برنامج قائم على النظرية البنائية
في تنمية الكتابة الجدلية والكفاءة الذاتية
بين طلاب المرحلة الثانوية في فلسطين

A Constructivist Based Program for Developing EFL
Argumentative Writing and Self-Efficacy among
Secondary Stage Students in Palestine

د. ثواب حازم مصباح عواد(*)

ملخَّص:

تبحث هذه الدراسة في فاعلية استخدام برنامج تعليمي بنائي قائم على نموذج بايبي البنائي (2009) 5Es، والذي يرمز إلى (Engagement, Exploration, Explanation, Elebaning, Evaluation) في تنمية بعض مهارات الكتابة الجدلية والكفاءة الذاتية لدى طلاب المرحلة الثانوية الفلسطينيين. تكونت عينة الدراسة من فصلين من طلاب الصف الأول الثانوي مدرسة سلفيت، الضفة الغربية، فلسطين؛ مقسمين إلى مجموعة ضابطة وأخرى تجريبية؛ وكانت الأدوات هي: استبانة للمهارات الضرورية للكتابة الجدلية، اختبار قبلي/بعدي للكتابة الجدلية، ومقياس لتصحيح الاختبار، كما تم استخدام مقياس الكفاءة الذاتية لتحديد مستوى الطلبة في الكفاءة الذاتية؛ وتم تحديد صدق وثبات الاختبار والمقياس؛ وتم تطبيق اختبار الكتابة الجدلية ومقياس الكفاءة الذاتية قبليًا على كلتا المجموعتين؛ وتم تدريس المجموعة الضابطة من خلال التدريس التقليدي، في حين تم تطبيق النموذج البنائي (5Es) المقترح على المجموعة التجريبية؛ ثم تم تطبيق اختبار الكتابة الجدلية ومقياس الكفاءة الذاتية البعديين على كل من المجموعة التجريبية والمجموعة الضابطة. وأظهرت النتائج أن أداء المجموعة التجريبية كان أفضل في اختبار الكتابة البعدية وعلى مقياس الكفاءة الذاتية البعدي. وأن النموذج التطبيقي له أثر فاعل في تنمية مهارات الكتابة الجدلية لدى طلاب الصف الأول الثانوي في اللغة الإنجليزية وكفاءتهم الذاتية. ويمكن استنتاج أن استخدام نموذج (5Es) لتنمية الكتابة الجدلية باللغة الإنجليزية وكفاءتهم الذاتية لطلاب المرحلة الثانوية فاعل.

(*) دكتوراه في التربية (تخصص مناهج وطرق تدريس لغة إنجليزية)، فلسطين، قسم بحوث ودراسات التربية، معهد البحوث والدراسات العربية، مصر.

Abstract:

This study investigated the effect of using a constructivist learning program based on constructivist Bybee model (2009) 5Es that stands for (Engagement, Exploration, Explanation, Elaboration, and Evaluation), for developing some argumentative writing skills and Self-Efficacy among Palestinians' secondary stage students. Participants of the study were two classes of first year secondary stage students divided into a control group and an experimental group. Two classes randomly chosen from the first year secondary stage, Salfeet school, The West Bank, Palestine. The instruments were: a questionnaire for necessary skills of an argumentative writing, an argumentative writing pre-posttest and an analytic scoring rubric, and a self-efficacy scale. The pre argumentative writing and self-efficacy scale were administered to both groups. The control group was taught through regular instruction, whereas, the proposed program based on constructivist 5Es model was applied on the experimental group. Finally, the post- argumentative writing test and self-efficacy scale were administered to both groups. Results showed that the experimental group performed better in the post-argumentative writing test and the post self -efficacy scale. This showed that using the proposed program based on constructivist 5Es model to develop EFL argumentative writing skills and self-efficacy for the secondary stage students is effective.

الكلمات الدالَّة

[البنائية – نموذج (5Es) البنائي – الكتابة الجدلية – الكفاءة الذاتية]

❋

Introduction:

Nowadays there is a revolution in education, one that deals with the philosophy of how one teach, the relationship between teacher and student, the way in which a classroom is structured, and the nature of curriculum. there is a powerful pedagogy, one that has been developing over the past hundred years. It embraces social issues, the culture of the classroom, life-long learning concerns, and technology. The basic issues of such pedagogy can be described through such key words as "constructivism", "learner centered", "problem-based", centering on the idea that people learn best when involved in the topic, motivated to seek out new knowledge and skills as they are needed to solve the problem at hand. The problem at heart as will be shown after wards is the bad need of developing argumentative writing skills and self - efficacy for secondary stage students in Palestine. This is very important because it is via argumentative writing that a person can communicate a variety of messages to a close or distant reader. Argumentative writing is one of the writing modes that promote reasoning and critical thinking skills which are often figured in the democratic society where different points of view

are criticized, analyzed and supported. To give his point of view, student considers his opinion on a controversial issue and supports his opinion with arguments for the purpose of getting the audience to change their mind on the controversial issue to reflect his point of view. Ultimately, the writer is successful when the audience accepts his beliefs on the ground of his discourse (Moore, 2009). Argumentative writing is one of the writing styles which need a critical reader to analyze, criticize and support different viewpoints.

Argumentative writing is a fundamental writing style which is required in higher schools to compose various writing tasks. The goal of argumentative writing is to convince an audience, and it is done in a situation where there exists a conflict between the beliefs and attitudes of the writer/speaker and the reader/audience. The writing of formal argument places heavy cognitive demands on the writer. It involves logical and coherent reasoning, which are acquired in cognitive development (Dastjerdi and Samian, 2011).

The importance of argumentative writing for academic success and for general life purposes has been considered in particular disciplines, Benetos (2006) stressed that argumentative writing is a valued genre in a range of disciplines and curricula because it requires that writers develop logical relationships between ideas and a deep and multi-faceted understanding of the topic. In school settings, critical thinking is often assessed by asking students to identify the issue, consider different view point, and respond to counterarguments. Argumentative writing is not a skill that can be easily acquired. Kuhn cited in (Chase, 2011) investigated the response of the adults and children to questions about controversial issues. Kuhn found that they are not able to relate evidence in order to claim which is essential if the argument is to be valid or not. Kuhn concluded that more controversial topics should be given to the students to be discussed to make valid arguments and that need specific pedagogical guidance on argumentation and self-efficacy.

Self-efficacy is a strong sense that enhances students' accomplishment and personal well-being in many ways. Students with high assurance in their capabilities approach difficult tasks as challenges to be mastered rather than threats to be avoided. Such an efficacious outlook fosters intrinsic interest and deep engrossment in activities.

Students set challenging goals and maintain strong commitment to them. It heightens and sustains student's efforts in the face of failure. So, they quickly recover their sense of efficacy after failures or setbacks. They attribute failure to insufficient effort or deficient knowledge and skills which are acquirable. They approach threatening situations with assurance that they can exercise control over them. Such an efficacious outlook produces personal accomplishments, reduces stress and lowers vulnerability to depression.

In contrast, students who doubt their capabilities shy away from difficult tasks which they view as personal threats. They have low aspirations and weak commitment to the goals they choose to pursue. When faced with difficult tasks, they dwell on their personal deficiencies, on the obstacles they will encounter, and all kinds of adverse outcomes rather than concentrate on how to perform successfully. They slacken their efforts and give up quickly in the face of difficulties. They are slow to recover their sense of efficacy following failure or setbacks. Because they view insufficient performance as deficient aptitude, it does not require much failure for them to lose faith in their capabilities. They fall easy victim to stress and depression, (Bandura, 2001).

Teaching of writing need to switch from conventional learning model (which is based on the assumption that knowledge can be transferred intact from the mind of the teacher to the student's mind) to the modern model of learning (constructivism). Learning models of a constructivist approach is not implemented in isolation, but are implemented in full in accordance with their interests, abilities, and learning needs. Aspects of language, language skills, and vocabulary are presented simultaneously as a whole taking into account the level of development of the emotional, cognitive, and socio-cultural. The Constructivist Learning Approach (C L A); is a suitable approach for learning writing so, In Writing, teachers should engage their students in the creative process, excite them about how their texts are coming out into being, give them insights into how they operate as they create their work, and to alter their concepts of what writing involves.

Context of the problem:

From the literature review and the researcher's experience as a teacher of English language at Salfeet school in Palestine. The researcher

observed that argumentative writing skills were not given much attention when teaching English to the secondary stage students. This may be due to the evaluation system adopted that mainly focuses on grammar, reading and writing yet totally neglecting argumentative writing skills.

The researcher reviewed the previous studies related to the EFL argumentative writing skills and self-efficacy, which revealed the actual problem in them. She noticed that most of the students have some negative attitudes towards writing. For example, they have some difficulties in expressing what they want to write. They could not write either simple coherent sentences or a paragraph. To make sure of this, the researcher conducted a pilot study.

The researcher administered an EFL argumentative writing test and self-efficacy scale to a group of (30) students of the first year secondary stage to write a paragraph about the importance of EFL writing skills for them, and if it is easy to write it. Analyzing students' written texts, it was clear that most students' writing were incoherent. They did not write proper topic sentences, supporting details and concluding sentences. Further, they did not use linking words to write coherent sentences. This could be due to the students themselves; they have some problems to express their ideas in English.

Also, a number of studies have proven weakness in argumentative writing skills like Helwa (2014) who studied the effectiveness of a program based on the combination of relevance and confidence motivational strategies on developing EFL argumentative writing skills and overcoming writing apprehension among students teachers at the faculty of education. The results of the study revealed that the participants' EFL argumentative writing skills developed after the implementation of the combination of relevance and confidence motivational strategies based program.

Ali's (2011) study aimed at investigating the effect of a suggested program based on multiple intelligences on developing some argumentative writing skills of the fourth-year primary education prospective teachers of English. Mahmoud (2007) examined applying a constructivist-learning model in Al-Fayouum preparatory schools on the second cycle of basic education learners' acquisition of some grammatical concepts and their attitudes towards using the model.

A Pilot study:

To determine the level of the student's mastery of argumentative writing skills, a pilot study was conducted on 35 students from the first year secondary stage, Salfeet School, The West Bank, Palestine. For the argumentative writing skills, an argumentative writing test was designed by the researcher. The participants were required to attempt these argumentative writing skills:

Table (1)
Argumentative writing skills

Making the right argument:
1- Analyze opinions 2- Evaluate opinions. 3- State the opposite point of view. 4- Refute the opposite view
Organization:
5- Write a well-organized introduction. 6- Write a well-organized body. 7- Write a well-organized conclusion.
Thesis statement:
8- Write a clear, convincing thesis statement. 9- Write a positive thesis statement. 10- Write a negative thesis statement. 11- Support argument. 12- Give reasons for argument.

Table (2)
Results of the argumentative writing test of the pilot study

N	Mean	S D deviation	percentage
30	4.2	1.8	36%

Results in table (2) indicate that the percentage of the mean score of the students on argumentative writing test is 36%. The above results show that students have difficulties in writing an argumentative writing. The results obtained showed that those students seem to face difficulty in producing convenient cohesive and meaningful pieces of writing with accepted structural form. That may be due to the lack of knowledge in this specific genre on one hand and to the traditional method of teaching argumentative writing on the other hand.

Statement of the problem:

Based on the results of the reviewed of literature and related studies and the results of the pilot study made by the researcher, the problem of this study can be stated as EFL secondary stage students' exhibit poor writing skills to write a good argumentative paragraph; as well as, they lack self-efficacy. They lack the ability to produce an argumentative paragraph supporting a point of view using the evidences and proofs to strengthen their opinions. They are unable to address varied readers; they cannot adapt an idea, defend it and persuade the reader by evidences and proofs. Hence, the present study attempted to investigate the effect of a suggested constructivist - based program for enhancing the self-efficacy and developing the argumentative writing skills for the secondary stage students in Palestine.

Questions of the study

To tackle the research problem, the present study tried to answer the following main question:

What is the effect of a proposed program -based on the constructivist model (5Es) to develop EFL argumentative writing skills and self-efficacy among first year secondary stage students in Palestine?

To answer this question, the following sub-questions were attempted:

1- What are the EFL argumentative writing skills required to be developed for first year secondary stage students in Palestine?

2- What are the required self-efficacy dimensions to be developed for the first year secondary stage students in Palestine?

3- What is the actual level of argumentative writing skills of students at the first year secondary stage students in Palestine?

4- What is the real level of the students' self-efficacy in the first year secondary stage in Palestine?

5- What are the main features of the proposed program -based on the constructivist learning model (five Es) designed for developing the EFL argumentative writing skills and self-efficacy of the first year secondary school students in Palestine?

6- What is the effect of the proposed program on each argumentative writing skill for the first year secondary stage students in Palestine?

7- What is the effect of the proposed program on each dimension of the self - efficacy scale (General Self - Efficacy Scale English Self-Efficacy Perceptions Concerning Writing- Self-Efficacy Perceptions Concerning Motivation and Expectations) for the first year secondary stage students in Palestine?

Hypotheses of the study:

This study aims to verify the following hypotheses:

1- There is a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group and the control group on the argumentative writing test, total skills and on making the right argument, organization and thesis statement in favor of the experimental group.

2- There is a statistically significant difference between mean scores of the pre and post administrations of the argumentative writing test of the experimental group, total skills and on making the right argument, organization and thesis statement, in favor of the post one.

3- There is a statistically significant difference between the pre and post administrations of the mean scores of the experimental group on the self-efficacy scale in all dimensions, in favor of the post administration.

Aim of the study:

This study mainly aimed at: Developing the required EFL argumentative writing skills and self - efficacy for the secondary stage students in Palestine through a constructivist - based program.

Significance of the study:

The study attempted to:

1- Provide empirical evidence to the value of adopting the constructivist five E's learning model - based program in reaching the most learning incomes.

2- Offer the program that contains guidelines and procedures of implementing the constructivist five E's model and serves best in

teaching EFL argumentative writing skills to secondary stage students.

3-Direct the attention of EFL researchers, instructors, educators, course designers, curriculum developers, language specialists to the effect of the constructivist five E's model based learning program on improving secondary stage students EFL argumentative writing skills.

4-Direct the attention of EFL researchers, instructors, educators, course designers, curriculum developers, language specialists to the effect of the constructivist five E's model based learning program on improving secondary students self-efficacy.

Variables of the study:

1-The independent variable is the constructivist five E's model - based program used with the experimental group.

2-The dependent variables are:

– The performance of the students on the argumentative writing skills post administration of the test.

– The level of students' self-efficacy at the secondary stage in the post administration of the self - efficacy scale.

Delimitations of the study:

The study was delimited to:

– Two classes randomly chosen from the first year secondary stage, Salfeet school, The West Bank, Palestine to be the participants of the study

– Developing the required argumentative writing skills that are (Making the right argument- Organization- Thesis statement) according to the final form of the present study checklist.

– Teaching specific forms of writing that suit the required argumentative writing skills as follows:

1. writing an argumentative statement.

2. writing an argumentative introduction,

3. supporting argument using various techniques and methods of development

4. linking supporting arguments using appropriate connectives,

5. refuting and argument,

6. writing an argumentative conclusion

– Self-efficacy scale (General Self-Efficacy Scale English Self-Efficacy Perceptions Concerning Writing- Self-Efficacy Perceptions Concerning Motivation and Expectations) according to the final form of the present study scale.

Definition of terms:

1-Constructivism:

According to Elliott et al., (2000) Constructivism is an "approach to learning that holds people actively to construct or make their own knowledge and that reality is determined by the experiences of the learner".

Mvududu and Thiel-Burgess (2012) stated that constructivism is widely touted as an approach to probe for children's level of understanding and to show that that understanding can increase and change to higher level thinking. Thus, constructivism refers to how of learning and thinking. Constructivism describes the way that the students can make sense of the material and also how the materials can be taught effectively.

Twomey Fosnot (1989) defined constructivism according to four principles: (1) learning depends on what individuals already know, (2) new ideas occur as individuals adapt and change their old ideas, (3) learning involves inventing ideas rather than mechanically accumulating a series of facts, (4) meaningful learning occurs through rethinking old ideas and coming to new conclusions about new ideas which conflict with our old ideas.

The researcher defines Constructivism operationally in the present study as the theory of learning that maintains the learners to construct or create their own understandings through the interaction between what they already know and believe and the ideas, events, and activities with which they come in. So, it not the teacher who can simply give the knowledge to the students at their class rather learners construct knowledge through an active process development.

2- The five E's model:

Bybee (2009) defines the 5E model as a model of teaching that consists of five phases. The five E's stand for the following: (E) Engagement, Exploration, Explanation, Elaboration, and Evaluation

According to Llewellyn (2007), the 5E model "is the model that can help "students move from concrete experiences to the development of understanding and to the application of the principles" it consists of five phases of instruction within the learning cycle: Engagement, Exploration, Explanation, Elaboration and Evaluation

The researcher used Bybee's model operationally in the present study as a model of teaching that consists of five phases, each of the 5 E's describes a phase of learning, and each phase begins with the letter "E": Engage, Explore, Explain, Elaborate, and Evaluate. It allows students and teachers to experience common activities, to use and build on prior knowledge and experience, to construct meaning, and to continually assess their understanding of a concept.

3- Argumentative writing:

Benetos (2006) defines argumentative writing as follows "Genres such as argumentation are thought to require students to process information deeply and to construct relationships among ideas, thereby attaining increased understanding and recall of curriculum material"

The researcher defines, operationally in the present study, argumentative writing as the act of analyzing information to create convincing reasons and drawing conclusions to apply them to the case in discussion. These reasons should be developed by providing certain facts, examples and opinions to make the points of view more acceptable.

4- Self-efficacy:

Bandura, (2001) defined self-efficacy as " an individual's belief in his /her capacity to execute behaviors necessary to produce specific performance attainments."

Bandura (2006) described perceived self-efficacy as peoples' beliefs in their capabilities to produce given attainments. Self-efficacy beliefs are related to motivational behavior and stand for individuals' perceptions of how capable they are of performing certain specific tasks

or activities (Graham, 2007). Self-efficacy is a psychological construct that plays important roles in many multi-dimensional and complex processes including, of course, foreign or second language learning. Self-efficacy people's beliefs in their capabilities to accomplish or attain a desired goal or do a certain task (Bandura,2006).

The researcher defined, operationally in the present study, self-efficacy as the student's belief in his ideas and information to argue for his own point of view and strengthen his opinions with evidence and proofs.

Theoretical Background:

This section is divided into four sections, dealing with the literature and previous studies related to the variables of the present study. The first section deals with argumentative writing skills. The second section covers self-efficacy among the students in Palestine. The third section focuses on the constructivist learning approach and its role in developing argumentative writing skills and other skills in the field of TEFL and the related studies to the constructivist learning approach.

1. Argumentative writing:

Effective writing is essential for effective communication. Constructivism advocates the process approach for teaching English writing in contrast with the traditional product oriented method because the method of constructivism helps students to organize creative ideas in writing literary works. Constructivism can help students take a more active role in their learning, giving them a forum to ask questions and take part in discussions about a subject presented to them. This is opposed to a more passive approach where students are expected to listen to a lecture and absorb information.

Students can develop ideas, characterizations, good storylines and the ability to raise current phenomena in writing stories. Unlike other language skill, writing includes many conventions spelling, punctuation, capitalization, grammar and paragraphing. Virtually the writer should use conventions to enhance the readability of the paper. Consequently, spelling should be correct. Punctuation should be smooth and guide the reader through the paper. Capitalization should be used correctly and paraphrasing should enhance organization (El-Meshry, 2013).

Nature and Types of argumentation:

Due to the variety of its study approaches, it is difficult to find accurate or all-inclusive description of argumentation in the literature. Perhaps that is main reason why most researchers find it more acceptable to identify argumentation by its components, purposes or functions. Wingate, (2012) for example, mentioned three-part description argumentation based on what the students need to write a good argumentative paragraph; (1) the evaluation of content knowledge. (2) the writer's progress of a position, (3) the presentation of that position in coherent manner.

Hillocks (2011) states that argumentative writing is that which supports a claim through the analysis of a topic or text using sound reasoning and valid evidence. It is meant to urge writers to think logically, to be analytical and to learn to rely on evidences as they assess sources in both life and literature.

Importance of Argumentative writing:

Argumentation is considered one of the most important aims of the academic writing. The importance of having knowledge and instruction in argumentative is stressed writing. Arguments have always been an essential part of the society from the times of Aristotle and before. Arguments are present in every field of learners' lives from writing a persuasive essay for winning a debate or convincing persons during a political campaign or for selling a product or making real-life decisions. Harria (2010), this genre of writing is essential for the development of logical thinking, in addition to its importance in showing the relation between languages and thinking.

Components of Argumentative writing:

Toumlin as cited in Qin (2009) suggested a model of argumentation in which he stated that argumentation includes the following elements a) Claim, which is an assertion presented in response to problem, b) Warrant, which supports the relation between the claim and data, d) Backing, known as support of the Warrant, e) Qualifier, which is a term indicating the probable nature of the claim and f)–Reservation, which refers to the circumstances under which the Warrant will not be accepted and cannot support the claim. These elements represent the basis of argumentative discourse and organizational framework for argumentative

essay writing. The following table summarizes the components of the elements of this argumentative writing model.

Table (3)
The elements in Toumlin Model of argument structure

Elements		Definitions
Fundamental elements	Claim	A proposition explaining a particular position and expressed by a thesis statement.
	Data	Evidences which are used to support and validate claims and provide reasons for why such claims should be accepted.
	Warrant	The underlying assumption that bring the reason and claim together.
Secondary element	Backing	Providing extra reasons as an elaboration of evidence.
	Rebuttal	Acknowledging opposing points of view and refuting them using sound evidence
	Qualifiers	Are words indicating degree of force or certainly attached to the claim.

El-Deen's (2011) study aimed at developing the necessary reading skills for Egyptian EFL first year secondary school students, through the use of a proposed program based on social constructivist learning model (scaffolding).. The study results revealed evidence that there were statistically significant differences at 0.01 level between the mean scores of the control and the experimental groups on the post-test, in favor of the experimental group in overall meta cognitive reading skills as well as the meta cognitive reading skills awareness scale, in favor of the post administration.

2. Self-Efficacy:

Self-efficacy conceptualizes students' beliefs in their capabilities in a specified field or task. Bandura (2006) describes perceived self-efficacy as peoples' beliefs in their capabilities to produce given attainments. Self-efficacy beliefs are related to motivational behavior and stand for individuals' perceptions of how capable they are of performing certain specific tasks or activities (Graham, 2007). Self-efficacy is a psychological construct that plays important roles in many multi-dimensional and complex processes including, of course, foreign or second language learning. Self-efficacy is people's beliefs in their capabilities to accomplish or attain a desired goal or do a certain task (Bandura, 2006). In Bandura's terms these are beliefs in one's capability to organize and execute the courses of action required to manage prospective situations.

Nature and source of self-efficacy:

To give an overview of the nature and sources of self-efficacy beliefs, it can be maintained that the originator of the theory, Bandura (1986) names four sources of self-efficacy; According to Bandura (1997) individuals form self-efficacy beliefs by interpreting information regarding their own capabilities. This information stems from four sources: mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and physiological and affective states.

1- Mastery Experiences: The first and foremost source of self-efficacy is through mastery experiences. However nothing is more powerful than having a direct experience of mastery to increase self-efficacy (Anderson & Betz, 2001).

2- Vicarious Experiences: The second source of self-efficacy comes from our observation of people around us (Britner & Pajares, 2006).

3- Verbal Persuasion: Influential people in our lives can strengthen our beliefs that we have what it takes to succeed which means that we are more likely to put in the effort and sustain it when problems arise (Usher & Pajares, 2008, 2009)

4- Emotional & Physiological States: The state you are in will influence how you judge your self-efficacy (Chen& Usher, 2013).

The importance of self-efficacy in learning:

Self-efficacy that students have will help do the tasks well. Students who have good self-efficacy tend to be proactive, competitive and creative work diligently and finish well so that it can have an impact on improving learning outcomes, while students with low self-efficacy tend to avoid difficult tasks.

Elsayed's study (2021). aimed at investigating the effect of an e-mentoring model on developing EFL student teachers' self-efficacy and emotional intelligence. The study adopted the pre- experimental one group pre-post administration design. In the Faculty of Education, Ain Shams University during their practicum in three different public schools. Their instruments were used in the study before and after the experiment. Results of the study revealed that the e-mentoring model was

effective in developing pre-service teachers' self-efficacy as well as emotional intelligence.

Suleyman & Neşe's (2014). Study probed into possible effects of E-learning experiences on English self-efficacy by enabling participants to listen to language learning podcasts repetitively and do related task-based activities. It focuses on first-year university students' self-efficacy perceptions of listening, speaking, reading and writing at elementary, intermediate and advanced levels. Participants' self-efficacy perceptions concerning motivation and expectations were analyzed. Findings support the idea that novel technology-based applications can have positive outcomes for language learning. However, participants' self-efficacy did not improve may be due to the fact that the program duration was insufficient.

3. Constructivism:

Constructivism is an important approach that considers the learner as an important component of the learning process. It is actually a philosophy not pedagogy. It is not a theory about teaching, but it is a theory about knowledge and learning (Foston & Perry, 2005). The constructivism philosophy concentrates on knowledge construction not knowledge production; Knowledge in the constructivist view is a developmental, culturally and socially meditated, and in this way, non-objective. It treated learning as self-organized process of solving inner cognitive arguments that often become clear through contextual situations, collaborative context, and reflection.

The nature of constructivism:

Constructivism has different faces and it has been used by numbers of people and for various aims so there is not agreement on its meaning. Yet, there have been some endeavors to clarify its meaning; according to Hein (1991) constructivism indicates the notion that learners construct knowledge for themselves, each learner individually (or socially). For O'loughin (1992) constructivism refers to it as the process of constructing and creating a concept. This mental construction then guides following actions with objects or events.

Importance of constructivism theory:

Constructivism is important as it is grounded in students' active participation in problem solving and critical thinking. Moreover, there are several benefits from applying constructivism theory in the classroom. First, students learn more and enjoy learning more when they are actively involved. Second, education does best when it concentrates on thinking and understanding. Furthermore, constructivism concentrates on learning how to think and understand. Third, constructivist learning is transferable. It can be said that, in constructivist classrooms, students create organizing principles that they can take with them to other learning settings. Fourth, constructivism gives learners ownership of their own learning since learning is based on learners' explanation and explorations.

The Constructivist Classroom:

Learning activities, in constructivist classroom, concentrate on tasks that attract the students' attention. Moreover, a group of probing and thoughtful questions encourages the students interact mentally and emotionally with the context. Examples of learning tasks are the completion of open-ended questions, the combining parts to construct wholes, perspective taking, moral reasoning, suggesting solutions to identified problems, and identification of multiple causes and effects. Hassan (2008) added that every learning activity helps the students to show their own potential, to use their experiences and understandings in interacting with the authentic situation and fully participate in forming relevant meaning. Learning activities give the students the chance to work together, fully participate, and make use of questioning in resolving disagreement and reaching an agreement.

The Constructivist Teacher and the five stages of the constructivist learning model (5Es model)

Teacher in the constructivist classroom is conceptualized as a facilitator of student understanding not a transmitter of knowledge. His role is not to dispense knowledge, but to provide students with opportunities and incentives to make meaning (Gould, 2005).

The Consistent and effective use of the 5E learning cycle model may be the first step to eliminating the achievement gap in language education.

369

The constructivist learning model stages on phases beginning with the letter E Bybee (1997) as cited in El-Nagady et al (2005) were used in the present study as follows:

1-Engagement:

In this stage the students' first encounter and identify the instructional task. Here they make connection between past and present learning experiences, lay the organizational ground work for the activities ahead to stimulate their involvement in the anticipation of these activities. Asking questions, defining problems, showing surprising event and acting out problematic situations are all ways to engage students and focus them on the instructional tasks.

2- Exploration:

In the exploration stage students have the opportunity to get directly involved with the phenomena and materials. Involving themselves in these activities develop grounding of experience with the phenomenon. As they work together in teams, students build base of common experience which assists them in the process of sharing and communicating.

3-Explanation:

This is the point at which the learner begins to put the abstract experience through which he has gone into a communicable form. Language provides motivation for sequencing events into logical format. Common language enhances the sharing and communication between the facilitator (teacher) and the learner. The facilitator can determine levels of understanding and possible misconceptions. Created work such as writing, drawing, videos, or tape recordings are communications that provide recorded evidence of the learner's development progress and growth.

4-Elaboration:

In this stage, the students expand on the concepts they have learned, make connections to other related concepts, and apply their understandings to the world around them. These connections often lead

to further inquiry and new understanding. Students present and defend their explanations and identify and complete several experiences related to the learning task. Facilitators provide an occasion for students to cooperate on activities, discuss their current understanding, and demonstrate their skills.

5-Evaluation:

The fifth "E", is an on-diagnostic process that allows the facilitator to determine if the learners have attained understanding of concepts and knowledge. Evaluation and assessment can occur at all points along the continuum of the instructional process. Some of the tools that assist in this diagnostic process are rubrics, teacher observation structured by checklists, tests, project and problem-based learning products, and other tests.

Several case studies have indicated the efficiency of applying constructivism in contemporary classrooms. Alnagar (2018) investigated the effectiveness of using a constructivist learning model for developing some critical reading and argumentative writing skills among al-Azhar secondary stage students. Results showed that experimental group performed better in the post- critical reading and the argumentative writing tests. It was concluded that using the constructivist 5Es model to develop EFL critical reading and argumentative writing for the secondary stage students is very effective.

Commentary:

In general, from what has been reviewed of the related literature that will be shown after wards, the characteristics of the constructivist classroom developing argumentative writing lessons so, they have been summed up by the researcher in the following points:

• Students learn more, and enjoy learning more when they are actively involved, rather than being passive listeners.

• Education works best when it concentrates on thinking and understanding, rather than on rote memorization. Constructivism

concentrates on learning how to think, understand and persuade.

• Constructivist learning is transferable. In constructivist classrooms, students create organizing principles that they can take with them to other learning settings.

• Constructivist assessment engages the students' initiatives and personal investments in their journals, research reports, physical models, and artistic representations. Engaging the creative instincts develops students' abilities to express knowledge through a variety of ways. The students are also more likely to retain and transfer the new knowledge to real life.

• Constructivism stimulates and engages students. Students in constructivist classrooms learn to question things and to apply their natural curiosity to the world.

Method of the study:

The previous chapter included the review of literature and studies related to the variables of the study. This chapter includes method, procedures, participants, and instruments of the study. It also deals with the description of the constructivist approach based program to develop argumentative writing and self-efficacy among secondary stage students in Palestine.

Design of the Study:

The study adopted the quasi-experimental design. Two intact classes were assigned to the experimental and control groups. The two groups were protested to determine equivalence in the actual performance of both groups in the argumentative writing skills and self-efficacy before the experiment. Then, the experimental group was taught through the syllabus prescribed in the textbook through (five E's model constructivist -based program). On the other hand, the control group was taught through the regular instruction. Both groups were post-tested in argumentative writing skills and self-efficacy to measure any possible improvement. The following figure shows the experimental design of this study:

Experimental group	Pre- test	The study Material	Post-test
	- Argumentative Writing - Self- efficacy scale	a program based on the constructivist approach	- Argumentative Writing - Self- efficacy
Control group		The traditional way	

Figure (1): The experimental design

Instruments and materials:

The following instruments and materials were used:

- An argumentative writing skills checklist. (Submitted to jury members to specify the list of argumentative writing skills required to be developed by first year secondary stage students)

- An argumentative writing skills test. (Used as a pre-posttest)

- A self-efficacy scale (used as a pre-post scale) (by the researcher).

- A scoring rubric for correcting the performance of the students in the required argumentative writing skills test.

Participants of the study:

Participants in this study were two classes (70) randomly chosen from the first year secondary stage students, Salfeet School, The West Bank, and Palestine. The participants' age ranged from sixteen to seventeen years old. Both groups were female classes, so no differences could be attributed to this variable. They represented the inhabitants of the area in which the experiment was performed. So, they reflected the socio-economic background of that area.

The Experiment of the study:

The results of the t-test of the control and experiment group in the pre administration of the pre-argumentative writing skills test and the pre self-efficacy scale showed that the t-value is not significant in the three parts and in the total score of the argumentative writing skills test. This showed that there is no significant difference between the mean scores of the control and experimental groups on the pre- test. In other words, this means that at the beginning of the experiment, the two groups were equivalent in their EFL argumentative writing skills concerning the three parts (Making the right argument, Organization, Thesis statement) and in

the total score before conducting the experimental treatment. Also, homogeneity between the two groups was ensured through the measurement of the level of the two groups and the self - efficacy scale before the experiment as a whole and on each dimension of the self - efficacy (General Self - Efficacy Scale English Self-Efficacy Perceptions Concerning Writing- Self-Efficacy Perceptions Concerning Motivation and Expectations).

Duration of the experiment:

Two days before the treatment in the experiment, the present study argumentative writing test and the self- efficacy scale were administrated to the control group and the experiment group of the study to ensure their equivalence in argumentative writing and self - efficacy.

Besides any improvement in the performance of the experiment group would be due to implementing the proposed program based on the 5Es constructivist model. This which was built on proven educational theories and had great support of research on conducting any weakness in the control group student's performance would be due to the regular instruction used in teaching them. The experiment of the present study was conducted in the second semester of the academic year 2022- 2023. The experiment lasted in 9 lessons 120 minutes each. For more detail about the proposed program used by the experiment group that was mentioned above, see Appendix E under the title Teacher's Guide - at the end of the experiment the argumentative writing test and the self - efficacy scale were post administration to the two groups of the study to see the difference between their levels after using the regular instruction with the control group and the constructivist model (5Es) in the proposed program and the difference between the two groups achieved the aim of the study as it was in favor of the experiment group which was taught the constructivist program.

Description of the training program:

The experiment was conducted of the first year in the secondary school students, Salfeet School, The West Bank, and Palestine in the second semester of the academic year (2022-2023). The control group used the regular instruction, while the experiment group used the proposed program based on the constructivist 5Es model. This program

proposes that learners build on construct new ideas on top of their old ideas. It could be easily used. The first unit consists of two lessons, the second unit consisted of two lessons, and the third unit consisted of five lessons. Each lesson stayed for 120 minutes. Each of the 5Es describes a phase of learning and each phase begins with the letter "E" Engage, Explore, Explain, Elaborate, and Evaluate. The 5Es allowed the experimental group students and the researcher as a teacher to experience activities, to use and build on prior knowledge and to construct meaning and to continually assess their understanding of a concept.

At the end of the experiment: Both the post argumentative writing skills test and the post self - efficacy scale were administrated to both the control and the experiment groups between the results of the two groups of the students in the pre and post administrations of the argumentative test and self - efficacy scale to come to the results through the statistical analysis.

Objectives of the proposed program based on the 5Es model:

The proposed program was implemented to achieve the following objectives:

1. Developing first year secondary stage students' argumentative writing skills in English.

2. Drawing the students' and the researcher's on (teacher's) goal to the importance of the constructivist learning model (5Es) on developing the argumentative writing skills of the students.

3. Developing first year secondary stage students' self-efficacy in English.

4. Drawing the students' and the researcher's (teachers) goal to the importance of the constructivist learning model (5Es) on developing the self-efficacy of the students.

Validity of the training program:

For making sure that the training program is valid and suitable to be administered, the program has handed to three of specialists to validate it. They agreed that the training program was valid and therefore, ready for implementation.

Experimentation:

Session One (Introductory Session):

Aim: familiarizing the students with the Training Program in the light of the constructivist 5Es model.

Objectives: By the end of this session students would be able to:

1. Identify what is meant by the constructivist 5Es model.

2. Understand how students to apply the constructivist 5Es model in argumentative writing.

Time: 120 minutes.

Teaching procedures:

Explain thoroughly the teaching procedures step by step.

Session Two (The Second Introductory Session):

Aim: Introducing the training program: its objectives, duration, and the teaching procedures.

Objectives:

By the end of this session, prospective teachers would be able to:

Know what is the training Program in the light of the constructivist 5Es model would be used while writing argumentative assays.

Time: 120 minutes.

Teaching procedures:

Explain thoroughly the teaching procedures step by step.

Statistical Analysis of Data and Discussion of Result:

This part deals with the results of the study in terms of analyzing them statistically to verify the hypotheses and to answer the questions of the study. Interpretation of the results will be delineated shedding light on the similarities and differences between the results of the present study and other related studies.

Verification of the Study's hypotheses:

Thus, the three hypotheses of the study were verified and its main question was answered and the sub one.

Hypotheses and the results of the study:

The argumentative writing skills test:

Hypothesis (1): To test the first hypothesis which addressed the difference between the experimental and the control groups on the post argumentative writing test, a t-test for independent samples was employed. Table (4) shows the results.

Table (4)
Results of t-test of the control and experimental groups
on the post argumentative writing test

Parts of the test Sig	Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t	$^2\eta$	Sig at
Making the right argument	experimental group	35	8.714	1.318	68	29.605	0.928	
	control group		1.542	0.56				
Organization	experimental group	35	9.40	1.666	68	26.785	0.913	
	control group		1.514	0.560				0.05
Thesis statement	experimental group	35	10.114	2.083	68	22.580	0.882	
	control group		1.714	0.710				
Total	experimental group	35	28.228	4.413	68	30.621	0.932	
	control group		4.771	1.031				

• The difference between the average score of experimental group students and the average score of control group students in making the right argument of the argumentative writing test, where experimental group students got an average (9.40) with a standard deviation (1.666), while control group students got an average (1.514) with a standard deviation (0.560). This means the average score of the experimental group students was higher than the average score of control group students in the post-test of the first question. Also the calculated value of (t) for the significance of the difference between the average scores of experimental group and control group students in the first question in the argumentative writing test, which reached (29.785) and the significance level was (0.000) which means that it was lower than the level of significance (0.05). Thus, there was a statistically significant difference at the level of significance (0.05) between responses of the students of

the experimental group and control group in post- administration to question 1 in the argumentative writing test, in favor of the experimental group.

• The difference between the average score of the experimental group students and the average score of the control group students in organization of the argumentative writing test, where experimental group students got an average (9.40) with a standard deviation (1.666), while control group students got an average (1.514) with a standard deviation (0.560). This means that the average score of the experimental group students was higher than the average score of the control group students in the post-test of the second question. Also the calculated value of (t) for the significance of the difference between the average scores of the experimental group and control group students in the second question in the argumentative writing test, which reached (26.785) and the significance level was (0.000) which means that it was lower than the level of significance (0.05). Thus, there was a statistically significant difference at the level of significance (0.05) between responses of the students of experimental group and control group in post- administration of question 2 in the argumentative writing test in favor of the experimental group.

• The difference between the average score of experimental group students and the average score of control group students in thesis statement of the argumentative writing test, where experimental group students got an average of (10.114) with a standard deviation (2.083), while the control group students got an average of (1.714) with a standard deviation (0.710). This means the average scores of the experimental group students was higher than the average scores of the control group students in the post-test of the third question. Also the calculated value of (t) for the significance of the difference between the average scores of the experimental group and control group students in the third question in the argumentative writing test, which reached (22.580) and the significance level was (0.000) which means that it was lower than the level of significance (0.05). Thus, there was a statistically significant difference at the level of significance (0.05) between response of the students of the experimental group and the control group in the post- administration to question 3 in the argumentative writing test, in favor of the experimental group.

•The difference between the average score of experimental group students and the average score of control group students in Total skills of the argumentative writing test, where experimental group students got an average of (28.228) with a standard deviation (4.413), while the control group students got an average of (4.771) with a standard deviation (1.031). It means that average score of the experimental group students was higher than the average score of the control group students in the post-test of Total skills. Also the calculated value of (t) for the significance of the difference between the average scores of experimental group and control group students in Total skills of Argumentative writing skills test, which reached (30.621) and the significance level was (0.000) which means that it was lower than the level of significance (0.05). Thus, there is statistically significant difference at the level of significance (0.05) between responses of the students of the experimental group and control group in post- administration to Total skills of the Argumentative skills test, in favor of the experimental group. This result can be illustrated by the following figure (6).

Hypothesis (2): To test the second hypothesis which addressed the difference between the scores of the experimental group on the pre-post argumentative writing tests, a t-test was employed. Table (5) shows the results.

<div align="center">

Table (5)
Results of t-test of the experimental group
on the pre-post argumentative writing tests.

</div>

Parts of the test	measurement	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	η^2	Sig at
Making the right argument	Pre	35	1.657	0.639	30.458	0.914	0.05
	post		8.714	1.318		large	
Organization	Pre	35	1.40	0.497	26.313	0.814	
	post		9.40	1.666		Large	
Thesis statement	Pre	35	1.60	0.650	24.584	0.783=0.8	
	post		10.114	2.083		Large	
Total	Pre	35	4.657	0.998	31.637	0.921	
	post		28.228	4.413		large	

It is shown from the previous table (5):

•The difference between the average score of the experimental group on the pre and post administrations of the argumentative writing test first question "Making the right argument", while the experimental

group students got an average of (1.657) in the pre administration of the skill, they got an average (8.714) in the post administration of the skill. It means the average score in the post administration of making the right argument in the argumentative writing test for experimental group students was higher than the average score in pre administration of the test. Also the calculated value of (t) for the significance of the difference between the average scores of the pre and post administration of making the right argument in the argumentative writing test, which reached (30.458) and the significance level is (0.000) which means that it is lower than the level of significance (0.05). Thus, there was a statistically significant difference at the level of significance (0.05) between responses of the students of the experimental group in the pre and post administration of Word Recognition Skills of the listening skills test, in favor of the post administration.

•The difference between the average score of the experimental group students on pre administration and average score on post administration in "organization Skills of the argumentative writing test", where the experimental group students got an average of (1.40) in the pre administration of the organization Skills, while got an average of (9.40) in the post administration of the organization Skills. It means that the average score in the post administration of the organization Skills for the experimental group students was higher than the average score in the pre administration of the organization skills of the argumentative writing test. Also the calculated value of (t) for the significance of the difference between the average scores of the pre and post administrations of the organization Skills of the Argumentative writing skills test, reached (26.313) and the significance level was(0.000) which was lower than the level of significance (0.05). Thus, there was a statistically significant difference at the level of significance (0.05) between responses of the students of the experimental group in the pre and post administration of the organization Skills of the argumentative writing skills test, in favor of the post administration.

•For the difference between the average scores of the experimental group students on the pre and post administrations in "Thesis statement "Skill " of the argumentative writing test, the experimental group students got an average of (1.60) in the pre administration of thesis statement Skills, while got an average of (6.74) in the post administration of the "Thesis statement skill'. It means the average score in the post

administration the of "Thesis statement "Skill for the experimental group students was higher than the average score in the pre administration of the "Thesis statement "of the argumentative writing test. Also, the calculated value of (t) for the significance of the difference between the average scores of the pre and post administration of the "Thesis statement Skill of the argumentative writing skills test, reached (29.306) and the significance level was (0.000) which means that it was lower than the level of significance (0.05). Thus, there was a statistically significant difference at the level of significance (0.05) between the two responses of the students of the experimental group in the pre administration and post administrations of the "Thesis statement skill "of the argumentative writing test, in favor of the post administration.

•The difference between the average scores of the experimental group students in the pre and the post administration in total skills of the argumentative writing test, where the experimental group students got an average of (4.657) in the pre administration of the total skills, while got an average of (28.228) in the post administration of the total skills. It means that the average score in the post administration of the total skills for the experimental group students was higher than the average score in the pre administration of the total skills of the argumentative writing test. Also, the calculated value of (t) for the significance of the difference between the average scores of the pre and post administrations of the total skills of the argumentative writing test, reached (31.637) and the significance level was (0.000) which means that it was lower than the level of significance (0.05). Thus, there was a statistically significant difference at the level of significance (0.05) between the responses of the students of the experimental group in the pre administration and post administration of total skills of the argumentative writing skills test, in favor of the post administration.

Third: Verifying the validity of the third hypothesis of the research:

The third hypothesis stated that "There was a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group in the pre testing and post testing of the self-efficacy scale, in favor of the post testing ". To test the validity of this hypothesis, the (t) test was employed in pre and post-application of self-efficacy Scale for the experimental students group. The results are shown in the following table (6):

Table (6)

The value of "t" test and the level of its significance for the difference between the experimental group in the pre and post application of the self-efficacy Scale

variables	measurement	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t	$^2\eta$	Sig at
General Self-Efficacy Scale	Pre	35	1.342	0.481	34	25.987	0.914 large	0.05
	post		6.57	1.144				
English Self-Efficacy Perceptions Concerning Writing	Pre	35	1.22	0.426	34	19.044	0.814 large	
	post		3.742	0.700				
Self-Efficacy Perceptions Concerning Motivation and Expectations	Pre	35	1.00	0.00	34	19.806	0.783 =0.8 large	
	post		3.485	0.742				
Total	Pre	35	3.751	0.698	34	27.209	0.921 large	
	post		13.80	2.206				

It is shown from the previous table (6):

• The difference between the averages score of the experimental group students of pre and post applications in" General Self-Efficacy Scale" dimension of the self-efficacy scale, where experimental group students got an average of (1.342) in pre application of" General Self-Efficacy " dimension, while they got an average (6.57) in post application of general Self-Efficacy dimension. It means the average score in post application of "General Self-Efficacy" for experimental group students was higher than the average score in pre application of" General Self-Efficacy" Scale. Also, the calculated value of (t) for the significance of the difference between the average scores of the pre and post applications in" General Self-Efficacy" of the Scale, reached (18.317) and the significance level was (0.000) which is lower than the level of significance (0.05). Thus, there was a statistically significant difference at the level of significance (0.05). Between the responses of the students of the experimental group in the pre and post applications in" General Self-Efficacy Scale ", in favor of the post application.

• The difference between the average scores of the experimental group students of the pre and the post applications of " English Self-Efficacy Perceptions Concerning Writing " of the self-efficacy Scale, where the experimental group students got an average of (1.22) in the pre application of Self-Efficacy perception concerning writing dimension, while they got an average of (6.57) in the post application of the scale. It means that the average score in the post application of " English Self-

Efficacy perception concerning writing " for experimental group students was higher than the average score in pre application of "English Self-Efficacy Perceptions Concerning writing "in the self-Efficacy Scale. Also, the calculated value of (t) for the significance of the difference between the average scores of the pre and the post applications in "English Self-Efficacy perception concerning writing", reached (19.806) and the significance level was (0.000) which is lower than the level of significance (0.05). Thus, there was a statistically significant difference at the level of significance (0.05) between the responses of the students of the experimental group in the pre and post applications in "English perception concerning writing" in the self-efficacy, in favor of post application.

•For the difference between the average scores of the experimental group students in the pre and post applications of "Self-Efficacy Perceptions Concerning Motivation and Expectations, dimension of the self-efficacy Scale, where experimental group students got an average of (1.00) in the pre application of this dimension, they got an average of (3.485) in the post application of the same dimension of the scale. It means that the average score in the post application of" Self-Efficacy Perception Concerning Motivation and Expectation" for the experimental group students was higher than the average score in the pre application in "Self-Efficacy Perceptions Concerning Motivation and Expectation, in the Efficacy Scale. Also,the calculated value of (t) for the significance of the difference between the average scores of the pre and post applications in this dimension of the Self-Efficacy of the Scale, reached (19.806) and the significance level is (0.000) which means that it was lower than the level of significance (0.05). Thus, there was a statistically significant difference at the level of significance (0.05) between the responses of the students of the experimental group in the pre and post applications in "Self-Efficacy Concerning Motivation and Expectations" in favor of the post application.

•For the difference between the average scores of the experimental group students of pre and the post applications in Total dimensions of the self-efficacy Scale, the experimental group students got an average of (3.751) in pre application of Total dimensions, while they got an average of (13.80) in the post application of the Total dimensions. It means that the average score in post application of the Total dimensions for the

experimental group students was higher than the average score in the pre application of the Total dimensions of the Self-efficacy Scale. Also, the calculated value of (t) for the significance of the difference between the average scores of the pre application and post application in the Total dimensions of the Self-efficacy Scale, reached (27.209) and the significance level was (0.000) which was lower than the level of significance (0.05). Thus, there was a statistically significant difference at the level of significance (0.05) between the responses of the students of the experimental group in the pre and post applications in the Total dimensions of the Self-efficacy Scale, in favor of the post application.

The results of the present study are compatible with the results of the study conducted by Alnagar (2018)The study investigated the effectiveness of using a constructivist learning model for developing some critical reading and argumentative writing skills among al-Azhar secondary stage students. Also, Ebedy, (2013) conducted a study to improve prep school reading and writing skills and their attitudes towards English language. A constructivism-based program was applied to achieve this aim. Also the results of the study conducted by Ali (2011) are in line with the same results of the current study. The study aimed at investigating the effect of a suggested program based on multiple intelligences on developing some argumentative writing skills of the fourth-year primary education prospective teachers of English.

Answering the Questions of the study:

To tackle the problem of the present study, the researcher tried to answer the following main question:

What is the effect of a proposed program -based on the constructivist model (5Es) to develop EFL argumentative writing skills and self-efficacy among first year secondary stage students in Palestine?

To answer this question, some sub-questions were attempted and answered as follows:

The first sub question is "what are the EFL argumentative writing skills required to be developed for first year secondary stage students in Palestine"? The researcher answered it through the final form of the argumentative writing skills.

And the second sub question is "what are the required self-efficacy dimensions to be developed for the first year secondary stage students in Palestine?" the researcher answered it through the final form of the self-efficacy dimensions scale of the present study.

The answers to the third and fourth questions were found in the results of the pre- argumentative skills test and the pre self - efficacy scales as it levels were weak in both of them. To the fifth question displayed the features of the proposed program based on the constructivist (5Es) model as shown in chapter 3 and for more details in Appendix 4 under the title teacher's guide. The answers to the 6th and 7th sub questions showed the effect size on each argumentative writing skill and on each skill test and on each self-efficacy dimension was large through the compare of the pre and post results of the test and the scale.

Recommendations:

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendation could be offered:

- EFL curriculum designers and developers should plan to incorporate 5Es learning model in TEFL curriculum as a constructivist paradigm. This helps provide learners with authentic learning environment through which learning outcomes can be achieved; knowledge can be constructed, life skills can be acquired.

- Acquiring both pre-service and in service teachers with the rationale method and the value of using the constructivist learning model in TEFL context through systematic training courses.

- More emphasis should be given to the learner's individual creativity and creation by involving thinking process such as applying knowledge, information reasoning and discussing ideas.

- More consideration should be taken to enhance students' awareness of the argumentative writing skills through explicit instruction from the early classes.

- Students should be trained on the argumentative writing skills through writing about varied topics using constructivist learning techniques.

- Writing in EFL writing classes should be an opportunity for the

students to write about their own opinions to enhance discussion and exploration skills.

- The scope of the English course syllabus should be modified to be more flexible to help teachers to manage the curricula units in innovate ways.

- The future educational policies should give due care to highlight the 21st century skills.

Suggestions for Further Research:

The following suggestions can be considered for further research:

1- Investigating the effectiveness of the constructivist 5Es learning model in EFL classes to develop other language skills such as oral communication skills.

2- Investigating the effectiveness of the constructivist 5Es learning model in EFL classes to develop other writing genres rather than argumentative writing.

3- Further research is needed to explore the extent to which the constructivist learning 5Es model can meet the content standards of English language stated by the National Authority for Quality Assurance and Accreditation of Education and Ministry of Education.

4- The Effectiveness of the constructivist learning (5Es) model on self-confidence and writing apprehension among secondary stage students

5- Further research is needed to investigate the effect of the constructivist learning (5Es) model on improving students multiple intelligences in different language areas.

6- New research should be conducted so as to measure the effectiveness of the constructivist model (5Es) when applied on the University Students.

7- New research should be conducted so as to measure the effectiveness of the constructivist techniques on the students' attitudes.

<div align="center">✸</div>

References

- Alnagar, A (2018): Using a constructivist learning model for developing some critical reading and argumentative writing skills among Al-azhar secondary stage students. Ph.D. thesis, Faculty of Education, Mansoura University.
- Balci, S. (2006): Engagement, exploration, explanation, extension, and evaluation (5E) learning cycle and conceptual change text as learning tools. *Biochemistry and Molecular Biology Education,* 34.
- Bandura, A. (2001): Self-efficacy. In V. S. Ramachaudran (Ed.), Encyclopedia of human behavior (Vol. 4). New York: Academic Press.
- ——————— (2006): Guide to constructing self-efficacy scales. In F.Pajares & T. Urdan (Eds.), *Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Bentos, K.(2006): Computer-supposed argumentative writer: An authoring tool with built-in scaffolding and self-regulation for novice writers of argumentative texts.
- Brooks, J.& Brooks, M. (1993): In Search of Understanding the Case for Constructivist Classrooms. *Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development,* New York, USA.
- Bybee, R. (2009): The BSCS 5E instructional model and 21st century skills: A commissioned paper prepared for a workshop on exploring the intersection of science education and the development of 21st century skills. BSCS.org. Retrieved February 9th, 2015. from: http://www7.nationalacademies.org/bose/Bybee.
- Chase, B. (2011): An Analysis of the Argumentative Writing Skills of Academically Underprepared College Students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, Columbia.
- Dastjerdi, H. and Samian, S. (2011): Quality of Iranian EFL Learners' Argumentative Essays: Cohesive Devices in Focus. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 2*(2).
- El-Deen, A. (2011): The effectiveness of a program based on social constructivist learning model in developing some metacognitive reading skills of the secondary first grades. Unpublished MA thesis, faculty of education, Ain shams University.
- ——————— (2014): The effectiveness of an EFL program based on freirean pedagogy in developing secondary school students' argumentative writing skills and reflective thinking. Unpublished ph. D thesis.
- El Mehry (2013): Everyday Arguments: A Guide to Writing and Reading Effective Arguments. New York: *Houghton Mifflin Company*.
- Elliott, S., Kratochwill, T., Littlefield Cook, J. & Travers, J. (2000): *Educational psychology: Effective teaching, effective learning (3rd ed.)*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill College.
- Elsayed, M. (2021): A Suggested E-Mentoring Model to Develop EFL Student-Teachers' Self-Efficacy and Emotional Intelligence. Ph.D. thesis. Faculty of Education. Ain shams University.
- Fosnot, C. & Perry, R. (2005): Constructivism. Constructivism: A theory Of Learning, In Catherin Foston (Ed): Constructivism: Theory, Perspectives, And Practice, Second Edition, New Yourk: *Teachers College Press.*

- Gerde, K. and Pierce, S. (2018): "Early Childhood Educators' Self Efficacy in Science, Math, and Literacy Instruction and Science Practice in the Classroom," Early Education and Development 29 (1).
- Gould, J. (2005): A constructivist perspective on teaching and learning in the language arts, in Catherin Fosnot(Ed): *constructivism: theory, perspectives and practice.* 2nd ed. New York: teachers college press.
- Harria, P. (2010): The effects of teaching argumentative writing. Scientific reading comprehension strategy on struggling fifth grade ability to summarize and analyze argumentative texts. Unpublished ph. Dissertation. Delaware University. U.S.A.
- Hassan, S. (2008): The effectiveness of a constructivism-based program in developing the listening skills of EFL primary student teachers. Unpublished M A thesis, faculty of Education, Mansoura University.
- Hein, G. (1991): The museum and the needs of people. A paper presented at the International conference for committee of museum educators in Jerusalem Israel, October 15-22 1991 *at Lesley College*. Massachusetts USA. Retrieved from: https://www.exploratorium.edu/education/ifi/constructivist-learning.
- Helwa (2014): The Effectiveness of a Program Based on the Combination of Relevance and Confidence Motivational Strategies in Developing EFL Argumentative Writing Skills and Overcoming Writing Apprehension among Students Teachers at Faculty of Education, *ERIC*.
- Lee, S. (2003): Computer Assisted Classroom Discussion in Three ESL Classrooms: A Case Study of the Experiences of a Teacher and Her Students. Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin. UMI Number: 3118040.
- Moore, S. & MacArther, A. (2012): The effects of being a reader and of observing readers on the fifth-grade students' argumentative writing and revising reading and writing, 25.
- Mvududu NH & Thiel-Burgess J. (2012): Constructivism in Practice: The Case for English Language Learners. International Journal of Education, 4(3).
- O,Loughlin, M. (1992): Rethinking science education beyond Piagetian constructivism toward a social-cultural model of teaching and learning. *Journal of research in science teaching, 29(8).*
- Qin, J. (2009): *The Analysis of Toulmin Elements and Use of Sources in Chinese University EFL Argumentative Writing*, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northern Arizona University.
- Suleyman & Neşe's (2014): Study probed into possible effects of E-learning experiences on English self-efficacy, *International Journal of Language Academy*, 2(2).
- Twomey Fosnot C. 1989. Enquiring teachers, enquiring learners: A constructivist approach for teaching. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Wingate, (2012): Argumenr helping studenta understand what essay writing is about, *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 11(2).

● ○ ●

ضوابط النشر في المجلَّة

مقدمة:

ترحب مجلَّة معهد البحوث والدراسات التربوية العربية العلمية المُحَكَّمة بنشر الإسهامات العلمية للأكاديميين وأساتذة الجامعات والباحثين المتخصصين في المجالات والتخصصات التربوية المتعددة مثل: أصول التربية، والتخطيط التربوي، والإدارة التربوية، والتربية المقارنة، والمناهج وطُرق التدريس، وعلم النفس التربوي، والتربية الخاصة، والصحة النفسية، وتكنولوجيا التعليم. وتقبل البحوث والدراسات باللُّغة العربية واللُّغات الأجنبية شريطة أن تندرج المادة العلمية المقدَّمة ضمن مجالات اهتمام المجلَّة، وأن تقدم إضافة علمية أصيلة في موضوع الدراسة، على أن يستوفي الموضوع المقدَّم للمجلَّة شروط البحث العلمي من حيث سلامة المنهج، وتسلسل الأفكار، والرجوع إلى الأدبيات ذات الصلة، ودقة التوثيق، وسلامة اللُّغة وتدقيقها، مع نبذ التحيزات بمختلف أنماطها وأشكالها، وعدم الإساءة إلى الأديان أو الثقافات، ويتم كل هذا وفق القواعد الإدارية والفنية التالية:

أولًا- القواعد الإدارية:

1- تنشر مجلَّة البحوث والدراسات التربوية العربية البحوث للسادة أعضاء هيئة التدريس بالجامعات المصرية والعربية والدولية وغيرها، والباحثين في الجامعات والمعاهد العلمية والمراكز والهيئات البحثية والأكاديمية ذات الصلة.

2- تنشر البحوث العلمية بأسبقية ورودها للمجلَّة بعد استيفائها الإجراءات الخاصة بالتحكيم العلمي المعتمدة.

3- يقدم الباحث ثلاث نسخ من كل بحث (الأصل + صورتين + أسطوانة إلكترونية) إلى سكرتير تحرير المجلَّة، ومعها رسوم التحكيم، كما يمكن إرسال الأبحاث بريديًا على العنوان التالي: هيئة تحرير مجلَّة البحوث والدراسات التربوية العربية – معهد البحوث والدراسات العربية – 1 شارع اتحاد المحامين العرب (الطلمبات سابقًا) – جاردن سيتي – القاهرة – جمهورية مصر العربية – ص.ب 229، أو إلكترونيًا على البريد الإلكتروني للمجلَّة rsdept@iars.net، وتورد رسوم التحكيم في حساب المعهد بالبنك الأهلي المصري.

4- كل ما ينشر في أعداد المجلَّة يعبر عن رأي صاحبه، ولا يعبر بالضرورة عن رأي هيئة التحرير أو الهيئة العلمية والاستشارية للمجلَّة.

5- تقوم هيئة التحرير باختيار مُحَكِّم من بين الأساتذة والمتخصصين في مجال كل دراسة ليقوم

بتحكيم البحث المقدَّم للنشر، وتحديد مدىٰ صلاحيته للنشر وفقًا لنموذج التحكيم المُحَكَّم من قِبَل وحدة المكتبة الرقمية بالمجلس الأعلىٰ للجامعات المصرية.

6- تنشر المجلَّة بحوث الأساتذة الدكاترة من داخل المعهد وخارجه بدون تحكيم.

7- تنشر المجلَّة البحوث المستلة من رسائل الماجستير والدكتوراه التي يمنحها المعهد في فترة إصدار المجلَّة.

8- كل ما ينشر في المجلَّة لا يجوز نشره بأية طريقة في أي مكان آخر إلَّا بموافقة كتابية من مدير التحرير.

9- يقدِّم الباحث تعهدًا موقعًا منه، ومن جميع الباحثين المشاركين – إن وجدوا – يفيد بأن البحث لم يسبق نشره في أي وعاء ورقي أو إلكتروني، وأنه غير مقدَّم للنشر في أية جهة أخرىٰ حتىٰ تنتهي إجراءات تحكيمه ثم نشره في المجلَّة، وأن البحث ليس جزءًا من كتاب منشور، وأنه يمكن للمجلَّة نشره إلكترونيًا وفق نموذج التعهد بنشر بحث المخصص لذلك.

10- تخضع البحوث المقدَّمة إلىٰ المجلَّة للتحكيم السري من قِبَل أعضاء لجنة تحكيم تختارهم المجلَّة؛ لذا يراعىٰ ألَّا يظهر اسم الباحث داخل بحثه، ويقتصر ظهوره علىٰ صفحة العنوان فقط، ويخطر الباحث بنتيجة التحكيم خلال 3 أشهر من إبلاغه بقبول بحثه من قِبَل هيئة التحرير.

11- يلتزم الباحث بإجراء التعديلات المقترحة من المحكمين علىٰ بحثه وفق التقارير المرسلة إليه، وموافاة المجلَّة بنسخة معدلة في مدة لا تتجاوز خمسة عشر يومًا.

12- تحتفظ المجلَّة بحق إجراء تعديلات في الصياغة التحريرية للمادة المقدَّمة، حسب مقتضيات النشر، علىٰ ألا تؤثر هذه التعديلات في محتوىٰ النص.

13- تحتفظ هيئة التحرير بحق عدم إبداء أسباب رفض نشر البحث، ويجوز أن يزود الباحث بالملحوظات والمقترحات التي يمكن أن يفيد منها في إعادة النظر ببحثه.

14- يقدِّم كل صاحب بحث معروض علىٰ المجلَّة سيرته الذاتية التي تتضمن بياناته الشخصية (المؤهلات العلمية، والتسلسل الدراسي، ومقر العمل، والدرجة الوظيفية، والإنتاج العلمي، والعنوان البريدي والإلكتروني، ورقم التليفون).

15- في حال الموافقة بشكل نهائي علىٰ النشر، تؤول حقوق النشر كافة تلقائيًا إلىٰ المجلَّة، ويصبح البحث بعد قبوله للنشر حقًا لمجلَّة المعهد، ولا يجوز النقل عنه إلا بالإشارة إلىٰ مجلَّة المعهد.

16- يلتزم الباحث بعدم إرسال بحثه لأية جهة أخرىٰ للنشر حتىٰ يصله رد المجلَّة خلال ثلاثة أشهر.

ثانيًا– القواعد الفنية:

1- يراعى أن يكون البحث خاليًا من الأخطـاء النحويـة واللُّغويـة والإملائيـة والطباعيـة، وأن تكـون كتابة البحث والمراجع والكتب والرسائل طبقًا للقواعد العلمية المتفق عليها.

2- البحوث باللُّغة العربية: يكتب البحـث بخـط Simplified Arabic بحجـم (14)، وتكتـب العناوين بحجم (16)، على أن تكون مواصفات الصفحة (حجم الورقة B5)، والهوامش يمين ويسار وأعلى الصفحة 2.5سم، وأسفل الصفحة 2سم، كما يراعى أيضًا الضبط والدقة في كتابة الجداول والأشكال، وأن تكون واضحة ومختصرة.

3- البحوث باللغة الأجنبية: يكتب البحـث بخط Time New Roman بحجـم (14)، وتكتـب العنـاوين بحجم (16)، وبهوامش حجم الواحد منهـا (3.25سم يمـين ويسـار الصـفحة)، (3.5سم أعلى وأسفل الصفحة)، وتترك مسافة مفردة بين السطور، كما يـراعى أيضًا الـضبط والدقة في كتابة الجداول والأشكال، وأن تكون واضحة ومختصرة.

4- تستخدم الأرقام العربية 1، 2، 3... في جميع ثنايا البحث، ويكون ترقيم صفحات البحـث في منتصف أسفل كل صفحة.

5- لا تزيد كلمات ملخص البحث عن (200) مائتي كلمـة، ويـشترط في البحـث المقـدَّم باللُّغـة الإنجليزية أن يُدرج فيه ملخص باللُّغة العربية.

6- يكتب البحث على وجه واحد، وتُسلسل الهوامش داخل المتن أو في أسفل كل صفحة على حدة، وتدرج الرسوم البيانية والأشكال التوضيحية في النص، وتكـون الرسـوم والأشكال بـاللونين الأبيض والأسود، وترقم ترقيمًا متسلسلًا، وتكتب أسماؤها والملاحظات التوضيحية أسفلها، وتدرج الجداول في النص، وترقم ترقيمًا متسلسلًا، وتكتب أسـماؤها أعلاهـا، وتكتـب الملاحظات التوضيحية أسفل الجدول، أما قائمة المصادر والمراجع فتوضع في نهايـة البحـث مرتبة ترتيبًا ألفبائيًا.

7- في حالة نشر البحث، يمنح الباحث نسخة مجانية من المجلَّة.

8- يرفق الباحث الأداة التي استخدمها في البحث إذا طلبها المحكمون.

ثالثًا– الرسوم المقرَّرة لتحكيم ونشر البحوث والدراسـات والبحـوث المـستلة مـن رسـائل الماجستير والدكتوراه:

1- تنشر دراسات الأساتذة الدكاترة من داخل المعهد وخارجه بدون رسوم نشر.

2- يدفع الباحثون من داخل وخارج المعهد رسوم تحكيم ورسوم نـشر حـسب القواعـد الماليـة المطبقة وقت تقديم البحوث لهيئة التحرير.

● ○ ●