for the students. Shih and Huang (2021) explored a flipped classroom model in an English as a Foreign Language (EFL) scenario. They further explained that the inclusion of vocabulary and reading-based pre-class activities helped them develop greater confidence in performing speaking tasks appropriately. Another relevant study is conducted by Bao and Wang (2023), targeting multimedia resources in flipped classes designed for EFL learners, using audio and video material to promote listening skills and understanding.

Although these studies demonstrate promising potential benefits that can be achieved with a flipped classroom approach to language learning, they generally limit themselves to only



one type of resource, primarily digital, and do not compare formats such as print, audio, and video. This gap requires further investigation into how multiple pre-class resource formats may impact student performance, particularly their individual learning preferences. This study bridges this gap through an investigation into a modified flipped classroom approach wherein diverse pre-assigned materials are used to enhance writing performance in language learning.

This paper examines the impact of various pre-class resources on learning outcomes, specifically focusing on the effects of a modified flipped class on students' language performance. A modified flipped approach, utilizing class materials in the form of printed texts, audio recordings, and video materials before class, accommodates various learning preferences and maximizes preparedness for practicing language skills during class.

The conclusions drawn are essential to different stakeholders. Teachers can benefit from the research by using more differentiated strategies with students and selecting resources that are appropriate to them. The results can also be helpful for curriculum developers and school officials in an effective expansion of their language program, further supporting new teaching approaches with increased chances of having motivated students. Finally, it is the students who would most benefit from this approach—one that lets them be an active participant in their own process of learning and equips them with language skills as applied to actual communication outside the classroom.

The major problem of this study lies in the less-than-ideal strategy for improving language performance within the limited time frame allowed for speaking and writing in traditional classroom environments. This is particularly crucial in language education, where mastering fluency requires constant, active practice. The improved version of the flipped classroom addresses this issue by encouraging students to engage with diverse pre-session materials — reading, listening to, or viewing texts, audio recordings, or videos, respectively — to prepare them for concepts in the languages being learned according to their diverse learning styles. Class time would be used for activities that go beyond mere comprehension, thanks to interaction and feedback.

The study examines whether changing the types of materials installed before class, either reading and listening assignments content or as video-based content, pre-class results in different levels of language performance in writing. The goal is to identify differences that could be exploited to enhance learners' performance in language proficiency within the classroom environment.

Statement of the Problem

This study aims to evaluate the effectiveness of a modified flipped classroom approach in enhancing language performance among students by utilizing various pre-class strategies- pre-reading and listening assignments and video-based contents — to engage different learning styles and preferences.

1. What is the level of performance of students in writing informative, descriptive, and argumentative essays before the implementation of the modified flipped classroom?
2. What is the level of performance of students in writing informative, descriptive, and argumentative essays in a modified flipped classroom using



- a. print and listening assignments
 - b. video-based content
3. What is the level of performance of students in writing informative, descriptive, and argumentative essays after the implementation of the modified flipped classroom?
4. Is there a significant difference in the level of performance of students in writing informative, descriptive, and argumentative essays before and after the implementation of the modified flipped classroom?
5. Is there a significant difference in the level of performance of students in writing informative, descriptive, and argumentative essays in a modified flipped classroom using print/listening assignments and video-based content?

Hypothesis

1. There is a significant difference in the level of performance of students in writing informative, descriptive, and argumentative essays before and after the implementation of modified flipped classroom.
2. There is a significant difference in the level of performance of students in writing informative, descriptive, and argumentative essays in a modified flipped classroom using print/listening assignments and video-based content.

II. MATERIALS and METHODS

Research Design

This study employed a single-group design to investigate the effects of two instructional strategies —pre-reading/listening assignments and video-based content — on the language performance of Grade 8 students within the flipped classroom. In this design, all participants experienced both strategies sequentially, which allowed for a direct comparison of language outcomes for the same set of students. This eliminated the need for a control group or distinct experimental groups, as the sections were heterogeneous in terms of learning requirements and levels of expertise, and it was deemed that there was already a clear distinction among the sections. In considering the operation on a single group of consistent proficiency, the research study limited variation to ensure that any differences in performance could be attributed to the instructional strategies in place and not to variations between student groups.

The first stage of the study involved pre-reading and listening activities for the students. In this stage, the students carried out tasks to build on their reading and listening skills, which provided basic knowledge of what was going to be discussed in writing activities. This stage utilized baseline data for the engagement, understanding, and language usage performance of students by applying pre-reading and listening materials.

In the flipped classroom approach, the same students were involved in video-based resources in the second cycle. Video resources are suggested to support even further development in language skills and convey multimodal cues like visual and auditory information that may promote understanding and pronunciation and overall linguistic performance during oral and written tasks. This sequential approach allowed us to compare the two strategies, namely pre-reading/listening versus video-based content, within the same group of students. Therefore, it was possible to obtain insight into which method was more effective for promoting language proficiency in the context of a flipped classroom.



This was an essential single-group research design because it addressed the specific needs of the study population, thus permitting meaningful comparisons of student performance across instructional strategies. Because each strategy was applied to the same group, the study could better isolate the influence of instructional methods on language skills in speaking and writing, thus providing data that directly relates to the research questions without confounding variables that might have arisen with a traditional control and experimental group setup.

Participants

The research study was conducted at Dugong National High School, focusing on a single section of Grade 8 students. Initially, two sections of Grade 8 were considered for the research study; however, one section had to be excluded because it was observed that these students learn at a slower pace. Therefore, only one group, which typifies the reading proficiency level of this grade, would be conducted in the study. For this target group, there was a need for a two-stage strategy implementation, where the first stage, the pre-reading and listening assignments, were introduced, and the second stage was the video-based content on the same set of students.

Instruments

Multiple data collection tools were used in this study to fairly evaluate the language performance of Grade 8 students in a modified flipped classroom. Every tool was meant to assess particular aspects of students' essay writing abilities and degree of involvement, thereby guaranteeing a comprehensive assessment of the success of the intervention.

The Essay Writing Rubric was the primary tool used to assess students' achievements in informative, descriptive, and argumentative essays. Five main criteria comprised the rubric: content development (clarity, depth, and progress of ideas); organization and coherence (logical sequencing and transitions); language and mechanics (grammar, punctuation, and sentence structure); creativity and engagement (use of imagery, sensory details, and persuasive techniques); word count compliance. Every criterion was scored on a 5-point Likert Scale; 5 indicated Outstanding performance (90–100%), 4 denoted Very Satisfactory (85–89%), 3 denoted Satisfactory (80–84%), 2 was understood as Fairly Satisfactory (75–79%), and 1 suggested Needs Improvement (below 75%). The norm of interpretation was based on the Department of Education's grading criteria, adapted to reflect the specific writing skills being tested.

There were also pretest and posttest writing assignments. Before and after the intervention, students turned in essays in each genre—informative, descriptive, argumentative. Using the specified rubric, these essays were assessed to find any notable development in their writing over the course of the research.

The Essay Writing Rubric and different topics per type of essay underwent validation before the instrument delivery. These instruments were sent to a panel of three professionals, comprising two master teachers and one teacher specializing in English language instruction, curriculum development, and educational research. The panel evaluated the tools based on their relevance, clarity, appropriateness, and comprehensiveness. Minor adjustments were made based on their suggestions to clarify some rubric descriptions and standardize survey item language. A Content Validity Index (CVI) of 0.80 or above was the accepted criterion for validation. A CVI within the range of 0.80 to 1.00 is qualitatively classified as Highly Valid, implying that the instruments required only minimum adjustments to meet the criterion of validity.



Reliability testing also helped ensure that the devices consistently measured what they were intended to measure. Inter-rater reliability was measured for the Essay Writing Rubric. Multiple raters separately assessed example essays from thirty Grade 9 students from the same school not engaged in the project during a pilot scoring session. After that, the results were examined to find how consistently ratings matched across several assessors. For this aim, an Inter-Rater Reliability index of 0.75 or above was seen as reasonable. With an Inter-Rater Reliability value of 0.82, the pilot test delivered Very Good ratings—that is, consistent, reliable scores across raters—from the rubric.

To ensure the accuracy and reliability of the results, the data collection tools in this study—the Essay Writing Rubric, the pretest and posttest essays, and the various topics—were thoroughly verified and evaluated for dependability. The range of ratings and interpretive guidelines matched statistical methods suitable for language performance evaluations and educational criteria. These initiatives guaranteed that the instruments were contextually relevant for Grade 8 students of Dugong National High School and methodologically sound.

Procedure

Permission was first sought from the school administration to conduct the study with the selected Grade 8 students of Dugong National High School. To ensure the reliability and appropriateness of the study materials, the pre-class resources—such as printed texts, audio recordings, and video materials underwent validation by experienced evaluators, specifically two master teachers from Cristina B. Gonzales Memorial High School and my co-teacher who is also Division LR Validator. These evaluators reviewed the materials to confirm their relevance, level of difficulty, and alignment with the targeted language competencies.

Additionally, performance rubrics used to assess students' language skills in speaking and writing were also validated by these evaluators. The rubrics include criteria for evaluating fluency, accuracy, pronunciation, coherence, grammar, and vocabulary in speaking tasks, and content, grammar, syntax, coherence, vocabulary, and mechanics in writing tasks. The feedback from co-English teachers were used to make necessary adjustments, ensuring that the rubrics accurately measure students' language performance and support consistent assessment throughout the study.

Two distinct phases of data gathering were proposed in this study, corresponding to two different strategies applied separately to a group of Grade 8 students. The process has ensured that any changes in students' performance in language use are captured as students experience one strategy after another.

Orientation first, a process by which the students were oriented on the objectives of the study, experiences of strategies, and types of materials prepared for each phase. This implies that students had preceded by presentations on language assessment tasks that they conducted at the end of every phase. In the first phase, the first strategy were as follows: printed texts and audio recordings were assigned to the students as pre-class activities. They worked with the materials independently, outside class, to prepare for classroom activities. In the class sessions, the students then did writing tasks developed from these pre-class activities. After the first stage, the students' language abilities were assessed by the language performance evaluation to gauge their experience with the first strategy.

In phase two, video-based pre-class content was distributed to the students. They watch these on their own to prepare for the subsequent activities to be undertaken in class. The students



once again prepared and shared tasks in class, based on the content of the video they watched. The same language performance assessment was administered at the end of this phase to ensure that students' language skills are assessed at the conclusion of the second strategy.

Finally, the data were gathered from the two phases and were put together and then analyzed. Statistical analysis was done from the obtained data in order to verify whether the difference is significant concerning the language performance and engagement levels of both approaches compared based on how they are provided, which entails understanding the impact of each metacognitive approach on the students' learning outcomes.

Data Analysis

The mean was used to describe the level of language performance in writing among students engaged in pre-reading and listening assignments, as well as video-based content, in a flipped classroom. The paired t-test was used to determine whether there is a significant difference in students' writing performance in writing informative, descriptive, and argumentative essays before and after the implementation of the modified flipped classroom. ANOVA will be conducted to compare students' writing performance across the three different essay types (informative, descriptive, and argumentative) before and after the implementation of the modified flipped classroom.

III. RESULTS

The following were the salient findings of the study.

Problem 1. What is the level of performance of students in writing informative, descriptive, and argumentative essays before the implementation of the modified flipped classroom?

Table 1. The level of performance of students in writing informative, descriptive, and argumentative essays before the implementation of the modified flipped classroom.

| Indicators | Mean | Descriptive Rating |
|---------------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|
| Informative Essay | | |
| Clarity of Information | 77.14 | Fairly Satisfactory |
| Depth of Explanation | 76.50 | Fairly Satisfactory |
| Logical and Progression | 77.27 | Fairly Satisfactory |
| Language and Mechanics | 77.14 | Fairly Satisfactory |
| Word Count | 83.73 | Satisfactory |
| Composite Mean | 77.55 | Fairly Satisfactory |
| Descriptive Essay | | |
| Content and Development (5 pts) | 76.27 | Fairly Satisfactory |
| Imagery and Sensory Details | 77.59 | Fairly Satisfactory |
| Organization and Coherence | 76.73 | Fairly Satisfactory |
| Engagement and Creativity | 77.27 | Fairly Satisfactory |
| Language and Mechanics | 77.14 | Fairly Satisfactory |
| Word Count | 84.27 | Satisfactory |
| Composite Mean | 77.59 | Fairly Satisfactory |

| Argumentative Essay | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|
| Thesis statement and positioning | 73.86 | Did Not Meet Expectation |
| Supporting evidence and reasoning | 74.09 | Did Not Meet Expectation |
| Counterargument and refutation | 75.09 | Fairly Satisfactory |
| Persuasive and technique | 76.73 | Fairly Satisfactory |
| Language and Mechanics | 77.14 | Fairly Satisfactory |
| Word Count | 82.09 | Satisfactory |
| Composite Mean | 75.91 | Fairly Satisfactory |
| Overall | 76.59 | Fairly Satisfactory |

Problem 2. What is the level of performance of students in writing informative, descriptive, and argumentative essays in a modified flipped classroom using

- a. print and listening assignments
- b. video-based content

Table 2a. The level of performance of students in writing informative, descriptive, and argumentative essays in a modified flipped classroom using print and listening assignments

| Informative Essay | Mean | DR |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|
| Clarity of Information | 81.06 | Satisfactory |
| Depth of Explanation | 77.30 | Fairly Satisfactory |
| Logical and Progression | 80.52 | Satisfactory |
| Language and Mechanics | 78.67 | Fairly Satisfactory |
| Word Count | 80.58 | Satisfactory |
| Composite Mean | 79.51 | Fairly Satisfactory |
| Descriptive Essay | | |
| Content and Development (5 pts) | 83.95 | Satisfactory |
| Imagery and Sensory Details | 77.18 | Fairly Satisfactory |
| Organization and Coherence | 83.64 | Satisfactory |
| Engagement and Creativity | 83.08 | Satisfactory |
| Language and Mechanics | 83.62 | Satisfactory |
| Word Count | 84.35 | Satisfactory |
| Composite Mean | 82.62 | Satisfactory |
| Argumentative Essay | | |
| Thesis statement and positioning | 77.95 | Fairly Satisfactory |
| Supporting evidence and reasoning | 80.89 | Satisfactory |
| Counterargument and refutation | 82.31 | Satisfactory |
| Persuasive and technique | 84.38 | Satisfactory |
| Language and Mechanics | 84.05 | Satisfactory |
| Word Count | 80.49 | Satisfactory |
| Composite Mean | 81.67 | Satisfactory |
| Overall | 81.27 | Satisfactory |

Table 2b. The level of performance of students in writing informative, descriptive, and argumentative essays in a modified flipped classroom using video-based content

| Informative Essay | Mean | DR |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------|
| Clarity of Information | 88.00 | Very Satisfactory |
| Depth of Explanation | 85.40 | Very Satisfactory |
| Logical and Progression | 87.65 | Very Satisfactory |
| Language and Mechanics | 87.86 | Very Satisfactory |
| Word Count | 91.67 | Outstanding |
| Composite Mean | 88.17 | Very Satisfactory |
| Descriptive Essay | | |
| Content and Development (5 pts) | 87.00 | Very Satisfactory |
| Imagery and Sensory Details | 87.59 | Very Satisfactory |
| Organization and Coherence | 89.25 | Very Satisfactory |
| Engagement and Creativity | 91.50 | Outstanding |
| Language and Mechanics | 92.68 | Outstanding |
| Word Count | 97.64 | Outstanding |
| Composite Mean | 90.64 | Outstanding |
| Argumentative Essay | | |
| Thesis statement and positioning | 88.95 | Very Satisfactory |
| Supporting evidence and reasoning | 87.48 | Very Satisfactory |
| Counterargument and refutation | 87.73 | Very Satisfactory |
| Persuasive and technique | 87.39 | Very Satisfactory |
| Language and Mechanics | 88.47 | Very Satisfactory |
| Word Count | 91.52 | Outstanding |
| Composite Mean | 88.42 | Very Satisfactory |
| Overall | 89.08 | Very Satisfactory |

Problem 3. What is the level of performance of students in writing informative, descriptive, and argumentative essays after the implementation of the modified flipped classroom?

Table 3. The level of performance of students in writing informative, descriptive, and argumentative essays after the implementation of the modified flipped classroom

| Informative Essay | Mean | Descriptive Rating |
|--------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Clarity of Information | 88.32 | Very Satisfactory |
| Depth of Explanation | 86.09 | Very Satisfactory |
| Logical and Progression | 87.82 | Very Satisfactory |
| Language and Mechanics | 93.50 | Outstanding |
| Word Count | 94.09 | Outstanding |
| Composite Mean | 89.95 | Very Satisfactory |
| Descriptive Essay | | |

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------|
| Content and Development (5 pts) | 90.64 | Outstanding |
| Imagery and Sensory Details | 91.18 | Outstanding |
| Organization and Coherence | 89.45 | Very Satisfactory |
| Engagement and Creativity | 88.91 | Very Satisfactory |
| Language and Mechanics | 88.32 | Very Satisfactory |
| Word Count | 92.32 | Outstanding |
| Composite Mean | 89.82 | Very Satisfactory |
| Argumentative Essay | | |
| Thesis statement and positioning | 86.00 | Very Satisfactory |
| Supporting evidence and reasoning | 87.73 | Very Satisfactory |
| Counterargument and refutation | 81.00 | Satisfactory |
| Persuasive and technique | 87.14 | Very Satisfactory |
| Language and Mechanics | 85.00 | Very Satisfactory |
| Word Count | 91.73 | Outstanding |
| Composite Mean | 86.27 | Very Satisfactory |
| Overall | 88.59 | Very Satisfactory |

Problem 4. Is there a significant difference in the level of performance of students in writing informative, descriptive, and argumentative essays before and after the implementation of the modified flipped classroom?

Table 4. Comparison of the significant difference in the level of performance of students in writing informative, descriptive, and argumentative essays before and after the implementation of the modified flipped classroom

| | Pretest Mean | Posttest Mean | Mean Gain | t-value | t-prob |
|---------------------------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------|
| Informative Essay | | | | | |
| Clarity of Information | 77.14 | 88.32 | 11.18 | 6.63 | <0.01 |
| Depth of Explanation | 76.50 | 86.09 | 9.59 | 7.22 | <0.01 |
| Logical and Progression | 77.27 | 87.82 | 10.55 | 8.84 | <0.01 |
| Language and Mechanics | 77.14 | 93.50 | 16.36 | 12.30 | <0.01 |
| Word Count | 83.73 | 94.09 | 10.36 | 9.68 | <0.01 |
| Composite Mean | 77.55 | 89.95 | 12.40 | 16.69 | <0.01 |
| Descriptive Essay | | | | | |
| Content and Development (5 pts) | 76.27 | 90.64 | 14.37 | 9.42 | <0.01 |
| Imagery and Sensory Details | 77.59 | 91.18 | 13.59 | 12.97 | <0.01 |
| Organization and Coherence | 76.73 | 89.45 | 12.72 | 8.74 | <0.01 |
| Engagement and Creativity | 77.27 | 88.91 | 11.64 | 7.56 | <0.01 |
| Language and Mechanics | 77.14 | 88.32 | 11.18 | 11.31 | <0.01 |
| Word Count | 84.27 | 92.32 | 8.05 | 5.15 | <0.01 |

| Composite Mean | 77.59 | 89.82 | 12.23 | 22.38 | <0.01 |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------|
| Argumentative Essay | | | | | |
| Thesis statement and positioning | 73.86 | 86.00 | 12.14 | 9.23 | <0.01 |
| Supporting evidence and reasoning | 74.09 | 87.73 | 13.64 | 8.20 | <0.01 |
| Counterargument and refutation | 75.09 | 81.00 | 5.91 | 4.10 | <0.01 |
| Persuasive and technique | 76.73 | 87.14 | 10.41 | 12.25 | <0.01 |
| Language and Mechanics | 77.14 | 85.00 | 7.86 | 5.00 | <0.01 |
| Word Count | 82.09 | 91.73 | 9.64 | 5.91 | <0.01 |
| Composite Mean | 75.91 | 86.27 | 10.36 | 16.46 | <0.01 |
| Overall | 76.59 | 88.59 | 12.00 | 30.40 | <0.01 |

Problem 5. Is there a significant difference in the level of performance of students in writing informative, descriptive, and argumentative essays in a modified flipped classroom using print/listening assignments and video-based content?

Table 5. Comparison of the significant difference in the level of performance of students in writing informative, descriptive, and argumentative essays in a modified flipped classroom using print/listening assignments and video-based content

| Informative Essay | print/ listening assignments -Audio | video- based content | Mean Difference | t-value | t-prob |
|------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| | Mean | Mean | | | |
| Clarity of Information | 81.06 | 88.00 | 6.94 | 9.15 | <0.01 |
| Depth of Explanation | 77.30 | 85.40 | 8.10 | 10.11 | <0.01 |
| Logical and Progression | 80.52 | 87.65 | 7.13 | 7.72 | <0.01 |
| Language and Mechanics | 78.67 | 87.86 | 9.19 | 8.35 | <0.01 |
| Word Count | 80.58 | 91.67 | 11.09 | 10.09 | <0.01 |
| Composite Mean | 79.51 | 88.17 | 8.66 | 11.49 | <0.01 |
| Descriptive Essay | | | | | |
| Content and Development (5 pts) | 83.95 | 87.00 | 3.05 | 4.31 | <0.01 |
| Imagery and Sensory Details | 77.18 | 87.59 | 10.41 | 24.61 | <0.01 |
| Organization and Coherence | 83.64 | 89.25 | 5.61 | 6.10 | <0.01 |



| | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------|
| Engagement and Creativity | 83.08 | 91.50 | 8.42 | 11.42 | <0.01 |
| Language and Mechanics | 83.62 | 92.68 | 9.06 | 12.32 | <0.01 |
| Word Count | 84.35 | 97.64 | 13.29 | 13.06 | <0.01 |
| Composite Mean | 82.62 | 90.64 | 8.02 | 18.13 | <0.01 |
| Argumentative Essay | | | | | |
| Thesis statement and positioning | 77.95 | 88.95 | 11.00 | 22.54 | <0.01 |
| Supporting evidence and reasoning | 80.89 | 87.48 | 6.59 | 14.14 | <0.01 |
| Counterargument and refutation | 82.31 | 87.73 | 5.42 | 8.79 | <0.01 |
| Persuasive and technique | 84.38 | 87.39 | 3.01 | 5.31 | <0.01 |
| Language and Mechanics | 84.05 | 88.47 | 4.42 | 5.21 | <0.01 |
| Word Count | 80.49 | 91.52 | 11.03 | 10.39 | <0.01 |
| Composite Mean | 81.67 | 88.42 | 6.75 | 17.20 | <0.01 |
| Overall | 81.27 | 89.08 | 7.81 | 18.99 | <0.01 |

IV. DISCUSSION

Table 1 shows that the students' composite mean performance over the three essay forms—informative, descriptive, and argumentative—is 76.59, falling within the "Fairly Satisfactory" standard. This score shows that although students could satisfy minimum requirements for essay writing, they clearly lacked depth of material, structure, language use, and higher-order thinking ability. Although their outputs showed a basic awareness of the prerequisites for every kind of essay, they typically lacked the refinement and organization anticipated in academic work. This general outcome suggests that a more ordered and encouraging teaching approach is needed to enable students to improve their writing skills, logically arrange their ideas, and apply language more deliberately. Using a modified flipped classroom was suggested to fill in these voids.

Comparatively among the three essay forms, the descriptive essay received the highest composite mean of 77.59, somewhat ahead of the informative essay with a composite mean of 77.55. Both of them still fell into the "Fairly Satisfactory" range, indicating that students' descriptive and informative writing was only rather competent.

The argumentative essay, meantime, came with the lowest composite mean—75.91—also classified as "Fairly Satisfactory" generally. Though several specific signs in the argumentative essay fell under the "Did Not Meet Expectations" threshold, implying more serious problems with students' capacity for persuasive communication.



The descriptive essay probably scored highest since this kind of writing promotes sensory language, personal thought, and originality. From their own experiences, students may find it simpler to explain known individuals, locations, or events than they could create logical arguments or offer accurate facts. Many students, for instance, were able to create vivid and emotionally charged paragraphs employing images, therefore improving the general caliber of their descriptive pieces. One student wrote: *"My grandmother's withered hands told stories of decades gone. Her kitchen smelled of love and warm bread always. Her hug gave me the impression that nothing else in the world could go wrong"*. Using emotional appeal and sensory details—two essential elements of good descriptive writing—this passage shows the student's capacity to produce a clear picture in the reader's mind. Word Count (84.27) was the only indicator among all three essay kinds scored as "Satisfactory," and it was the highest indicator in this essay type. This implies that, free from the constraint of adhering to strict patterns or referencing factual information, students felt more secure and at ease creating longer writings detailing something personal.

On the other hand, the argumentative essay scored lowest with the Thesis Statement and Positioning (73.86) and Supporting Evidence and Reasoning (74.09) indicators both falling within the "Did Not Meet Expectations." This shows how difficult students found it to develop strong, forceful opinions on a topic and back up their points of view with reasonable arguments and pertinent data. Many also neglected to provide and reject counterarguments, a fundamental element of good persuasive writing. One student wrote, for instance, *"I think students should wear uniforms because they are nice. People claim they are dull, but I disagree. For the classroom, uniforms are appropriate."* This example is not very clear, deep, or persuasive. It employs evasive language, does not fairly acknowledge the other point of view, and offers no specific arguments or instances. These flaws suggest that students lacked the analytical and logical ability required to produce strong arguing papers. Usually more cognitively challenging, this essay type calls for the combination of reasoning, critical thinking, and planned persuasion—all of which required for directed teaching and practice.

With a composite mean of 77.55 and all of its metrics scored as "Fairly Satisfactory," the informative essay strata between the two. The ratings imply that although students could clearly explain material, there were still difficulties providing thorough explanations and keeping logical flow across the essay. The indicator Depth of Explanation, for example, had one of the lowest means (76.50), which would suggest that students often offered surface-level details without really developing their views. The performance of the informative essay could be explained by students' limited knowledge of the subject but inadequate direction on how to organize factual information holistically. A student writing on the advantages of exercise, for instance, would say: *"Exercise keeps kids and teens healthy and strong, hence it is excellent for them. It also eases stress"*. Though the material is accurate, the article is undeveloped in execution yet instructive in intention as it lacks depth and particular examples.

Overall, students shown a basic degree of writing skill prior to the modified flipped classroom intervention; their clear preference and proficiency in descriptive writing most likely resulted from its personal and imaginative character. Closely trailing, the informative essay lacked depth but showed some capacity to transmit accurate facts. The weakest argumentative



essay highlighted how challenging structured thinking and persuasive devices are for kids. These results highlight the importance of instructional innovation, including the flipped classroom method, to solve particular deficiencies in important writing abilities and give students more focused chances to improve and polish their writing across several genres.

The students' overall performance across all essay forms shows that they could write at a basic level but battled with important elements such depth, organization, and arguments. Particularly in the argumentative essay, the performance showed a need for targeted education on creating powerful, unambiguous arguments and properly using evidence. The results imply that the students' writing could profit from a more dynamic and interesting approach, including the modified flipped classroom, which could offer the required help to improve their writing skills in these important areas. By providing more active learning and customized feedback, supporting studies by Talley & Hughes (2017) emphasize the advantages of the flipped classroom approach in boosting writing skills, specifically in writing coherence, organization, and argumentation, especially The flipped classroom model might result in significant performance gains by filling in the gaps in students' writing, particularly in regard to content development and argumentation.

Table 2a shows the essay writing performance of the students in a modified flipped classroom applying print and audio-based assignments. With a composite mean of 81.27, the overall performance shows a Satisfactory level across the three essay forms: informational, descriptive, and argumentative. This overall result implies that students showed fundamental ability in terms of concept organization and meaning communication in writing. But their work also shows deficiencies in higher-order writing abilities including depth of explanation, imagery, and argumentative clarity. These results draw attention to the advantages and drawbacks of employing pre-class materials in a flipped learning environment that are passive instructional forms like printed books and audio recordings.

With a Fairly Satisfactory composite mean of 79.51, the informative essay came out among the three categories of essays evaluated in lowest performance level. This implies that although students understood the need of telling the reader about a specific issue, they frequently found it difficult to provide thorough justifications and supporting data. Under this essay style, Clarity of Information (mean = 81.06) was the highest-rated criterion; this suggests that students could generally express concepts in an understandable way. A better-performing student, for instance, penned: *"Friendliness is one of the most important aspects of human life. Friends support one by means of tough situations, celebration of good times, and emotional and social personal growth support system. Studies show that close friends usually make people happier and healthier; good friends also give stability and trust. Apart from the emotional level, friendship benefits the physical one as well"*. This output logically elaborates supported by factual evidence and clearly shows a fundamental point. The language is suitably scholarly, and the information flows in a command of expository writing. But Depth of Explanation (77.30) had the lowest mean in this group, suggesting a surface-level interest with the subject among a number of students. Think about this lower-performing sample, *"Friendship makes you happy, hence it is quite significant. Friends enhance your way of life. They are right at your side as required"*.



Although the comment makes sense, it lacks analytical depth, examples, and nuance. The material is simple and falls short in adequately addressing the idea of friendship outside of platitudes. This inclination captures what Brown (2015) advises against passive resource-based education—that is, reading and listening—which might not inspire critical thinking or motivate students to broaden their perspectives. Without interactive and visual tools or teacher modeling, students can revert to general comments without really expanding their material effectively.

With a Satisfactory composite mean of 82.62—the highest of the three essay forms—the descriptive essay produced better outcomes. Students who scored highest in Development and Content (83.95) and Organization (83.64) showed their capacity to logically sequence significant life events. One high-scoring kid related a cherished pet: *"Our golden retriever, Coco, is my favorite pet. She has been with us from my fourth grade entrance. She is our family member, not merely a pet. Every day by the fence, she whags her tail as if she hasn't seen us in years. She sat next to me throughout my tearful over a low mark. Her eyes focused squarely with mine, she appeared to understand. Coco is special since of her warmth and commitment. She has helped me to be orderly, polite, and patient"*. This example has clearly chronological flow, well-organized material with emotional depth, and a close relationship between the writer and the subject. The capacity of the student to offer particular details improves the vividness of the work. Students generally struggled in Imagery and Sensory Details (77.18), though, suggesting that although they could describe experiences, they often failed to "paint pictures with words." A sample that performs poorly shows this weakness: *"A cat is the pet I would want. Sensual elements and imagery abound. She is amiable and lovely. I like hanging about with her. She sleeps a lot; I feed her every day. She makes my day more joyful"*. Though clear, the description lacks sensory language that would let readers fully picture the cat's look, sounds, motions, or personality. Students who rely mostly on print and auditory inputs may struggle with creative expression as Aebersold and Field (1997) claim because of the lack of visual cues and interactive feedback. Factors not completely present in the print/audio-only flipped activities, descriptive writing thrives when students are exposed to models rich in language and given chances to practice writing with guided help.

With a composite mean of 81.67, students' performance on the argumentative essay likewise fell into the Satisfactory category. Especially, they showed their ability to employ appeals (ethos, pathos, logos) and weigh opposing perspectives in their writing by scoring well in Persuasive Technique (84.38) and Counterarguments (82.31). A strong persuasive essay can be one like this: *"Let kids use cellphones in the classroom; this is an opportunity rather than a distraction. These devices have dictionaries, learning software, and emergency communication tools. Used intelligently, phones turn into tools of empowerment. Actually, prohibition of them encourages mistrust rather than self-control. Schools should guide acceptable behavior instead of outright prohibition of probable use. After all, learning in the twenty-first century should reflect the technologies that define it"*. This essay makes a clear, strong case backed by logical analysis and contemporary relevance. The tone is strong, and the idea changes flow is flawless.

On the other hand, Thesis Statement and Positioning (77.95) turned out to be the poorest feature in argumentative writing. Many students weakens the basis of their essay by failing to properly establish their major point at the outset. As an illustration: *"Cellphones can either be*



good or bad in classrooms. Some say they help, others disagree. In this article I will go over all points of view including my own". This introduction lacks a clearly established thesis that claims a viewpoint; it is erratic and unclear. Students who are not specifically taught how to grow and articulate a thesis typically find it difficult to organize convincing arguments, as Ferris (2002) pointed out. Geren (2007) further noted that sometimes in passive flipped situations using simply print or audio resources, ambiguous positioning occurs from training that does not emphasize the formation of argumentative assertions.

Across the three essay forms, the results imply that although the use of print and audio materials in a flipped classroom can effectively support fundamental writing skills—such as organization, clarity, and basic content development—it falls short in promoting higher-level cognitive and expressive skills. Important components of advanced academic writing, elaboration, vivid language, and strong arguments were challenging for students.

These results confirm Applebee and Langer's (2011) contention that rich, dialogic, and graphically assisted teaching environments are necessary for more advanced degrees of writing development. While helpful for autonomous content access, passive resources could not inspire the kind of thinking and expression required for robust informational, descriptive, and argumentative writing. Combining print, audio, visual or interactive materials—along with organized teacher feedback—into a more balanced flipped classroom format would help students' writing ability flourish.

In general, although students showed good performance in all kinds of essays, the passive character of print and audio materials hampered their capacity to really interact with knowledge, especially in terms of creativity and argumentation. The performance indicates that although these tools can help with writing growth, including more interactive or diversified learning opportunities would help to promote deeper involvement and enhance particular writing skills.

Table 2b shows convincing data demonstrating students' performance in writing informative, descriptive, and argumentative essays in a modified flipped classroom environment was much improved by using video-based content. Video integration produced more significant improvements almost across all evaluation criteria than print- and audio-based activities.

With a composite mean of 88.17 (Very Satisfactory), students showed improved performance in informative essay writing. Individual components such as clarity of information (88.00), depth of explanation (85.40), logical development (87.65), and language mechanics (87.86) all surpassed the Satisfactory mark, showing a general elevation in writing quality. Word count had the highest score—91.67 - Outstanding. This implies that the interesting and graphic quality of the video material motivated pupils to go further in elaborating on their ideas. Videos probably gave students more context, useful examples, and settings they could use to create more complex material in terms of both visual and audio cues. One student wrote, *"Exercise improves our mental and emotional as well as our physical state. Regular physical activity among children and teenagers usually results in stronger muscles and bones, increased focus in the classroom, and decreased risk of chronic diseases.* This output shows how students could support larger compositions by providing multiple pertinent and linked themes. Their



capacity to build on the subject shows a deeper degree of involvement perhaps helped by the multimodal input.

Depth of explanation (85.40) came up as the lowest scoring criterion, but clarity of information (88.00) placed second best, showing that students could clearly and orderly and understandable style of explaining ideas. Students could name advantages of exercise, but many of their answers lacked nuance and specificity. Inaccurate Response for instance, *"We should exercise. It heals and strengthens us. That is quite helpful.* This answer shows a basic knowledge but lacks causal links and critical depth. This result implies that more instructional scaffolding is required to encourage deeper analytical thinking even if video-based materials clearly supported content arrangement and clarity. Mayer's (2009) Multimedia Learning Theory supports these findings by underlining that, when appropriately developed, video-based materials help to improve understanding and retention, therefore influencing academic outputs including informative essays.

With a composite mean of 90.64 (Outstanding), the descriptive essay stood out among the three kinds of essays in most improvement. Word count (97.64) and involvement and inventiveness (91.50) had the largest increases. These results suggest that video materials helped students to visualize and express their ideas more clearly and precisely. Rich visual and auditory imagery in movies probably helped pupils to absorb models of descriptive language, therefore enhancing their ability to write with more inventiveness and fluidity. *"My ideal house is a two-story white white one close to the mountains. Its big windows let early sunshine pour on every side. Inside are a peaceful study area with towering book shelves in the library. The backyard consists in a lavender, tulip, rose garden and a little fountain"*. Rich level of descriptive skill is indicated by vivid images, many details, and sensory allusions. Moreover, language and mechanics (92.68) also performed very well, implying better grammatical correctness and vocabulary usage.

Still another good sample: *"The air smells lavender as sunshine dances across the glass windows. A plush carpet cushions every step in the corridor, and quiet music comes from hidden speakers.*

Still, the lowest score component was visual and sensory details (87.59). Most students concentrated mostly on visual elements and made less attempts to involve other senses such touch, smell, or sound. This suggests a deficiency in fully exploiting the spectrum of sensory language, which is absolutely essential in creating immersive descriptive works. Response from none student, *"My dream house is big. Its three bedrooms, living room, and kitchen all mirror different sides of life. Red tiles make up the roof; the walls are white.* Though accurate, the lack of rich sensory richness and emotional appeal in the description gives it more of a list than an expressive picture. These results are supported by Clark & Mayer (2016), who note that video content stimulates several sensory pathways, so enhancing memory recall and descriptive expression—skills quite important in descriptive writing tasks.

With a composite mean of 88.42 (Very Satisfactory), the argumentative essay also displayed noteworthy development. The thesis statement and positioning had the highest score—88.95—then closely followed by language and grammar—88.47. This shows that students could clearly state their position and create logical, grammatically perfect arguments. Student wrote,



"Younger age drivers should not be let among teenagers. Though they could be eager to learn, their lack of experience and emotional control might lead to mistakes. This passage succinctly expresses the writer's point of view and provides a targeted guidance for the remaining part of the essay.

Persuasive methods came last (87.39). Although students could make reasonable arguments, their writing sometimes lacked rhetorical devices that support argumentative writing, such emotional appeal, analogies, or rhetorical questions. *"Teens, being young, should not drive. They might break laws or collide cars. For adults, driving is preferable.*

This answer expresses a definite view, but it lacks the persuasive power required to influence readers. This implies that although the video content improved organization and clarity, more education is needed to teach students how to employ stylistic methods to increase persuasion. Research by Sweller et al. (2011) on Cognitive burden Theory also indicates that well-designed video content can reduce superfluous cognitive burden, helping learners absorb complicated ideas more easily. In this situation, the video information certainly helped students comprehend how to develop arguments and rebuttals in a systematic manner.

Overall, the incorporation of video-based resources into the flipped classroom showed strong improvements across all three essay categories. The modified flipped classroom created a more engaging, multimodal, and student-centered learning environment, which led to better material organization, greater elaboration, clearer arguments, and improved language. Informative essays increased in clarity and organization but need more depth of explanation. Though they profit from vivid imagery and inventiveness, descriptive essays need better application of complete sensory language.

Though they lacked sophisticated persuasive techniques, argumentative essays become more rational and orderly. These results support the transfer of information and match those of Zhang et al. (2020), who discovered that video-based training helps students articulate difficult concepts in writing and supports their ability to. By making learning more accessible, interactive, and cognitively exciting, the findings of Table 2b highlight the possibility of video-based content to improve writing performance in many genres.

Table 3 shows that following a modified flipped classroom, students showed a significant increase in their writing skill across informative, descriptive, and argumentative essays. Reaching 88.59, the general composite mean falls under the Very Satisfactory level. This shows a good change in the writing skills of the students, which reflects the success of the intervention in improving technical accuracy and content development among several essay forms.

The informative essay produced a Very Satisfactory composite mean of 89.95. Students routinely did well on all measured standards. Especially remarkable were Word Count (94.09) and Language and Mechanics (93.50), all of which received Outstanding ratings. These findings imply that students were not only quite involved but also able to produce long, technically accurate pieces of work. Such results could be ascribed to the pre-class exposure to well-written books and disciplined editing assignments, fundamental elements of the flipped classroom approach. This backs up Bishop and Verleger's (2013) contention that flipped classrooms give students more time for active learning, including honing difficult skills as academic writing.



Students so turned out writings with grammatical accuracy and structural soundness. A student wrote: *"Reading opens several paths for intellectual development and knowledge. Frequent book readers help to increase critical thinking, vocabulary, and comprehension..."* This passage rightly shows consistent interest in the subject and logical growth, which justifies the Outstanding Word Count rating. Without using repetition, the student was able to communicate significant concepts beyond the mandated length.

Likewise for Language and Mechanics, another student said: *"Reading, sometimes thought of as a basic pleasure, actually affects students' brains. It picks sentence construction, spelling, and grammar. Increased reading helps a learner write better."* This section has excellent grammar, accurate punctuation, and clear sentence construction—qualities of good writing that support the high mechanical score. Still within the Very Satisfactory range, the criterion Depth of Explanation got the lowest mean score of 86.09. Some students presented valid facts but lacked further insight or specific examples.

"Reading is good since it lets children grasp lessons. Reading widely will enable you to be intelligent...". Although the overall concept is clear-cut, the justification lacks depth, accuracy, and precision. This emphasizes the need of more scaffolding to support analytical thinking and creativity.

Nevertheless, the general results show that the flipped classroom approach effectively improved students' technical accuracy and organizing abilities in informative writing.

Also rated Very Satisfactory, students scored a composite mean of 89.82 on the descriptive essay. Both getting Outstanding ratings, Word Count (92.32) and Imagery and Sensory Details (91.18) were the top scored category. These findings imply that students' capacity to create vivid, expressive descriptions was much enhanced by pre-class materials including multimedia inputs and example passages. Mehring (2016) underlined that through exposure to interesting and diverse pre-class materials, flipped learning environments foster higher-order thinking. This method seems to have helped students to develop their narrative complexity and creative expression. One student, for instance, detailed a major event in their life with: *"His touch is kind yet his hands are rough from years of effort. He embraces me and I feel safe and as though the world cannot damage me. His voice is like deep, comforting rain-day music"*. Rich in sensory language, this passage evokes touch, sound, and emotion, therefore displaying a sophisticated application of descriptive devices along with the high grade for imagery.

The great Word Count performance also supports: *"My mother changed my direction in life. Every morning she rises early to prepare breakfast and attend to our needs. She works hard all day and yet keeps time to help me with homework.* This reflects constant and significant expression and displays the student's ability for developed, logical paragraphs.

Still, with a mean score of 88.32, Language and Mechanics came out as the lowest among the criteria. Though still quite satisfactory, some of the student outputs had minor punctuation and grammar problems that interfered with flow. Like this: *"She tell me all the time, i am strong. Her advice really has enormous worth she made my food and provided me mental support..."* Problems include poor capitalization, wrong verb tense, and missing punctuation point to places



needing more work. Still, the general success of the descriptive essay under the flipped classroom paradigm is highlighted by the capacity to communicate vivid personal stories with emotional depth.

The argumentative essay kept a Very Satisfactory rating by getting a composite mean of 86.27. Word Count (91.73 – Outstanding) and Supporting Evidence and Reasoning (87.73 – Very Satisfactory) ranked highest among the performance standards. These findings show how capable students are to create disciplined, well-reasoned arguments, most likely derived from reading opinion pieces and debate examples before classes. One student produced: *"Students should wear uniforms since they support equality and help to reduce bullying. Uniforms help schools to maintain discipline and let free students to focus more on their studies..."* This answer is cohesive and thorough, indicating both active participation with the subject and the capacity to build arguments with justifiable support.

Still, Counterargument and Refutation got the lowest mean score—81.00—classified as Satisfactory. This implies that many students battled with appreciating and refuting opposing points of view—a necessary component of persuasive writing—while they could articulate and defend their own perspectives. A representative passage says:

"Some people say uniforms are boring. Still, they are not exactly boring. Still, they are clothes and help the institution. Although an effort at addressing a counterargument is evident, the answer lacks logical depth and cannot clearly rebut the other point of opinion. This is consistent with Tucker's (2012) finding that even in flipped learning situations, critical thinking skills like rebuttal call for additional guided practice.

Therefore, even if the flipped classroom helped students write generally more persuasively, more instructional attention on counterargument creation is required to increase persuasive efficacy.

The modified flipped classroom improved students' writing competency across all kinds of essays, particularly in technical (e.g., grammar, structure, word count) and creative areas (e.g., imagery, subject creation). Students showed great improvement in keeping concepts, crafting cogent arguments, and utilizing language precisely.

These results support the 2013 conclusion of Roehl, Reddy, and Shannon that flipped learning promotes student autonomy, involvement, and accountability, therefore enhancing academic performance. Still, areas like elaboration and refutation might profit from more methodical help and repeated exercise.

All things considered, the adjusted flipped classroom turned out to be a successful pedagogical tool for raising essay writing abilities of the students. To reach complete writing competency, further interventions might concentrate on improving depth of explanation and critical thinking, particularly in addressing conflicting opinions.

Before and after the modified flipped classroom, the data shown in Table 4 expose a notable change in the performance of the students in writing informative, descriptive, and



argumentative essays. High t-values and p-values less than 0.01 corroborated the data showing significant mean gains across all three essay forms, therefore demonstrating that the improvements were statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

Showing a mean gain of 12.40 points with a t-value of 16.69 ($p < 0.01$), the composite mean for the informative essay changed from 77.55 (Fairly Satisfactory) to 89.95 (Very Satisfactory). Every person's indicator—that of information clarity, depth of explanation, logical development, language and mechanics, and word count—also showed notable gains. These findings confirm that turned-around classroom instruction improved students' capacity to logically organise their writings and clearly transmit knowledge. Supporting this conclusion, a 2016 Zainuddin and Halili study found that flipped classes significantly raise academic performance, especially for assignments requiring critical thinking and coherent idea presentation.

Comparably, for the descriptive essay, the composite mean went from 77.59 to 89.82, a mean gain of 12.23 points, with a matching t-value of 22.38 ($p < 0.01$). Indicators of content growth, imagery and sensory details, and language mechanics revealed amazing improvement. This development implies that students gained from the adaptable and multimodal strategy of the flipped classroom, which gave better sensory experience and writing creativity. In line with Hung's (2015) results, multimodal content in flipped classrooms improves students' creative ability and descriptive writing competency by means of active interaction with several resources.

With a mean gain of 10.36 and a t-value of 16.46 ($p < 0.01$), the composite mean of the argumentative essay rose from 75.91 to 86.27. Though increases were rather less than in other essay forms, every indicator—including development of the thesis statement, supporting evidence, persuasive strategies, and counterargument handling—showed notable improvement. With a mean increase of 5.91, counterargument and refutation stood out as having the lowest mean gain, implying that although students' argumentation abilities developed generally, confronting conflicting points of view still presented some challenge. This discovery is consistent with the results of Bergmann and Sams (2012), who pointed out that whereas flipped classrooms encourage individual learning and mastery of knowledge, developing higher-order reasoning skills and critical assessment may call for more explicit instruction and practice.

Showing a mean increase of 12.00 points and a very significant t-value of 30.40 ($p < 0.01$), the students' overall performance improved from a composite mean of 76.59 before implementation to 88.59 following implementation. Strong statistical data supports the fact that the modified flipped classroom approach greatly improved students' essay writing abilities in terms of clarity, organisation, creativity, technical accuracy, and persuasive ability.

Thus, consistent with the research of Hamdan, McKnight, McKnight, and Arfstrom (2013), the present study supports that the flipped classroom model generates a more student-centered learning environment that fosters improved academic outcomes, particularly in writing tasks that demand critical thinking, creativity, and technical accuracy.



Table 5 shows significant difference in the level of performance of students in writing informative, descriptive, and argumentative essays in a modified flipped classroom using print/listening assignments and video-based content. Students who interacted with video-based materials regularly scored better than those working on print-based projects across all essay forms—informative, descriptive, and argumentative. At $p = 0.01$ all t-values are significant, therefore verifying the statistical relevance of the variations. This is supported by the mean difference of 7.81 and a t-value 18.99 at .01 level of significance. This means that the outputs of the respondents' are better when exposed to video-based materials. This is maybe because videos engage multiple senses, improve comprehension and memory, and offer clearer context through visual and auditory cues. They also enhance motivation, cater to various learning styles, and provide better models of language use. Additionally, vocabulary from videos is more contextually grounded, making it easier for students to recall and apply in their writing.

With a mean difference of 8.66 points and a t-value of 11.49 ($p < 0.01$), the composite mean score for the informative essay moved from 79.51 (print/listening) to 88.17 (video-based). With video material, indicators like clarity of information, depth of explanation, logical progression, language and mechanics, and word length were noted increases. These results imply that watching films with visual and aural reinforcement helps pupils organise and grasp factual knowledge. This is consistent with Mayer's (2009) Cognitive Theory of Multimedia Learning, which holds that dual channels—visual and aural—that process data concurrently help pupils learn.

With a t-value of 18.13 ($p < 0.01$), a composite mean rise from 82.62 (print/listening) to 90.64 (video-based) was noted for the descriptive essay demonstrating a mean difference of 8.02 points. Particularly, word count and sensory information as well as images shown the most improvements. This suggests that with their vivid visual components, video resources improve the depth of students' descriptive writing and help them to engage their imagination. In line with Al-Zahrani's (2015) research, video-based training promotes creativity, visualisation, and emotional involvement—all important elements in good descriptive writing.

Reflecting a mean difference of 6.75 points and a t-value of 17.20 ($p < 0.01$), the composite mean improved from 81.67 (print/listening) to 88.42 (video-based) in the argative essay. The thesis statement and positioning (11.00 points) clearly showed the largest mean gain. This implies that greater persuasive writing resulted from perhaps clearer, more interesting examples of building arguments and counterarguments given by video material. This outcome complements research by Lee and Wu (2012), who claimed that video resources enable students acquire critical thinking and argumentative skills more successfully than text-based resources by themselves.

With video-based content, students had an overall composite mean of 89.08; with print/listening assignments, their mean increase was 7.81 points with a very significant t-value of 18.99 ($p < 0.01$). This significant variation emphasises how well video-based pre-class resources improve language performance in several writing genres in a changed flipped classroom environment.



Thus, the results unequivocally show that video-based content is more effective than print/listening assignments in improving students' performance in informative, descriptive, and argumentative essay writing within the modified flipped classroom, so confirming the advantages of multimodal learning environments as stressed by researchers like Hung (2015) and Zainuddin & Halili (2016).

V. CONCLUSION

The study finds that low pre-intervention writing performance of students resulted from inadequate comprehension, poor organization of ideas, restricted vocabulary, and underdeveloped writing skills. Though print and listening-based resources provided some progress, they were not enough to greatly raise students' higher-order writing abilities. The usage of video-based resources inside a modified flipped classroom showed significant improvement in students' writing performance, therefore demonstrating the great efficacy of multimodal, visually rich, and student-centered approaches. The results confirm the need of dynamic material delivery in promoting more proficient writing and more involvement. Print and listening exercises improved writing somewhat. Students' performance on print and listening exercises raised to a good level—composite mean = 81.27. While clarity and organization grew, deeper originality, argument strength, and technical abilities remained limited, demonstrating that passive resources alone are insufficient for advanced writing progress.

VI. RECOMMENDATION

Use video-based multimodal learning. Video-based pre-class materials could be included into writing lessons by teachers to boost comprehension, organize better, and encourage more innovative and technically sound writing. Schools are urged to embrace and hone flipped classroom techniques combining interactive pre-class activities with active in-class participation to maximize writing growth. Offer varied writing support. While most students gain from video tools, some may still call for focused interventions. Teachers should spot students who struggle often and give targeted instruction in logical organization, grammar, and vocabulary development. Provide multidimensional integration teacher training. Professional development initiatives should be carried out to assist teachers in properly selecting, designing, and using different multimodal tools including video-based materials to improve writing instruction. Track and Evaluate sustainability.

Pre- and post-assessments of writing performance should be kept under constant observation to assess the long-term success of teaching approaches and guide next curriculum developments.

REFERENCES

- Aebbersold, J. A., & Field, M. L. (1997). *From reader to reading teacher: Issues and strategies for second language classrooms*. Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, H. D. (2015). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (4th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Ferris, D. R. (2002). *Treatment of error in second language student writing*. University of Michigan Press.
- Mayer, R. E. (2009). *Multimedia learning* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Sweller, J., Ayres, P., & Kalyuga, S. (2011). *Cognitive load theory*. Springer.
- Bao, W., & Li, Y. (2022). The role of multimedia resources in flipped classrooms: Promoting listening skills among EFL learners. *Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, 12(4), 205-218.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2021). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, 91(3), 327-357.
- Gao, X., & Zhang, Y. (2021). Multimodal learning strategies in language education: Enhancing student performance through diverse resources. *Language Learning & Technology*, 25(3), 44-56.
- González, M. (2020). Flipped classrooms in language education: Implications for engagement and learning outcomes. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 68(5), 297-310.
- He, Y., & Li, X. (2020). Language performance in flipped classrooms: Effects of pre-class video assignments on speaking and writing proficiency. *TESOL Quarterly*, 54(2), 313-327.
- Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. Longman.
- Lantolf, J. P. (2000). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford University Press.
- Li, X., Li, J., & Li, M. (2021). Flipped classroom strategies in EFL: Enhancing student speaking confidence and language learning. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 24(2), 42-53.
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2013). *How languages are learned* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Piaget, J. (1970). Piaget's theory. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.), *Carmichael's manual of child psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 703-732). John Wiley & Sons.
- Storch, N. (2013). *Collaborative language learning and teaching*. Routledge.
- Tucker, B. (2012). The flipped classroom. *Education Next*, 12(1), 82-83.



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

Willis, D., & Willis, J. (2007). *Doing task-based teaching*. Oxford University Press.