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The flipped instruction classroom has been claimed as an educational strategy that actively promotes students’ efficiency to independently prepare for lessons, mainly through online material prepared by their teachers. The current study was aimed at addressing the deficits of traditional classroom instruction and enhancing learning among upper-intermediate Iranian EFL learners through implementing flipped classroom instruction. The aim was to improve learners’ English writing outcomes, more precisely, learners’ attitude towards English writing, and experience with English writing using flipped classroom instruction. The study lasted over twelve weeks, from September to December 2020. The participants were 80 EFL students, aged 25-38, learning English in Rama and Parto institutes. Both a questionnaire and pretest-posttest argumentative essay were used for data collection. The outcomes showed that learners had a favorable view of flipped writing instruction classrooms. The flipped learners also revealed statistically significant achievements in the posttest scores than their non-flipped counterparts. Furthermore, the results of this study indicated a broader perspective on a certain number of pedagogical implications for curriculum designers, teachers, administrators, and learners. The study also hopes to help officials and teachers establish a practical class using flipped instruction.

1. Introduction

This study focuses on writing skills, a complex task in EFL writing classes due to the problems commonly occurring to EFL learners. These problems are experienced by elementary students as well as higher-level students. Elementary students often have difficulty finding words to develop ideas and remembering grammatical rules. On the other hand, higher-level students mostly encounter problems in their writing skills, especially micro-subskills, linguistic features like lexical choice, articles, plural and singular forms of nouns, subject-and-verb agreement, and verb tense. Additionally, consistent struggle with linking ideas and production of proper target language discourse is primarily experienced by higher-level students [1, 2].

In traditional teaching classes, the instructor has to explain the concepts during the writing task with limited time for practicing writing. Consequently, learners are required to complete their writing assignments at home. Learners struggle to cope with the problems in the writing process while at home. Considering such issues, the instructors have attempted to vary the tasks depending on learners’ interests and abilities; however, they still experience difficulty in learning independently [3–5].

Flipped learning, on the other hand, is generally regarded as an approach where the content is delivered in advance of the class time, thus freeing the class time for the student to discuss and apply the content and concept discipline [6, 7]. Therefore, flipped classroom instruction or FCI as a new pedagogical approach can resolve the students’ writing difficulties. Video lectures and in-class active learning as technological innovations are designed to create meaningful student-student and student-instructor interactions. FCI, as noted above, is best defined as a pedagogical framework comprising a wide variety of implementations, both concerning in- and out-class activities. A relatively nascent development, FCI has been developed very quickly. This article was aimed at exploring the efficacy of FCI as a new teaching method in EFL writing classes compared to the conventional teaching method.
A series of studies have been conducted on FCI; nevertheless, studies concerning FC implementation are presently beginning to be published in an English-as-a-Foreign-Language (EFL) context (e.g., [8]). In addition, the experiments conducted in earlier studies serve only a testament to the instructor’s and learner’s satisfaction with the flipped model. They have not reflected on the student’s learning outcomes using flipped Instruction. Consequently, there is still scope for examining the ways for cultivating the FCI quality in EFL classes, most notably upper-intermediate Iranian EFL learners. Furthermore, the following research questions are raised:

(1) Does implementation of flipped classroom instruction lead to significant achievement in the learner’s writing skills?

(2) What is the EFL learner’s attitude towards English writing outcomes using flipped classroom instruction concerning improving writing skills?

2. Literature Review

2.1. Flipped vs. Traditional Instruction Classrooms. Conventional teaching refers to the directed transfer of information from the teacher to students using chalk and board for teachers and pen and paper for learners [3]. In teaching and learning, the conventional approach is the most traditional and direct method applied in Iran’s educational system. The main advantage of this approach is building a classroom interaction to help learners face or solve their problems in their studies correctly [9–11]. The nature of classroom interaction is one factor that may affect learners’ ability to cope with explanations in the classroom. Hence, classroom interaction is most likely to provide conditions for effective learning. Under the conventional approach in the teaching and learning process, on the other hand, learners are passive listeners and passively give responses or comments in the lectures [12, 13]. Teachers are responsible for presenting the teaching process where the learners are just the audiences. Since only one teacher is handling the classroom, a complete guide to all students may not be reached. Furthermore, “spoon-feeding” is often seen as one of the more conventional approaches to learning, in which teachers “feed” students with information to memorize and regurgitate for a test or an exam and then forget it. Consequently, the learners could be losing their interest in learning. Besides, the conventional method primarily focuses on theoretical knowledge, which leads to a tedious learning process.

Unlike the traditional lecture, FCI is regarded as one of the most acceptable active and creative engagement methods through preparatory work, such as teacher-made videos [14]. This learner-oriented approach required the learners to be active participants in constructing, understanding, and learning processes [15].

Due to its characteristics, FC can address problems raised within writing classes and consider students’ different learning styles. Numerous studies divulge many advantages of flipped classroom instruction, namely: more active learning opportunities [16], the effective use of class time [17], significant interactions between students and the teacher and among students [18, 19], and students’ responsibility for learning ([20]; Overmyer, 2012). In the academic achievement settings, the outcomes seem to vary depending on the individual’s performance. In a study, day and Foley [21] asserted that, as expected, participants gained higher scores on all their homework and assignment performance. Many researchers have been interested in FCI. Some researchers reported the implication of FC instruction in vocabulary [22]. The researcher considered the application of FC instruction on the grammatical level. In recent years, studies on FC instruction in China attracted more researchers’ attention. The researchers studied the effects of FC instruction on learners’ lexical growth [23, 24]. Researchers study the effects of FC instruction on learners’ oral ability [25, 26] and learners’ lexical, grammatical, and pronunciation ability.

Compared to FC, the lesson was lectured in the traditional classroom, and the instructor presented the materials and exercises in PowerPoint slides. The students, therefore, will be passive listeners and take notes. There were thus some exercises and discussions about the book content, for which there were often not enough time to do them; hence, the students were supposed to do them at home. In contrast, according to Bergmann and Sams [27], FCI is defined as “what is traditionally done in class is now done at home, and that what is traditionally done as homework is now completed in class” (p. 13). The FCI changes the classroom’s environment from a knowledge station to a place for learner engagement and formative assessment [28]. The benefits of implementing the FC consist of students learning at their own pace and strengthening the teacher-student relationship [27, 29], in which learners benefitted using technology in learning English [30–32].

2.2. Writing Skill. The accumulation of studies suggested that writing skills can have a significant role in language development [33]. Despite the importance of writing, this skill has not received enough attention. Some recent studies have mentioned the problem areas in writing. They have tried to reveal how we can improve writing skills. However, far too little attention has been paid to writing skills; therefore, the following domestic and foreign research is presented:

Farazmand [34] investigated the effects of different kinds of feedback on EFL learners’ writing and delineated how feedback can enhance writing [35, 36] and highlighted the impact of critical thinking on Iranian students’ IELTS writing skills through an integrative process-oriented approach, and she contributed a lot to this issue.

Afrilyasanti et al. (2016) examined the impact of FC on the writing ability of 62 EFL learners at an Indonesian secondary school level across their differences in learning. The learning group significantly outperformed the control group. Ekmecki [37] investigated a study of FC in a Turkish EFL context to discover its effect on learners’ foreign language writing skills. The outcomes revealed a statistically
significant difference between members in the FC and those in the conventional delivery classroom concerning their writing performances.

L2 writing is usually associated with significant challenges as it needs much cognitive and linguistic engagement and an adequate command of language proficiency in terms of lexical knowledge, grammatical accuracy, cohesion, and coherence [38]. Flipped writing classroom is argued to alleviate such challenges and difficulties [39]. Zou and Xie [40] stated flipped writing. Instruction contributed to enhancing the writing competencies and motivation of EFL students.

In conclusion, there were few studies on learners’ outcomes on English writing and learners’ attitude toward FC. Therefore, further investigation is required. Hence, the current study investigated the EFL learners’ writing skills in a flipped classroom model.

3. Methodology

3.1. Design. A randomized trial of a quasi-experimental pretest-posttest control group design was used to scrutinize the impact of flipped instructions on upper-intermediate EFL learners’ writing performance. Two levels of independent variables and types of instruction that participants received were (a) flipped instruction and (b) conventional instruction in which in FC, tutorial YouTube videos were assigned to students. The dependent variable was the participants’ writing performance (measured by pretest-posttest score results).

3.2. Participants. This research was undertaken at Rama Language Institution in Iran. The sample comprised 80 upper-intermediate male and female EFL Iranian language learners (aged 25-38) chosen from 150 participants from two language Institutions: Rama and Pars. To ensure homogeneity and the institute placement criteria, the Oxford Quick Placement Test (OQPT) was administered as a proficiency test. Eighty learners whose scores were one standard deviation above the mean were chosen as participants and then nonrandomly divided into experimental and control groups comprising 40 participants in each group. The conventional instruction was devoted to the control group, while the FC was dedicated to the experimental group.

3.3. Instruments. The first instrument used in this study was the OQPT test, which helped the researcher gain greater insight into such proficiency levels such as elementary, intermediate, or upper-intermediate. Accordingly, the participants whose scores ranged 47-55 out of 150 were regarded as upper-intermediate. The second and yet most significant instrument needed for collecting the data to answer the research questions was for an argumentative essay from IELTS task 2 writing used both as pretest-posttest, based on the students’ textbook (Academic Writing from Paragraph to Essay (2011)). The objective of the writing course was to enhance the participants’ writing skills considerably. To measure their writing performance, the pretest and posttest were administered for different writing subskills, including lexical resource or vocabulary choice, articles/determiners, plural/singular forms of nouns, spelling, punctuation marks, subject, and verb agreement. The candidates were asked to respond to an argumentative essay with 250 words in at least 40 minutes. The rationale behind selecting an argumentative essay was that the only one with an entire writing task 2 subcomponent was an argumentative essay among the various types of essays. Furthermore, it should be noted that the test was measured by IELTS task 2 writing band descriptors. Two qualified raters were assigned to score the test papers, and then, the interrater concordance was calculated. The results are explained in Section 4. To ensure the interrater concordance rates, the Pearson correlation test was administered with a perceived index of 0.83.

As the final instrument, a structured online questionnaire consisting of 16 items was developed to explore the learners’ perceptions of implementing FCI for their advanced writing lessons. The questionnaire was aimed at identifying the participants’ perception of the writing skills using flipped instruction and sought to gain a greater understanding of the effects of FCI. The questionnaire was developed as a word document and shared via WhatsApp with the experimental groups. All the questionnaire items were based on a 5-point Likert scale with the values ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) to ensure sufficient variations among the item scores. A unanimous experts’ decision confirmed the validity of the questionnaire. It means that to verify the validity of the questionnaire, three experts in second language learning, education, and psychology were employed. Thus, for reliability, all the items on the questionnaire were processed using IBM SPSS 21.

3.4. Procedure. The experiment included three phases, a proficiency test, pretest, and posttest. The 80 participants were equally divided into two groups: control and experimental. The participants in both groups were asked to take a pretest to help the researcher measure their writing performance before the treatment was given. Therefore, the participants in both groups were required to write a paragraph on the topic that they had chosen from the topics given by the instructor.

"Academic Writing from Paragraph to Essay by Zemach and Rumisek (2011)" was the textbook used in teaching English writing for the participants of the study in CG and TG. All the participants started learning English at Rama and Pars Institutes. They were required to participate in a two-hour writing course held twice a week. This led to improving their writing skill in different genres, including (1) argumentation, (2) process analysis, (3) advantages-disadvantages, (4) exposition, and (5) descriptive writing. The study lasted four months, from September to December 2020.

The basic concepts had been explained to participants before class time by watching videos, listening to podcasts, preparing materials at home, and using the class time to investigate the course contents more concisely to build up their knowledge. An essential characteristic of FC was accessing the course material before coming to class, followed by prepared activities. The learners were required to either watch a short teacher-made lecture video (six to seven
also apparent that the participants’ pretest for overall writing. There was a slight minimal difference between the two groups was statistically significant. In other words, the experimental group outperformed the control group ($p < 0.05$). This means that the control group also significantly affected the learners’ writing performance. To confirm the efficacy of the FC, a paired-sample $t$-test was conducted on the experimental group to analyze the within-group data (within-group statistics). Table 4 shows the statistical analysis of the experimental pretest and posttest.

These tests highlighted that there was a statistically significant difference between the groups’ score results from the pretest to the posttest ($p < 0.05$) (mean = 4.47, $N = 40$, SD 0.84) (mean = 6.0, $N = 40$, SD 0.71). This revealed actual progress in writing proficiency for the experimental group. The control group pretest and posttest scores had to be analyzed to determine how much learners have progressed in the conventional class. To achieve this aim, a paired sample $t$-test was conducted to analyze the control group’s within-group pretest and posttest scores. The results are shown in Table 5.

The results reveal an overall statistically significant increase from pretest (mean = 4.5000, $N = 40$, SD 0.9337) to posttest (mean = 5.0750, $N = 40$, SD 0.74343) scores of the conventional class, and the significance level is 0.001 ($p < 0.05$). The outcomes indicated that the control group treatment had a positive effect on the participants’ writing performance. There is no disputing that the traditional writing class did impact the learners’ writing performance; however, the effect was not as significant as it showed in the target group.

4. Results

4.1. Results of Pretest and Posttest Scores in the Experimental and Control Group. To ensure the equality of the performance between experimental and control groups before the flipped writing class instruction was employed, the same pretest was administered to both groups. An independent sample $t$-test was used to analyze the scores using SPSS 26 software. The statistical analysis of the pretest is shown in Table 2.

The analyses showed that there was no statistically significant difference in the mean scores among the two groups’ performance ($p > 0.05$). With a $p$ value larger than 0.05, it is also apparent that the participants’ scores in the control group went up compared to the experimental group on the pretest for overall writing. There was a slight minimal difference between the control groups’ pretest overall mean scores (overall mean = 4.47, $N = 40$, SD 0.84) compared with the experimental group scores (overall mean = 4.50, $N = 40$, SD 0.93). The highest overall scores in the pretest for both the experimental and control groups were 5.0 and 4.0, respectively. An independent sample $t$-test was administered to analyze the average posttest scores. The results of the posttest are presented in Table 3.

To establish whether the differences between the mean scores for both groups were statistically significant, an independent sample $t$-test was used. It can be seen in Table 3 that the experimental group outperformed the other group on the posttest. Independent sample $t$-test comparisons revealed that the difference between the two groups was statistically significant. In other words, the experimental group outperformed the control group ($p < 0.05$). This means that the control group also significantly affected the learners’ writing performance. To confirm the efficacy of the FC, a paired-sample $t$-test was conducted on the experimental group to analyze the within-group data (within-group statistics). Table 4 shows the statistical analysis of the experimental pretest and posttest.

These tests highlighted that there was a statistically significant difference between the groups’ score results from the pretest to the posttest ($p < 0.05$) (mean = 4.47, $N = 40$, SD 0.84) (mean = 6.0, $N = 40$, SD 0.71). This revealed actual progress in writing proficiency for the experimental group. The control group pretest and posttest scores had to be analyzed to determine how much learners have progressed in the conventional class. To achieve this aim, a paired sample $t$-test was conducted to analyze the control group’s within-group pretest and posttest scores. The results are shown in Table 5.

The results reveal an overall statistically significant increase from pretest (mean = 4.5000, $N = 40$, SD 0.9337) to posttest (mean = 5.0750, $N = 40$, SD 0.74343) scores of the conventional class, and the significance level is 0.001 ($p < 0.05$). The outcomes indicated that the control group treatment had a positive effect on the participants’ writing performance. There is no disputing that the traditional writing class did impact the learners’ writing performance; however, the effect was not as significant as it showed in the target group.

4.2. Experimental Group Learners’ Attitudes towards Flipped Classrooms. Table 6 presents an analysis of the questionnaire items, which sought to answer the second question of the study, i.e., “what is the EFL learners’ attitude towards the flipped instruction classroom concerning the improvement of the writing skills?” The results show the frequency of the responses for each item in the questionnaire, in addition to the calculated mean scores for the individual questionnaire items. A mean score larger than 3.00 indicates the learners’ agreement with the item, while a mean score lower than 3.00 indicates their disagreement.

As shown in Table 6, for all the questionnaire items except for items 7, 12, and 13, significant differences ($p < 0.05$) were seen between the mean scores of the groups on all items. That is to say, the corresponding mean scores were larger than the average value of the choices (i.e., 3.00). This proves that the EG participants all agreed with the statements in the questionnaire (except for those of 3 items). In other words, the EG learners expressed their positive attitudes towards the FC through the 13 items. Item # 2 ($M = 4.95$), 5 ($M = 4.95$), 10 ($M = 4.70$), and 16 ($M = 4.85$) demonstrated the highest mean scores where the EG learners expressed that (a) they felt more satisfied with their learning with FC, (b) applying FC made writing Task 2 responses a lot easier for them, (c) recorded videos had a positive effect on their learning system, and (d) FC enabled them to have access to the videos at any time. The reason
Table 1: Flipping the upper-intermediate writing instruction classroom process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Weeks 1 &amp; 2</th>
<th>Week 3</th>
<th>Week 4</th>
<th>Weeks 5 and 6</th>
<th>Week 7 and 8</th>
<th>Weeks 9 and 10</th>
<th>Weeks 11 and 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph means?</td>
<td>Watching a video recorded for the course teacher.</td>
<td>Watching YouTube videos to revise different tenses/peer review process.</td>
<td>Watching YouTube videos to differentiate between paragraph and essay/topic sentences and punctuation.</td>
<td>Watching online video for descriptive writing.</td>
<td>Watching online video for comparison and contrast essay.</td>
<td>Watching a video recorded for the course teacher.</td>
<td>Watching a video recorded for the course teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-class activities</td>
<td>In groups of two: students investigate the topic.</td>
<td>Independently: work on topic sentence.</td>
<td>In a group of two: learners exchange the paragraphs with other group members discussing them to understand the run-on sentences and engage in peer review.</td>
<td>In pairs, learners choose, compare, and contrast topic. Using a clustering technique.</td>
<td>In pairs: students engage in peer review.</td>
<td>In pairs: students engage in peer review.</td>
<td>In pairs: students engage in peer review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A determined effort is required to produce an effective FC. Since this newly developed approach is in its infancy, the conventional wisdom on best practices is still in development. The current study examined the FCI effect on performance in upper-intermediate EFL learners’ writing outcomes. The results are presented and discussed in this final part. The factors that might have led to these findings are discussed concerning the relevant theoretical and empirical work on FC.

The findings of this study can be summed up as follows. The primary instructional benefits of flipping the writing classroom consist of (1) improving the learners’ classroom interaction, (2) providing a more constructive learning environment, (3) enhancing the students’ understanding of writing, and (4) improving the quality of writing performance. Considering the first research question, the results of data analysis revealed that the experimental group led to more improvement in writing proficiency. These findings also revealed that both groups had a significant difference in their overall writing proficiency. However, the outcomes showed that FC students significantly outperformed the traditional classroom. These findings lend support to Mason et al.’s [41] study in which the learners in FC gained considerably higher scores than the control group.

The findings also support Mireille’s [42] study, which reported the positive effects of FC on the writing achievement of upper-intermediate learners and determined the students’ perception of FC in an EFL writing class. The findings of this study are also consistent with Ahmed [43] who studied the impact of FC on writing skills in EFL classes and the participants’ attitude towards flipping classrooms. The results revealed that the participants in the experimental group outperformed the control group on the posttest, which is attributed to the teaching impact.

Similarly, the findings are compatible with those of Quyên and Loi (2018) who examined the effects of an FC model on EFL (English as a Foreign Language) students’ speaking performance. The learners’ reactions to FC were further explored. The findings revealed that the learners’ speaking skills improved thanks to FC and a positive attitude towards this model.

The outcome of the first research question contradicts the findings from Ekmekci [37] who investigated the effect of FC on EFL learners’ writing skills. The results revealed that the difference between the experimental and control groups was statistically significant regarding the experimental groups’ writing performance. However, in this study, the overall groups’ writing performance in terms of proficiency was not statistically significant. This may be due to the differences in the participants’ performance on the test, the implementation of the methods, or other uncontrolled variables. The findings in the current study are consistent with several studies reporting positive reactions to FC ([7, 44–47]). The results were also consistent with Abdullah et al. [44] and Ekmekci’s [37] studies in which FC showed its superiority over the traditional classrooms in terms of improving the EFL participants’ writing performance. Furthermore, the finding confirmed the alignment of active learning and FC. Consequently, the interview outcome specified that prior preparation improved the participants’ class participation and interaction.

### Table 2: Experimental and control group pretest results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exp.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p > 0.05.

### Table 3: Experimental and control group posttest result.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exp.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>-7.19</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p > 0.05.

### Table 4: Comparison of the experimental group’s pretest-posttest results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
<td>-8.48</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05.

### Table 5: Control group pretest-posttest result comparison.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05.

item # 7, 12, and 13 received low mean scores was that they were negatively worded items. For instance, for item # 7 (M = 1.40), the learners stated that they understand the teacher’s instruction in class more easily. Or for item # 12 (M = 4.55) and 13 (M = 1.65), the EG learners disagreed that FC had not affected their learning and would rather choose TC than FC. The low mean scores of the negatively worded items were also indicators of the learners’ positive attitudes towards FC.

The total mean score obtained from the questionnaire items, as shown in Table 7, is 3.93. To see whether this degree of positive attitude is statistically large/significant, the p value should be assessed in the following one-sample t-test table.

Since the p value was smaller than the significance level (0.008 < 0.05), it can be concluded that EG learners held significantly positive attitudes towards the FC for L2 writing development.

### 5. Discussion

A determined effort is required to produce an effective FC. Since this newly developed approach is in its infancy, the
Moreover, the participants’ positive attitude towards flipped learning as well as the classroom interaction improvement, a constructive learning environment, the learners’ understanding of writing, and the quality of writing performance obtained from this study can serve as a testament to Ekmekci’s findings, which shared the same results with this study. Consequently, in-class collaborative learning was generally viewed as positive, with the instructor’s small group time, working exercises, and individual attention as most useful. Coming up with a solution for the entire class and listening to peers were viewed as less beneficial. Some learners considered the class time as inefficient and unfavorable. These findings resonate with other studies [50, 51] comparing the traditional and flipped courses that have uncovered the student discomfort with or resistance to instructional changes. The recognition that students may initially find the conventional model of instruction more comfortable has implications for others thinking of implementing flipped instruction at the upper-intermediate level. The course supported more active, less passive learning. Despite the freshness of flipped instruction in EFL, learners could navigate the model with comparative ease. The flipped classroom is more than creating videos for lectures. The crux of this model lay in the rich in-class time with the instructor and peers.

6. Conclusion and Implications

This study examined the efficacy of FC in improving students’ English writing and illustrated their positive attitudes towards FC. A careful analysis of the related literature on FC proves that FC improves learners’ outcomes and it has a

Table 6: Results of attitude questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 FC assists learners to ask questions and get immediate targeted answers to challenging notions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 I feel more satisfied with my learning with FC</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 After watching the videos, I feel more confident to ask for clarifications</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 I feel more independent with FC learning</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Applying FC made writing Task 2 responses a lot easier for me</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Applying more learning time in class leads to a better writing performance</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 I understand the teacher’s instruction in class more easily</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 I feel more confident to write in class to get immediate feedback from the instructor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 FC highly improves your writing ability in English</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Recorded videos have a positive effect on the learning system</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 The technique of sending videos before class and administering the lesson was very positive, and I highly recommend using it for other courses</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Students would rather traditional classroom than FC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 I feel that the FC was not effective at all</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 TC has not improved the learners’ writing skills</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 The degree of frustrating sessions is reduced with FC</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 FC makes it easy for students to have access to the lectures at any time</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Learners’ attitudes as a result of the one-sample t-test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Test value = 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
positive effect on learners’ attitudes and satisfaction toward the instruction ([52], Başal 2012; Bishop & Vergeler, 2013; Leis, Tohei, & Cooke (2015)). Using teacher-made videos, YouTube videos, class pamphlets, and WhatsApp software provided learners with opportunities for peer instruction, novel learning experiences, and shared culture. Therefore, flipped learning instruction is strongly recommended for application in more English classes.

In addition, the outcomes of the study provide instructional implications for the instructors who plan to adopt the FC model in their English classes. First, learners highly appreciate the new instructional approach. Even though some learners’ academic achievements do not corroborate the FC efficacy, they prefer the approach to the traditional and consider the FC interactive, engaging, and participatory. It is functionally compatible with Smith’s [53] findings which concede the FC benefits even though reviewing the online lectures may be time-consuming.

Second, learning materials or predelivered videos need to be motivating and concise rather than burdensome for learners. Basel (2015) suggests short video recording to 15 minutes, including collaborating elements in the videos. Third, the instructors need to encourage learners to complete tasks before coming to class and provide extra support if they miss the predelivered instruction. Solozhenko and Eversea (2015) claimed that instructors could provide mini-lectures after checkup quizzes with face-to-face classroom instruction or allow learners to leave shortly for a brief review of the online instruction.

Data Availability

The data used to support the findings of this study are included within the article.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

References


[23] J. Khan, K. H. Yuen, B. H. Ng et al., “Bioequivalence evaluation of two different controlled release matrix formulations of


