



El apoyo de mnemotecnias y mapas mentales en la escritura en inglés como lengua extranjera de nivel A1: un estudio de aula

Mnemonic and Mind-Mapping Support for A1 EFL Writing: A Classroom Study

JACQUELINE ELIZABETH LOPEZ LOPEZ

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1765-8103>

Jacqueline.lopezl@ug.edu.ec

Universidad de Guayaquil

Ecuador - Guayaquil

ALEJANDRO ANDRÉS PONCE MARISCAL

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4547-4782>

aaponcem@ube.edu.ec

Universidad Bolivariana del Ecuador

Ecuador - Durán

Article received: (30/06/2026) - Accepted for publication: 28/07/2026

Conflicts of interest: None to declare.

*Corresponding author

Suggested citation (APA, seventh edition)

Lopez Lopez, J., Ponce Mariscal, A. (2026). Mnemonic and mind-mapping support for A1 EFL writing: A classroom study. *Linguattech*, 2(2), pages 108 - 123.

RESUMEN

Los escritores principiantes de inglés como lengua extranjera deben recuperar palabras mientras organizan y monitorean oraciones simples. Este estudio de aula de un solo grupo, de métodos mixtos, examinó una secuencia breve que combinó mnemotecnias de acrónimos y acrósticos con mapas mentales en papel para la escritura de nivel A1. Treinta y dos estudiantes de octavo grado completaron la misma evaluación de escritura calificada localmente antes y después de cuatro actividades instructivas. Las lecciones avanzaron desde recordar verbos y generar palabras relacionadas hasta componer oraciones y organizar textos breves sobre información personal y actividades de tiempo libre. El puntaje medio aumentó de 3.94 (DE = 1.37) a 6.81 (DE = 1.49) en una escala de 10 puntos. La diferencia media pareada fue de 2.88 puntos, IC del 95% [2.34, 3.41], $t(31) = 11.02$, $p < .001$, con una diferencia estandarizada intraparticipante grande ($d_z = 1.95$); un análisis de sensibilidad de Wilcoxon también fue significativo ($W = 0$, $p < .001$). Treinta estudiantes mejoraron y dos no mostraron cambios. El logro por criterio aumentó más en ortografía y gramática, seguido de organización y coherencia, mientras que el vocabulario aumentó solo 6.25 puntos porcentuales. La evidencia de la encuesta inicial y de las entrevistas docentes indicó una alta disposición a usar apoyos visuales y mnemotécnicos, pero persistieron dificultades con el vocabulario, la formación de oraciones y la transferencia desde la lengua materna. La mejora observada es prometedora, pero no permite establecer causalidad porque el estudio no contó con grupo de comparación, tuvo una duración incierta de la intervención, no incluyó una medida diferida ni calificación independiente, y presentó evidencia incompleta de la confiabilidad de los puntajes. La réplica debería emplear tareas paralelas, calificación doble ciega, un análisis preregistrado y una condición de comparación.



Palabras clave: mnemotecnias, mapas mentales, escritura en inglés como lengua extranjera, estudiantes de nivel A1, diseño pretest-posttest, investigación en el aula

ABSTRACT

Beginning English as a foreign language (EFL) writers must retrieve words while organizing and monitoring simple sentences. This mixed-methods, one-group classroom study examined a short sequence combining acronym and acrostic mnemonics with paper-based mind maps for A1-level writing. Thirty-two eighth-grade learners completed the same locally scored writing assessment before and after four instructional activities. The lessons moved from recalling verbs and generating related words to composing sentences and organizing short texts about personal information and leisure activities. The mean score increased from 3.94 (SD = 1.37) to 6.81 (SD = 1.49) on a 10-point scale. The paired mean difference was 2.88 points, 95% CI [2.34, 3.41], $t(31) = 11.02$, $p < .001$, with a large within-participant standardized difference ($d_z = 1.95$); a Wilcoxon sensitivity analysis was also significant ($W = 0$, $p < .001$). Thirty learners improved and two were unchanged. Criterion attainment increased most for spelling and grammar, followed by organization and coherence, whereas vocabulary increased only 6.25 percentage points. Baseline survey and teacher-interview evidence indicated high willingness to use visual and mnemonic supports but continuing difficulty with vocabulary, sentence formation, and first-language transfer. The observed improvement is promising but cannot establish causation because the study had no comparison group, uncertain intervention duration, no delayed measure, no independent rating, and incomplete evidence of score reliability. Replication should use parallel tasks, blinded dual scoring, a preregistered analysis, and a comparison condition.

Keywords: mnemonics, mind mapping, EFL writing, A1 learners, pretest-posttest, classroom research

INTRODUCTION

Writing in an additional language requires more than knowing isolated words or rules. Even a short sentence asks a beginning writer to retrieve vocabulary, select grammatical forms, spell words, order constituents, maintain a communicative purpose, and monitor whether the result is understandable. These processes compete for limited attention. When lexical retrieval and sentence construction are effortful, little capacity remains for planning, revising, or connecting ideas. Instruction for beginning writers



therefore benefits from supports that reduce retrieval demands while making organization visible (Hyland, 2019; Kellogg, 2008).

The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages describes A1 users as able to produce simple isolated phrases and sentences and to provide basic personal information in highly familiar contexts (Council of Europe, 2020). These modest outcomes are pedagogically demanding for learners with limited exposure to English. They need frequent opportunities to compose meaningful language, but they also need explicit models, manageable steps, and feedback on foundational features such as spelling and sentence structure. Evidence-based guidance for secondary writing similarly recommends explicit strategy instruction through modeling, guided practice, reflection, and gradual movement toward independence (Graham et al., 2016).

Mnemonic devices are deliberate cues that connect unfamiliar material to a more retrievable verbal or visual structure. Acronyms compress a set of items into initial letters, whereas acrostics use those initials to generate a phrase or sequence. Such devices can support recall, particularly when learners understand what the cue represents and practice retrieving the target information. Mnemonics are not a substitute for contextualized language use: remembering a form does not ensure that a learner can select it appropriately, inflect it, or integrate it into a sentence. Their instructional value depends on moving from the cue to meaningful production (Bellezza, 1981; Dunlosky et al., 2013).

Mind maps address a different but complementary challenge. A map places a topic at the center and organizes associated words or ideas through branches, spatial grouping, and visual relations. Mapping can externalize planning, reduce the need to hold every idea in working memory, and make gaps or repetitions easier to notice. Mind maps should not be treated as equivalent to concept maps or argument maps, which encode more explicit propositional or logical relationships (Davies, 2011). For beginning EFL writers, a simple bubble or radial map can serve as a prewriting scaffold without requiring advanced metalanguage.

The generative-learning perspective helps explain why learner-created maps may be useful. A productive map requires the learner to select relevant information, organize it into a coherent structure, and connect it with prior knowledge. These actions can support learning when the task is aligned with the target content and sufficiently guided; they can also impose unnecessary cognitive demand when learners focus on decoration or copy disconnected words (Fiorella & Mayer, 2016). In writing instruction, the map must



therefore lead to sentences, receive feedback, and be revised rather than remain an end product.

A combined sequence can distribute the work of composing. Mnemonic cues can make selected vocabulary or grammatical patterns easier to retrieve, while a mind map can organize what the writer intends to say. Teacher modeling and scaffolding connect both supports to the writing process: first demonstrate the cue or map, then construct one jointly, ask learners to create their own, and finally require an independent written product. The essential transition is from remembering and listing to composing and revising.

Writing research supports this emphasis on explicit processes. Meta-analytic evidence indicates that strategy instruction and opportunities to plan, draft, evaluate, and revise can improve school writing, although effects vary by learner, task, dosage, and study quality (Graham et al., 2012; Graham & Perin, 2007). In second-language settings, feedback must also be understandable and usable. Correcting every error can overwhelm beginning writers; focused feedback on one or two current goals, followed by revision, is more compatible with limited proficiency and a scaffolded sequence (Hyland & Hyland, 2019).

The present classroom study examined a four-activity program that combined acronyms, acrostics, and mind maps for young EFL learners working around A1. The quantitative strand compared participant-level writing scores before and after instruction and summarized criterion attainment in grammar, spelling, vocabulary, and organization/coherence. A baseline survey and interviews with two English teachers provided contextual evidence about learner beliefs, existing practices, and instructional needs.

Three questions guided the analysis: (1) How did total writing scores differ from pretest to posttest? (2) How did the proportion of learners meeting the criterion change across writing components? and (3) What baseline perceptions and teacher observations contextualized the quantitative pattern? Because the design lacked a comparison condition, the study evaluates observed change and feasibility rather than causal effectiveness.



METHODS

Design

The study used a convergent mixed-methods classroom design centered on a single-group pretest-posttest comparison (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). Quantitative data came from a baseline questionnaire, a writing pretest, and a writing posttest. Qualitative evidence came from semi-structured interviews with two English teachers. The intervention was implemented in one intact class, and no untreated or active-comparison group was available.

The analytic logic was deliberately asymmetric. The paired writing scores were treated as the principal outcome because a participant-level record was available. Component percentages, survey responses, and interviews were used to describe where change appeared and how the classroom context might explain the pattern. These secondary sources were not used to claim independent confirmation of an effect.

Context and participants

Participants were 32 eighth-grade learners in one intact EFL class. The class was selected by convenience because it was taught by the teacher-researcher. English instruction was scheduled for three hours per week, and the target curriculum described learners as basic users working toward A1 writing. The classroom had limited access to internet-connected technology, so the intervention relied primarily on paper, notebooks, dictionaries, board work, and teacher-prepared examples.

Sex-disaggregated analyses were omitted because the subgroup totals were internally inconsistent. The complete paired outcome dataset contained 32 pretest and 32 posttest scores with no missing pair. Two English teachers who worked with the grade participated in interviews. Family informed consent was documented because the learners were minors, and participant identities were protected.

Table 1

Study components and evidentiary role

Component	Documented information	Role in the analysis
Paired writing assessment	32 complete pretest-posttest pairs on a 10-point classroom scale	Primary quantitative outcome; paired inference and sensitivity analysis
Component criteria	Grammar, spelling, vocabulary, and organization/coherence	Descriptive pre-post attainment; no participant-level pairing by component



Component	Documented information	Role in the analysis
Baseline questionnaire	10 Likert-type statements completed by 32 learners	Contextual perceptions; frequencies recalculated into percentages
Teacher interviews	Two teachers; open responses about methods and learner difficulties	Contextual themes; no prevalence claims
Intervention dosage	Four activities/classes; calendar evidence conflicts on total weeks	Dosage reported conservatively and uncertainty retained

Note. Only the total writing score was available as a complete participant-level paired dataset. Other strands are descriptive and contextual.

Instructional sequence

The intervention consisted of four linked activities or classes. The implementation calendar spans approximately four weeks, whereas the active teaching period is also described as two weeks. Because exact dates, attendance by session, lesson length, and total instructional minutes were not consistently available, four activities/classes are treated as confirmed and total duration in weeks as unresolved.

The sequence began with mnemonic generation and moved toward organized writing. Learners first used the initial letters of familiar action verbs to create acronyms or acrostic associations, consulting a dictionary where necessary. In the second activity, they reused selected verbs and associated words to form simple ideas and sentences. The third activity introduced a mind map for personal information, with branches such as age, preferences, color, and music; learners then converted the map into a short paragraph. The fourth activity used a map of free-time activities to connect verbs and complements in sentences about hobbies.

Instruction followed a scaffolded routine. The teacher modeled an example, elicited words, constructed a cue or map with the class, and guided learners as they produced their own representations. Learners then converted selected map nodes into sentences. The teacher assessed written work with the same criteria used for the classroom test and supplied corrective feedback. Additional teacher and peer feedback was desirable but constrained by time.

Table 2

Four-activity mnemonic and mind-mapping sequence

Activity	Primary support	Writing focus	Expected product
1. Retrieve	Acronym/acrostic associations built from familiar action verbs	Recall and spelling of high-frequency words	Word set linked to a mnemonic cue



Activity	Primary support	Writing focus	Expected product
2. Compose	Reuse of mnemonic words in modeled patterns	Subject-verb order and simple sentence formation	Short sentences about familiar actions
3. Organize self-description	Mind map with personal-information branches	Selection, sequencing, and coherence	Brief personal-information paragraph
4. Organize leisure ideas	Mind map linking activities, verbs, and complements	Vocabulary retrieval and connected meaning	Sentences or a short text about free time

Note. The sequence moves from retrieval to composition. Exact instructional minutes and the number of weeks could not be verified consistently.

Instruments

The writing assessment contained five tasks aligned with basic curriculum content. One task elicited simple personal information and foregrounded grammar, a second targeted spelling in familiar present-simple sentences, two tasks sampled vocabulary, and a final task required sentences about free-time activities to assess organization and coherence. Pretest and posttest were scored with the same locally adapted rubric. Performance categories were described as excellent, satisfactory, acceptable, and not acceptable, and the participant-level data contained integer total scores on a 0-10 scale.

The operational rubric details did not specify category cut scores, item weights, interrater procedures, or internal-consistency evidence. One teacher appears to have administered and rated the tests. The assessment should therefore be interpreted as a local classroom measure, not a standardized proficiency test. The posttest appears to have closely resembled the pretest, making familiarity with content or format a plausible alternative explanation for part of the change.

For each component, the available counts indicated how many learners answered the associated task correctly: grammar, spelling, vocabulary, and organization/coherence. These counts refer to different items rather than separate multi-item scales. Because participant-level correct/incorrect status by component was unavailable, paired categorical tests such as McNemar's test could not be calculated.

The baseline questionnaire contained 10 statements with five options from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Items addressed the usefulness of English, confidence, simple-sentence writing, graphical representation, familiarity with bubble maps and mind maps, and willingness to use acronyms. Frequencies rather than tabulated percentages were



treated as authoritative because several percentages contained arithmetic or typographical errors.

The two teacher interviews asked about classroom methods, writing difficulties, and the use of mnemonic or mapping techniques. Responses were summarized through descriptive coding. The interviews indicated use of group work, project-based activities, and flipped-classroom practices; limited routine use of mind maps; occasional mnemonic use; and persistent problems with vocabulary, sentence construction, and first-language transfer.

Data analysis

Paired scores were independently recalculated from the 32 participant-level pairs. For pretest, posttest, and change scores, the analysis reports means, standard deviations, medians, interquartile ranges, and observed ranges. The primary comparison used a paired-samples *t* test with a 95% confidence interval for the mean difference. The standardized mean change was calculated as Cohen's *d_z*, dividing the mean paired difference by the standard deviation of the paired differences.

The distribution of paired differences did not provide evidence against normality, Shapiro-Wilk $W = .96$, $p = .232$. Because the score was bounded, integer-valued, and included two zero changes, a Wilcoxon signed-rank test was also calculated as a sensitivity analysis. Statistical significance was set at $\alpha = .05$, two-sided. Interpretation prioritizes the confidence interval and consistency of individual change over the *p* value.

Component and questionnaire percentages were recalculated directly from frequencies using $N = 32$. Percentage-point change was computed as posttest attainment minus pretest attainment. No correction for multiple component comparisons was required because component results were descriptive rather than inferential. Interview responses were organized into themes and integrated after the quantitative analysis.

Ethical considerations

Family informed consent and protection of learner identities were documented. Teachers also agreed to participate in the interview process. This article uses only anonymized aggregate information and de-identified paired scores. No personal, institutional, geographic, cohort, or contact identifiers are retained.



RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Baseline perceptions and instructional need

Learners generally valued English and expressed willingness to improve. Thirty of 32 respondents (93.8%) agreed or strongly agreed that learning English was useful, and 27 (84.4%) expressed confidence that their writing could improve. Twenty-seven (84.4%) also preferred graphical representation of words, while 25 (78.1%) believed acronyms could help them write vocabulary. These responses suggest favorable conditions for introducing mnemonic and visual scaffolds, but they do not demonstrate prior strategy knowledge or writing ability.

Self-perceptions were more positive than the pretest pattern. Twenty-one learners (65.6%) agreed that they could write simple sentences, and 26 (81.3%) agreed with a closely related statement about writing short sentences. Yet the pretest mean was 3.94 out of 10, and only 8 learners met the criterion for organization and coherence. The divergence illustrates why self-report and performance should not be treated as interchangeable. Confidence can support participation, but a learner may interpret can write more broadly than the assessment rubric does.

Familiarity with mapping was uneven. Eighteen learners (56.3%) agreed that they knew a bubble map, while 21 (65.6%) agreed that they understood mind mapping. The sizable undecided or negative responses justified explicit modeling rather than assuming prior competence. Teacher interviews reinforced the need: mind mapping was not part of routine practice, only one teacher reported prior mnemonic use, and both identified limitations in vocabulary and sentence formation.

Table 3

Selected baseline questionnaire results

Statement	Agree/strongly agree, n	%	Undecided, n	Disagree/strongly disagree, n
Learning English is useful	30	93.8	1	1
I can write simple sentences	21	65.6	6	5
I am confident my writing can improve	27	84.4	5	0
I like graphical representation of words	27	84.4	4	1
I know about bubble maps	18	56.3	11	3
I understand mind mapping	21	65.6	3	8



Statement	Agree/strongly agree, n	%	Undecided, n	Disagree/strongly disagree, n
Acronyms can help me write vocabulary	25	78.1	5	2

Note. N = 32. Percentages were recalculated from frequencies and rounded to one decimal; they may differ from the initial tabulation.

Paired total writing scores

All 32 learners had a complete score pair. The pretest mean was 3.94 (SD = 1.37), and the posttest mean was 6.81 (SD = 1.49). The mean paired increase was 2.88 points on the 10-point scale, 95% CI [2.34, 3.41]. The paired-samples test was statistically significant, $t(31) = 11.02$, $p < .001$, and the standardized mean change was large, $d_z = 1.95$.

The individual pattern was highly consistent: 30 learners improved, two were unchanged, and none had a lower posttest score. The median change was 3 points, with an interquartile range of 2 to 4 and an observed range of 0 to 6. The Wilcoxon signed-rank sensitivity analysis reached the same conclusion, $W = 0$, $p < .001$. The agreement between parametric and rank-based analyses indicates that the result was not driven solely by a small number of extreme changes.

Scores of 7 or higher were observed for 2 learners at pretest and 20 at posttest when recalculated from the participant-level data. The threshold itself was not linked to a validated proficiency standard, so it is reported only as a descriptive classroom benchmark.

Table 4
Paired writing-score summary

Statistic	Pretest	Posttest	Paired change
Mean (SD)	3.94 (1.37)	6.81 (1.49)	2.88 (1.48)
Median (IQR)	3.50 (3-5)	7.00 (6-8)	3.00 (2-4)
Observed range	2-7	3-10	0-6
Improved / unchanged / decreased	-	-	30 / 2 / 0
Mean-difference 95% CI	-	-	[2.34, 3.41]
Paired inference	-	-	$t(31) = 11.02$, $p < .001$; $d_z = 1.95$
Rank-based sensitivity	-	-	$W = 0$, $p < .001$



Note. N = 32 complete pairs; scale range 0-10. Cohen's dz uses the standard deviation of paired differences. Statistical significance does not resolve threats from the one-group design.

Writing-component attainment

Criterion attainment increased in all four reported components, but not uniformly. Grammar increased from 6 to 23 learners and spelling from 5 to 23. Organization and coherence increased from 8 to 21. Vocabulary increased only from 10 to 12. Expressed as percentage-point differences, the changes were +53.1 for grammar, +56.3 for spelling, +40.6 for organization/coherence, and +6.3 for vocabulary.

The pattern corresponds to the most immediate targets of the sequence. Modeled sentence frames and repeated attention to familiar present-simple forms may have supported grammar and spelling. Mind maps made the order and relation of ideas more visible, which may have assisted organization and coherence. Vocabulary showed the smallest change even though learners expressed high interest in acronyms. This difference is theoretically plausible: a brief cue can support recall of selected words, but broad lexical growth requires repeated encounters, retrieval, semantic elaboration, and contextual use across time (Nation, 2013).

Component results require caution because each percentage represented correct performance on one associated task or task set, not a validated subscale. The available data do not show whether the same individuals changed from incorrect to correct on each component. The large spelling and grammar shifts could reflect learning, practice with similar prompts, scoring leniency, or some combination of these factors.

Table 5

Criterion attainment by writing component

Component	Pretest n (%)	Posttest n (%)	Percentage-point change
Grammar	6 (18.8)	23 (71.9)	+53.1
Spelling	5 (15.6)	23 (71.9)	+56.3
Vocabulary	10 (31.3)	12 (37.5)	+6.3
Organization and coherence	8 (25.0)	21 (65.6)	+40.6

Note. N = 32 at each occasion. Percentages were recalculated from counts. Participant-level component pairings were unavailable, so no paired categorical tests were performed.

Teacher perspectives and mixed-methods integration

Teacher interviews identified three recurring instructional needs. First, limited vocabulary restricted the ideas learners could express. Second, word order, verb forms, and spelling interfered with simple-sentence production. Third, learners frequently



transferred first-language patterns or translated directly. Teachers reported group work and active methodologies, but mind maps were not routinely used and mnemonic experience was limited.

These observations converge descriptively with the pretest: the lowest criterion attainment occurred in spelling and grammar, and only one quarter met the organization/coherence criterion. They also help explain the intervention design. Acronyms and acrostics supplied retrieval cues, modeled sentences supplied linguistic frames, and maps externalized planning. However, convergence among sources collected in the same classroom does not eliminate common-method bias or establish that the intervention caused the observed change.

The modest vocabulary result is especially instructive. Learners liked graphical representations and expected acronyms to help, yet expectation was not matched by a large attainment increase. Mnemonic cues are selective: they can help retrieve rehearsed items, but a writer still needs meaning, collocation, grammatical behavior, and task-appropriate choice. Future lessons should revisit a smaller set of high-utility words across reading, speaking, retrieval practice, mapping, sentence construction, and delayed review.

Interpretation and pedagogical implications

The paired-score increase is large and unusually consistent for a short classroom intervention. The confidence interval indicates that the average change in this sample was unlikely to be trivial on the local 10-point scale. Nevertheless, a large within-group statistic is not equivalent to a causal effect. Without a comparison group, it cannot separate the program from maturation, ordinary English instruction, test familiarity, teacher expectations, changes in effort, or regression to the mean.

The most defensible instructional interpretation is that the four-activity sequence was feasible and coincided with improved performance on closely aligned classroom tasks. The design linked supports to successive stages of writing: retrieve, compose, organize, and communicate. This sequence is consistent with explicit strategy instruction, which works best when teachers model a process, provide guided practice, prompt reflection, and gradually release responsibility (Graham et al., 2016).

Mnemonic work should remain subordinate to communication. A cue is useful when it helps a learner access a word or rule while writing; it becomes unproductive when learners spend more effort inventing an acrostic than using the target language. Teachers can reduce this risk by providing a small set of high-value cues, checking that each learner



can explain the association, and immediately requiring sentence-level retrieval without the model.

Mind maps likewise need an explicit bridge to text. Learners can number branches in the order they will write, circle words that require checking, draw lines between related ideas, and cross out repetition. During drafting, each selected branch can become one sentence, after which the learner checks whether the subject, verb, and complement communicate the intended relation. In revision, the map and text can be compared to identify omitted or disconnected ideas.

Focused feedback is essential for beginning writers. One cycle might target capitalization and the verb *be*; another might target present-simple third-person forms or subject-verb order. The teacher can mark a limited number of recurring patterns, ask the learner to explain the correction, and require a revised sentence. Peer feedback can address meaning and order with simple prompts such as *What is the main idea?* and *Which sentence is unclear?* while the teacher retains responsibility for technical language guidance (Hyland & Hyland, 2019).

The program was designed for low-technology conditions, which strengthens its practical relevance. Paper maps, reusable word cards, mini-whiteboards, notebooks, and classroom dictionaries can support the entire sequence. Technology may add convenience, but it is not necessary for the core cognitive actions of selecting, organizing, retrieving, composing, and revising.

A longer instructional cycle should integrate mnemonics and mapping within a balanced writing curriculum. Learners need repeated writing for authentic audiences, exposure to model texts, explicit sentence construction, vocabulary growth, opportunities to plan and draft, and multiple feedback-revision cycles. Daily or frequent writing time is particularly important because isolated strategy demonstrations do not produce durable control (Graham et al., 2012).

Assessment should also be strengthened. Parallel prompts should elicit comparable but not repeated content. A complete analytic rubric should define each score level for grammar, vocabulary, spelling, organization, and coherence. Two trained raters should independently score a sample or all texts, with agreement reported before resolving discrepancies. Participant-level component scores should be retained so change can be modeled rather than reduced to aggregate percentages.

The study has several limitations beyond the absence of a comparison group. Convenience sampling and a single class restrict generalization. The teacher-researcher



likely delivered and scored the intervention, creating expectancy and rater-bias risks. Intervention duration was internally inconsistent, attendance and instructional minutes were not recorded, and test equivalence was not established. The same rubric was used at both occasions, but its reliability and category boundaries were not reported.

No delayed posttest examined retention or transfer to a new topic. The posttest was closely aligned with rehearsed personal-information and leisure content, so higher scores may partly represent task-specific learning. Component attainment was based on different prompts and lacked participant-level pairing. The survey was administered at baseline only, and the two teacher interviews did not provide an independent post-intervention measure.

A stronger replication could compare two intact classes receiving equal time and teacher attention. One class would receive the combined mnemonic-mapping sequence, while the other would receive conventional modeled writing or an alternative planning strategy. Parallel prompts should be counterbalanced; scoring should be blinded; the analysis should be preregistered; and a delayed transfer task should use unfamiliar but level-appropriate content. Such a design would clarify whether the combined approach adds value beyond practice and feedback alone.

CONCLUSIONS

Four classroom activities combining acronym and acrostic cues with paper-based mind maps were followed by higher A1-level EFL writing scores among 32 eighth-grade learners. The mean increased from 3.94 to 6.81 on a 10-point local scale, with a mean paired difference of 2.88 points. Thirty learners improved and two were unchanged. Grammar, spelling, and organization/coherence showed the largest descriptive increases; vocabulary changed comparatively little.

The evidence supports feasibility and a promising within-class pattern, not causal effectiveness. The intervention made retrieval and planning visible, and teacher reports identified needs that the activities directly addressed. At the same time, the one-group design, uncertain duration, closely aligned tests, teacher scoring, lack of reliability evidence, and absence of delayed transfer prevent a strong efficacy claim.

For practice, mnemonics should cue a small set of useful forms and immediately lead to meaningful sentence production. Mind maps should be used to select and sequence ideas, then checked against a draft. Focused teacher feedback, structured peer response, repeated retrieval, and revision should extend the sequence beyond a single exposure.



Future research should document instructional dosage, maintain complete participant-level component scores, use parallel prompts and an operational analytic rubric, blind at least two raters, include an active comparison condition, and measure delayed transfer. These safeguards would show whether the observed gains are durable and attributable to mnemonic and mind-mapping support rather than to repeated testing or ordinary classroom development.

REFERENCES

- Bellezza, F. S. (1981). Mnemonic devices: Classification, characteristics, and criteria. *Review of Educational Research*, 51(2), 247-275.
<https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543051002247>
- Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment - Companion volume. Council of Europe Publishing. <https://rm.coe.int/common-european-framework-of-reference-for-languages-learning-teaching/16809ea0d4>
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). SAGE.
- Davies, M. (2011). Concept mapping, mind mapping and argument mapping: What are the differences and do they matter? *Higher Education*, 62(3), 279-301.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-010-9387-6>
- Dunlosky, J., Rawson, K. A., Marsh, E. J., Nathan, M. J., & Willingham, D. T. (2013). Improving students' learning with effective learning techniques: Promising directions from cognitive and educational psychology. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 14(1), 4-58. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100612453266>
- Fiorella, L., & Mayer, R. E. (2016). Eight ways to promote generative learning. *Educational Psychology Review*, 28(4), 717-741. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-015-9348-9>
- Graham, S., Fitzgerald, J., Friedrich, L. D., Greene, K., Kim, J. S., & Olson, C. B. (2016). Teaching secondary students to write effectively (NCEE 2017-4002). National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/508_WWCPG_SecondaryWriting_122719.pdf
- Graham, S., Kiuahara, S. A., McKeown, D., & Harris, K. R. (2012). A meta-analysis of writing instruction for students in the elementary grades. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 104(4), 879-896. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029185>
- Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). A meta-analysis of writing instruction for adolescent students. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99(3), 445-476.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.99.3.445>
- Hyland, K. (2019). *Second language writing* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.



- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (Eds.). (2019). Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108635547>
- Kellogg, R. T. (2008). Training writing skills: A cognitive developmental perspective. *Journal of Writing Research*, 1(1), 1-26. <https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2008.01.01.1>
- Nation, I. S. P. (2013). Learning vocabulary in another language (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139858656>