Challenges Faced When Teaching Writing Skills Using Write and Improve With Cambridge

Rifqi Naufal Ramadhan, Panji Jovan Ramadhani

Universitas Tidar, Universitas Tidar

nauvalpbg1@gmail.com, panjijovanramadani@gmail.com

Abstract

This study uses qualitative research to collect and process data obtained from respondents. Researchers asked 8 questions to find out whether Write and Improve with Cambridge is an effective tool for learning to write in the classroom. The researchers found 31 participants and there were 15 participants who agreed that Write and Improve is an effective tool for learning and want to master writing skills. In addition, researchers also revealed that there were 16 people who disagreed with Write and Improve with Cambridge as the only reference for learning to master writing skills.They argue that the real-time feedback provided by the features of Write and Improve with Cambridge is less contextual. The participants explained that the feedback provided by this application was too "bot or AI" and could not be sure that the correction was correct. They also explained that the feedback given was too focused on grammatical rather than complex writing styles such as the use of language and varied sentence structures. The results of this study were that as many as 16 participants used other applications besides Write and Improve with Cambridge, while the other 15 participants would use the application in their classrooms when they became English teachers.

Keywords: Writing, AI, Write and Improve with Cambridge.

INTRODUCTION

The integration of technology into education has advancements especially in writing instruction. Over the past two decades, technological tools have emerged as essential components of educational ecosystems, supporting interactive, personalized, and efficient learning experiences. Write & Improve with Cambridge, a web-based application, exemplifies this transformation by providing real-time feedback on a student's writing performance. This tool offers advancements in artificial intelligence (AI) to analyze writing tasks, find and identify errors, and provide suggestions for improvement. According to Mayer in his Cognitive Theory of Multimedia Learning (2005), technology plays a crucial role in enhancing the learning process when appropriately aligned with pedagogical principles. Write and Improve with Cambridge cohere to these principles by promoting immediate feedback, a crucial factor in skill acquisition. However, while technology promises numerous benefits, it also presents challenges, such as over-reliance on automated systems and the risk of lessening critical thinking among learners.

Over time, the teaching methods used in writing lessons, especially English, have changed due to the development of technology. One of the uses of web-based application technology called Write and Improve with Cambridge which is designed to provide real time feedback is

gaining popularity among educators. This application presents an interactive approach by providing immediate and detailed feedback on learners' writing. The app aims to support students and adults to support their writing skills. However, it is not always smooth sailing to use these applications, as there are challenges that will be found in using these web-based applications, and since writing has become the hardest proficiency in English (Flower & Hayes, 1981).

While the app serves many beneficial features, the appliance of Write and Improve with Cambridge also gives typical lacks and challenges that must certainly prevail by students and educators. As mentioned by Kumaravadivelu (2014) that suggests the feedback by the web-based application became exclusive and automated, neglecting peer reviews and instructor feedback that lead to reduced critical thinking of students' side. Since automated feedback is generated, it is the chance of misinterpretation that causes fatal errors in their understanding. Additionally, the tool just delivers grammar considerations without generating contextual considerations. Student's that usually use an automated feedback on writing will face dependence too much over the auto-correction feature by the application, indicating lack of editing and authentic writing (Kirschner, 2015). Moreover, the advent of web-based applications has reshaped how educators approach writing instruction. Traditional method focused heavily on teacher-led feedback and peer reviews. Since the feedback is generated automatically by Write and Improve with Cambridge, creating a paradigm shift that prioritizes efficiency over depth understanding in some cases. This shift has sparked debates among educators and researchers about the balance between automation and human interaction in the educational domain. Skehan's (1988) theory of task-based language learning emphasizes the need for personalized feedback and meaningful engagement, both of which are often lessened in automated systems.

The use of technology in writing instruction offers undeniable benefits. One example of an obvious benefit is that it allows students to practice independently and receive instant feedback. It is this feedback that can assist students in knowing their mistakes in writing, with this students can understand how to improve their writing in order to build their confidence in their writing skills. Warschauer and Healey (1998) argue that language learning using computers allows students to learn more independently and interactively. Write and Improve reflects this idea by giving students the opportunity to learn to write and identify their errors in real time. Effective feedback is very effective to help students in understanding to develop their writing skills and build students' confidence in writing. However, despite these advantages, there are challenges that educators and students face, one of which is that the Write and Improve with Cambridge platform provides generic feedback that can overlook the needs of students and educators such as specific idea development and logical structure in writing. In addition, challenges include triggering students' dependence on technology. Littlewood (1996) states that independence is a trait that learners should have, especially language learners. The fear is that students will continue to rely on instant correction without understanding the reasons why they make mistakes in writing. This will hinder students' potential to develop independent skills in writing.

Following this, the research intends to discuss and understand specific challenges learners and educators face when implementing web-based tools into their writing activities. This also assesses the strengths and weaknesses of the platform namely Write and Improve with Cambridge especially in the education domain. Moreover, this research may conduct

recommendations over educators on how to optimize the use of Write and Improve with Cambridge specifically in teaching and education domain for better writing skills enhancement. By examining its strengths and limitations, the study aims to provide actionable insights for optimizing its use in educational settings, especially enhancing student's writing proficiency.

METHOD

Following Cresswell (2013) suggestion that the use of purposeful research may be helpful for researchers to hold data following research preferences. This study adopts a qualitative method to gather data which are collected following considerations such as participants' perspectives, experiences and opinions (Merriam, 2009). The participants who joined this research were the students of the English Department at Tidar University. This research provides open-ended questions to gather participants' responses about using Write and Improve with Cambridge and what challenges they have found in the context of mastering writing skills within it. Then researchers have to collect the participants' data via Google form. While data will be constructed in a short answer regarding the participants' experiences, thoughts, and opinions. The participants will be students specifically enrolled as learners of the English Department at Tidar University in all semesters. About 30 students are required to fill the questionnaires from researchers.

The conducted research provide several questions following these below

Number	Questions
1	After using Write and Improve with Cambridge, do you feel improvement on your writing skill?
2	Do you think about using it again after using it once?
3	Have you used other tools to help develop your writing skills?
4	Do you feel there are any limitations in using Write and Improve with Cambridge that affect your writing performance?
5	What changes do you think should be made to Write and Improve with Cambridge to make it more effective?
6	If you were an English teacher, would you use Write and Improve with Cambridge to develop your student's writing skills?
7	Do you have other alternative tools suggestion to develop writing skills than Write and Improve with Cambridge

The questionnaire results were analyzed to find the percentage in each question point. This approach was chosen to ease researchers in notes the challenges that might appear while applying Write and Improve with Cambridge to master writing skills. This qualitative approach is conducted to help researchers gather the data and construct it to analyze the phenomenon based on the participants' experiences, meanings, and perspectives. One of the weaknesses of the research might be presented as results that cannot be representative as well since the approach potentially has subjectivity and holds in tighter populations.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The research results reveal that about 31 respondents from the English Education Department of Tidar University have various answers. As the research delivered open-ended questions in collecting tier answers about the challenges and limitations. This research intends to find out and explore students' responsibilities over mastering writing skills within Write and Improve with Cambridge which is considered as web-based writing tools.

The first question shows about 16 respondents are not sure that they have improved after using Write and Improve with Cambridge and the rest of 15 respondents think that the web is helpful tools for writing activities. This indicates that the usage of Write and Improve with Cambridge is not that effective for some respondents. This split response highlights variability in participant's experiences with the tool. While several students found value in its features, others struggled to achieve the significant performance, possibly by its surface-level feedback and correction rather than detailed explanation (Beatty, 2013).

The second question regarding the reusability of the application. When asked about the likelihood of reusing Write and Improve with Cambridge, a similar split was observed. About 16 respondents express hesitation, preferring for other writing tools such as Grammarly and et cetera. They have found other applications more helpful as they offer more user-friendly and versatile features like contextual analysis and creative writing support. Write and Improve with Cambridge, the response mainly said that the feedback given by it is less-personalized and resulting confuse them to express creative writing and cannot be as suitable as respondents' needs.

Additionally the rest of 15 students indicated a willingness to continue using Write and Improve with Cambridge, provided it integrates more advanced functionalities, such as personalized feedback and support for creative writing. This feedback is in line with the findings of Dudeney (2007) which emphasizes the importance of aligning educational tools with user expectations to ensure sustained engagement.

The use of Write and Improve with Cambridge among students is less-popular than other web-based applications. Researchers identified that 16 participants alternate their writing assistant tool out of Write and Improve with Cambridge that indicates the preference of participants using other tools due to those features and accessibilities. Participants also mention that the feedback given by this application is too focused on grammar rather than complex writing styles such as the use of language and varied sentence structures also they explain the feedback is "bot" or "AI" based, so they cannot explore their ideas through the mistake they made when they are mastering writing skill. Moreover, Davis (1989) suggests that the unique features such as contextual feedback, creative writing suggestions, and structural analysis can be added later on this app to attract and increase its usage. Furthermore, integrating personalized writing options and addressing students' concerns could enhance the app's reliability and competitiveness with other educational technology platforms. As Davis (1989) explained, contextual feedback, analytical structures are needed to develop writing skills.

One of the key challenges identified was the over-reliance on automated feedback, which 16 participants are not sure to use if they were a teacher that had to try this to develop students' writing proficiency. Aligning with Kirschner notes (2015) dependence on technology can lead to a decline in critical thinking and problem-solving skills. For instance, students over use on

automated corrections might struggle to understand the principles of using grammar as well, whereas potentially limit their growth as writers. Furthermore, the study showed that automated feedback often lacks writing elements, such as coherence, well-structured argumentation, and creativity. This limitation was particularly concerning for students aiming to improve their academic writing, which requires a deep understanding of structure and content (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). Feedback given must be constructive, specific, and timely to lead meaningful improvement and help students to reflect on their progress.

The findings also have significant implications for educators. While web-based tools like Write and Improve with Cambridge offer efficiency, they cannot entirely replace the traditional way of teaching writing (Cennamo, Ross, & Ertmer, 2009). Educators must set a balance between grasping technology and providing personalized guidance to students. In addition, training sessions on using these tools effectively could help teachers and students boost their benefits while overcoming their limitations

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

The use of technology in the learning system has grown rapidly, especially in English lessons. The use of technology makes it easier for learners to understand what English skills will be mastered. Write and Cambridge is one of the web-based applications that presents English learners who want to learn writing skills. The use of web-based applications such as Write and Improve with Cambridge has the benefit of developing writing skills significantly. This web-based application helps students in understanding their mistakes in writing by providing them with feedback in real time. Kumaravadivelu (2014), Automated feedback makes students dependent on this feature, which will hinder the development of their writing skills.

The examiner uses a qualitative approach method by giving 8 questions to the participants, in order to find out their perspectives and experiences regarding using Write and Improve with Cambridge will develop their writing skills and also the researcher asks if the participant becomes a teacher whether they will use this web-based application for English learning activities in their class. The researcher revealed that around 31 respondents from the English Language Education study program had a variety of answers with about 15 Participants agreeing that using Write and Improve with Cambridge will improve their writing skills and that they will integrate the app into their classrooms if they become English teachers in the future. Another 16 participants are using other apps than Write and Improve with Cambridge to help them develop their writing skills and they do not integrate the Write and Improve with Cambridge application into their English learning, especially related to writing, if they become teachers in the future.

REFERENCES (Examples)

Beatty, K. (2013). *Teaching and Researching Computer-Assisted Language Learning*. Routledge.

Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). *Inside the black box: Raising standards through classroom assessment*. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 80(2), 139–148.

Cennamo, K., Ross, J., & Ertmer, P. (2009). *Technology Integration for Meaningful Classroom Use: A Standards-Based Approach*. Cengage Learning.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches*. Sage Publications.

Davis, F. D. (1989). *Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, and User Acceptance of Information Technology*. MIS Quarterly.

Dudeney, G., & Hockly, N. (2007). *How to Teach English with Technology*. Pearson Education.

Flower, L., & Hayes, J.R. (1981). *A Cognitive Process Theory of Writing*. College Composition and Communication, 32(4), 365-387.

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). *The power of feedback*. Review of Educational Research, 77(1), 81–112.

Kirschner, P. A. (2015). *The Overreliance Effect in Technology-based Learning*. Journal of Educational Psychology, 107(4), 981-993.

Kress, G. (2003). *Literacy in the New Media Age*. Routledge.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2014). *Critical Language Pedagogy: A Postmethod Perspective*. Journal of Language and Linguistics, 13(4), 849-963.

Littlewood, W. (1996). *Autonomy, Self-instruction and Language Learning*. System 24(2), 151-163.

Mayer, R. E. (2005). *Cognitive theory of multimedia learning. In R. E. Mayer* (Ed.), The Cambridge handbook of multimedia learning (pp. 31-48). Cambridge University Press. doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511816799.003.

Nicol, D. J., & Macfarlane-Dick, D. (2006). *Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice.* Studies in Higher Education, 31(2), 199-218.

Skehan, P. (1988). I*ndividual differences in second-language learning*. Journal of Research in Personality, 22(3), 353-374. doi: 10.1016/0092-6566(88)90006-2.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Harvard University Press.

Warschauer, M., & Healey, D. (1998). *Computers and Language Learning: An Overview*. Language Teaching. 31(2), 57-71.