The Effect of Interactive Writing on Jordanian EFL Sixth-Grade Students' Writing Skills

د. ديما حجازي(*)   أحمد طعاني

Abstract

This study aimed to reveal the effect of interactive writing on the writing skills of sixth-grade Jordanian students who learn English as a foreign language. A two-group, quasi-experimental design was used. The researcher randomly selected two full sections of sixth-grade students at Al-Hassan Bin Al-Haytham School for Boys. The experimental group consisted of 23 students in the first section, and the control group consisted of 23 students in the second section. To achieve the aim of the study, a pre-posttest of writing skills was designed. The experimental group was taught using interactive writing, while the control group was taught using the traditional teaching method suggested in the teacher's book. The results revealed that the students' writing skills were improved compared to the control group. In light of these results, the study recommends the use of interactive writing in various types of writing.

Keywords: Interactive Writing; Writing Skills.

الملخّص

أثر الكتابة التفاعلية على مهارات الكتابة لدى طلبة الصف السادس الأردنيين متعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية لغة أجنبية

هدفت هذه الدراسة الكشف عن أثر الكتابة التفاعلية على مهارات الكتابة لدى طلبة الصف السادس الأردنيين متعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية لغة أجنبية. تم استخدام مجموعتين وتصميم شبه تجريبي. قام الباحث باختيار شعبتين كاملتين من طلبة الصف السادس في مدرسة الحسن بن الهيثم للبنين بشكل عشوائي، حيث تكونت المجموعة التجريبية من 23 طالبا في الشعبة الأولى، وتكونت المجموعة الضابطة من 23 طالبا في الشعبة الثانية. لتحقيق الهدف من الدراسة، تم تصميم اختبار قبلي– بعدي لمهارات الكتابة. تم تدريس المجموعة التجريبية باستخدام الكتابة التفاعلية، بينما تم تدريس المجموعة الضابطة باستخدام طريقة التدريس التقليدية المقترحة في كتاب المعلم. كشفت النتائج بأن مهارات الكتابة لدى الطلبة تحسنت مقارنة بالمجموعة الضابطة. وفي ضوء هذه النتائج توصي الدراسة باستخدام الكتابة التفاعلية في مختلف أنواع الكتابة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الكتابة التفاعلية، مهارات الكتابة.

Introduction

Writing is necessary for learning. It is crucial since it is widely used in higher education and in the workplace. It is considered a means of communication between writers and readers in order to deliver messages resulting from both real-world events and imaginative works (fiction), so that readers can learn information or even interpret invitations through written communications (Ezza, Alhuqail, & Elhussain, 2019). Also, it is one of the four most useful language skills since writing-related tasks call for the use of other language skills, including speaking, listening, and reading (Beiler & Dewilde, 2020).

Writing skills go beyond merely the ability to write. Knowledge of research, planning and outlining, editing and revising, spelling and grammar, and organization are crucial components of the writing process (Kaplan, 2022). Additionally, they are communication activities because writing is not only a difficult series of steps but also a collection of processes for connecting students to the imagination and creation of the writer so that they can independently develop their writing skills, regardless of their academic levels (Kartika, Susilo, &Natsir, 2018).

Writing in the basic stage aims to give the learner the capacity to think in an organized way with regard to the sequence of elements, effective presentation, and connecting ideas to one another; to give the learner the capacity to construct the subject with regard to choosing the title; and to ensure that it is free from grammatical, spelling, and linguistic errors (Ministry of Education, 2006). In recent time, EFL teachers have demonstrated an increasing concern in learning how to support

the writing growth of their students. Interactive writing is one strategy for this kind of assistance.

Interactive writing is the collection of activities that improve students' engagement in writing and aid in their ability to pay attention to the specifics of letters, words, and their sounds as they collaborate with their teacher (Williams, 2017). Interactive writing is a great teaching and learning activity that can encourage strong links between reading and writing. Working together to co-create written texts is what interactive writing implies between the teacher and the students. "Sharing the pen" is the expression used to describe this cooperation. Students learn about the writing process through interactive writing by working together to develop and write while receiving guidance from their teacher (Wall, 2008).

"Sharing the pen" with the teacher is a key component of interactive writing, which is similar to shared writing in that it involves the teacher and students deciding on a message and working through the writing process together. Students will typically be asked to write a sentence based on a reading, conversation, or previous classroom experience. A responsive teaching decision that provides students with a scaffold in relation to their conceptions of print is choosing the precise point at which the students act as scribe (Pinnell & McCarrier, 1992). The purpose of applying it is to transfer the learned skills to students so that they can develop into independent writers, in addition to enhancing reading skills (Swartz, Klein, Shook, and Belt, 2001).

According to Kronberg (2014), interactive writing is an effective way for developing students and preparing them for independent writing, in addition to teaching fundamental skills.

There are various steps involved in interactive writing, including the three phases Jones (2008) identified: student and teacher discussion of the work, text structuring, and text reviewing. The teacher introduces fundamental writing skills during writing classes, and students practice them while sharing a pen. The teacher then talks with the students about the written text and negotiates with them.

Throughout the interactive writing lesson, a teacher can demonstrate print conventions, phonological skills, early reading strategies, and word structure. Students are typically in command of their writing, which improves their spelling proficiency. Students develop spelling patterns that are related to the phonics and decoding techniques they use for reading, reinforcing the relationship between the two skills. They learn to put words together by using letter connections, letter clusters, and sounds. Because the written work that students generate is read and reread numerous times during the course and even beyond, students are exposed to sight words and their word recognition improves. Both large and small groups of students can engage in interactive writing (Brotherton & Williams, 2002).

Using interactive writing is intended to help students develop the skills necessary to write independently and to support their reading skills (Swartz, Klein & Shook, 2001). Several writing techniques can be taught at once by the teacher thanks to it. The teacher exhorts his/her students to use punctuation, margins, and other writing tools. Additionally, in order for students to successfully enhance their writing skills, they must have an understanding of spelling, the correspondence between letters and their sounds, and all of the abovementioned (Brotherton& Williams, 2002).

Coloquit, Canabal, and Paderan (2020) asserted that interactive writing fosters an evenly distributed learning environment that provides low and intermediate achievers with great opportunities; it also increases their sense of leadership and confidence when writing in a foreign language; it establishes cooperative learning within the same and competing groups; and it allows students to learn effectively while also having a lot of fun. Both the learner's character and their writing production are benefited by the use of interactive writing.

Statement of the Problem

Based on the researcher's teaching experience as an EFL teacher for fifteen years in the basic stage in Jordan, he has noticed a common weakness in students' capacity to write sentences, paragraphs, and short stories successfully. Researchers (BaniYounis, 2016; Obeiah&Bataineh, 2016) have found that most of the Jordanian EFL students exhibit a very subpar level of writing proficiency. A variety of issues, including a limited vocabulary (Al-Khasawneh, 2010; Adas&Bakir, 2013), inefficient learning methods (Dewi, 2014), and little chances for practice (Adas&Bakir, 2013), were blamed for these deficiencies. Integrating an interactive writing strategy could improve students' writing skills to overcome this problem. In a similar vein, El-Salahat (2014) concluded thatthat interactive writing strategy had a beneficial impact and advised using it in the teaching and learning process.

Purpose of the Study

The current study's objective is to investigate how interactive writing may affect Jordanian EFL sixth-graders' writing skills.

Question of the Study

The purpose of the current study was to address the following research question:

- Are there any statistically significant differences at (α = 0.05) in the mean scores of the writing skills post-test between the Jordanian EFL sixth-grade students that can be attributed to instructional strategy (interactive writing vs. conventional instruction)?

Significance of the Study

The importance of the current study may lie in its potential to help Jordanian EFL sixth-graders improve their writing skills through interactive writing exercises. The study's findings might be useful to language teachers who want to encourage their students to overcome writing difficulties. The findings might also provide curriculum designers and policymakers with feedback on the usage of interactive writing and persuade them to consider including it in the EFL curriculum. The findings may also be useful for EFL supervisors, who may be inspired to support and enhance the use of interactive writing in their EFL teachers' classes by providing frequent training sessions or in-depth workshops. Additionally, the results reported in the current study may open new ventures for interested researchers as it is hoped to contribute to educational research.

Operational Definitions of Terms

In the current study, the following terms are defined as follows:

Writing Skills: Specific abilities which help writers put their thoughts into words in a meaningful form and to mentally interact with the message. They use written symbols to communicate ideas, thoughts, and feelings to other people.

(Yovie, 2019). In the current study, they are defined as the performance of the Jordanian sixth grade students in the writing skills post- test, which is prepared specifically for the purposes of this study. Sentence writing, paragraph writing, and short story writing are the writing skills that were chosen for this study based on the results of some chosen units studied in Action Pack 6.

Interactive Writing: It is an event in which the teacher and students participate in the production and writing of the text, in addition to sharing decisions (Swartz, Klein, & Shook, 2001).In this study, interactive writing is a collaborative writing experience in which teacher and students jointly compose and write texts. Not only do they share the decision about what they are going to write, they also share the duties of scribe. Sixth-grade students are taught to develop their writing skills using the interactive writing strategy.

Limitations of the Study

The following limitations apply to the current study's findings:

1. The study's generalizability is restricted to sixth-grade male students at Al-Hassan Bin Al-Haytham Basic School during the academic year 2022-2023. The results of this study can therefore be applicable to samples or situations with comparable characteristics.

2. The trial was only conducted for nine weeks. A longer time frame can produce different results.

3. Only sentences, paragraphs, and a short story are used to assess students' writing skills. various writing styles could produce various results.

Review of the Related Studies

The following studies, which the researcher acquired after reviewing educational research, are relevant to the investigation of interactive writing.

Beeding (2012) examined interactive writing in the teaching of eighth- grade students in Illinois, and its impact on their writing ability. The participants of the study were 205 students. The researcher divided them into two groups: experimental and control, the first was taught according to the interactive method, and the other was taught according to the usual conventional method. The findings revealed improvements in focus, support, and organization abilities as well as statistically significant differences in writing ability favoring the experimental group that received interactive writing instruction.

El-Salahat (2014) looked into how well the interactive writing strategy worked to improve the writing abilities and attitudes of seventh-graders in Gaza. Seventy-six students participated in the study. The data were gathered via a questionnaire and an achievement test. The results demonstrated that there were statistically significant differences between the experimental group's students and the control group's students, with the experimental group's students benefiting from instruction that was interactive in writing. The results also demonstrated that the experimental group's students had good views of the interactive writing strategy taught during writing lessons.

Jones (2015) investigated how methods of writing instruction contribute to kindergarten students' acquisition of foundational and compositional early writing skills. The participants were 112 males and females in kindergarten. A pre-

and post-test was used to collect the data. The study attempted to reveal the effect of three teaching methods: interactive writing and writing workshops for the two experimental groups, and the regular way for the control group. The results of the study showed that there were statistically significant differences in favor of the two teaching methods (interactive writing and writing workshops).

Isnaeni (2016) examined students' descriptive text writing skills in the second grade of SMPN 1 and determined whether interactive writing strategies affected their descriptive text writing skills. The study included 119 students in second grade. To collect data, a pre-/post-test was used. The findings showed that the interactive writing strategy may be used as a substitute for traditional writing instruction because it allows students to take part in the composition and construction of the text by exchanging pens with the teacher. It also builds on each student's unique writing abilities to help students understand and become more engaged in learning activities, particularly writing activities.

Sukmana (2017) investigated if there is a discernible difference in writing abilities between students who receive collaborative writing instruction and those who receive interactive writing instruction, as well as whether collaborative writing is more effective than interactive writing for teaching writing. Participants included 68 male and female students who were split into two groups: experimental (34), which received collaborative writing instruction, and (34) control group, which received interactive writing instruction. To collect data, a pre-/post-test was used. The findings demonstrated that the experimental group, which received collaborative writing

instruction, has writing skills that were statistically different from those of the control group.

Zurcher (2018) looked into how writing workshops and interactive writing affected students' performance and writing processes. The study included 26 kindergarten students. To collect data, a pre-/post-test was used. The study's conclusions showed that both writing workshops and interactive writing can be successfully implemented in preschool classrooms by empowering emerging writers and offering them opportunity to create.

Al-Rwaily and Khdair (2019) looked into how interactive writing strategies could help fourth-grade students in Saudi Arabia perform better when writing stories. Thirty-four male students were the study's participants. Participants in the experimental group were taught how to write stories using an interactive writing style, while those in the control group were instructed using more traditional methods. The training consisted of two sessions each week for a total of six weeks, with each session lasting at least an hour. The findings revealed statistically significant differences in favor of the experimental group for both collective and individual narrative writing abilities.

Majed and Muhammad (2020) investigated the effectiveness of interactive writing strategies in teaching writing to EFL prep school students and their views toward it were both examined. Ninety-one students from Al-Tuz city's fifth grade participated in the study. The control group received traditional instruction whereas the experimental group received writing instruction using the interactive writing style. An achievement pre-/post-test and a questionnaire were used to gather the data. On the post-test of writing skills, the results showed a significant

difference between the mean scores of the experimental group and those of the control group, favoring the experimental group. The results also revealed that the experimental group's students had good views of the interactive writing strategy taught during writing lessons.

Coloquit, Canabal, and Paderan (2020) determined the effectiveness of interactive writing strategy in intensifying basic writing skills to produce competent students. This study also sought to address the predicament of students' and students' low-level proficiency in basic writing. The participants of the study were 20 second year Bachelor of Secondary Education major in English of the University of Nueva Caceres in the Philippines. Data were gathered using a pre- and post-test. The study showed that there was an improvement in the writing proficiency of the students using the interactive writing strategy. Moreover, this result was utilized to continuously strengthen and amplify student's basic writing skills.

Concluding Remarks

Numerous studies (e.g., Beeding,2012; El-Salahat, 2014; Jones, 2015; Isnaeni, 2016; Zurcher, 2018; Al-Rwaily& Khdair, 2019; Majed& Muhammad, 2020; Coloquit, Canabal, &Paderan, 2020) have demonstrated the value and effectiveness of interactive writing as a teaching strategy. A few studies that looked at how interactive writing affects college and high school students' writing skills were also made public. However, earlier studies showed that interactive writing considerably enhanced the writing skills of EFL students. They also wanted to look at how students felt about interactive writing as a way to improve writing skills. This study varies from earlier studies in that it looked at how interactive writing affected the writing skills of

male sixth-grade students at a public school. This study seeks to fill a gap in the literature on this topic.

Method and Procedures

Design and Variables of the Study

In this current study, a quasi-experimental design was employed. The independent variable was interactive writing. The dependent variable was the outcomes of the students' post-test on their writing skills. The experimental group received instruction through interactive writing, whereas the control group received instruction through the teacher's suggested conventional teaching methods.

Participants of the Study

The participants were conveniently selected from Al-Hassan Bin Al-Haytham Basic School for Boys, a public school, First Directorate of Education in Irbid, for the second semester of the academic year 2022/2023. The researcher has spent the last two years working at the school, hence it was especially picked for this study. The administration of the school gave the researcher access to its resources as well.

Two complete sections from the school's three sections were randomly selected to participate in the study. After the names of the three sections were placed in a basket, only two of them were randomly selected to take part in the current study. A coin flip was used to determine which of the two 23-student groups would act as the experimental group and which group would act as the control group. The experimental group was taught through interactive writing, whereas the control group

received instruction using a conventional method based on the Teacher's Book.

Research Instrument

The pre and post writing skills test was designed to achieve the goal of the study. An explanation of the instrument is provided below:

The Pre/Post-test for Writing Skills

The pre-post writing test was designed by the researcher; students had to write a brief paragraph, complete the sentences, and write a short story. To identify how writing skills should be taught, assessed, and then given by the teacher, a content analysis of the Action Pack 6 units (9, 10, reviews 3, 11, 12, 13, 14, and review 4) was completed.

The pre-test's objectives were to evaluate the students' writing skills and ascertain whether or not the experimental and control groups were equivalent. The impact of interactive writing was assessed using a post-test at the conclusion of the instructional program, which was adjusted for the results of the pre-test.

The Writing Scoring Rubric

The students' writing skills were marked by the researcher employing Anderson (2003:92) scoring rubric which consists of five sub-skills: ideas and development, organization, vocabulary, sentence structures, and mechanics (spelling, capitalization, and punctuation).

Table 1: The Writing Scoring Rubric (Anderson, 2003:92)

No	Criterion	Descriptions	Score
1	Ideas and Development	a. topic needs to be developed	1
		b. focus needs to be expanded and supporting details are needed	2

		c. informative with clear focus	3
		d. informative with clear focus and supporting details	4
2	Organization	a. organization is needed	1
		b. little organization; needs transitions	2
		c. has a beginning, middle, and end	3
		d. very well organized; easy to read	4
3	Vocabulary	a. Inappropriate and incorrect word choice	1
		b. Limited and redundant words; using simple words	2
		c. Words are logical and almost related to the topic	3
		d. Excellent, appropriate, and effective use of vocabulary	4
4	Sentence Structure	a. Persistent spelling, capitalization, grammatical, and punctuation mistakes	1
		b. Misusing norms with many mistakes	2
		c. Repeating errors that render the text incomprehensible	3
		d. Readable text although with certain mistakes	4
5	Mechanics (Spelling, Capitalization, and Punctuation)	a. Having serious errors	1
		b. Unsuitable, wrong, or ambiguous inconsistency	2
		c. Using words in a vague, repetitive, faulty manner	3
		d. Minor grammatical mistakes not affecting meaning	4

Reliability and Construct Validity of the Writing Skills Test

The test was piloted using a sample of 20 students who were not included in the study's sample in order to assess the internal consistency (construct validity) of students' performance on the test. Then, the sub-skill score

and the total score of the entire test were correlated using the Pearson Correlation Coefficient, and the corrected item total correlation between the sub-skill score and the total score of its type was correlated using the Pearson Correlation Coefficient. Table 2 illustrates the results.

Table 2: Summary Results of Correlation Analysis (Internal consistency)

Skills of Writing	Sub-skills	Pearson Correlation Coefficient between the sub-skill score and the total score of		Corrected item-total correlation between the sub-skill score and the total score of its level
		its type	the whole test	
A paragraph writing	1	.66**	.58**	.52
	2	.62**	.61**	.54
	3	.83**	.80**	.75
	4	.79**	.81**	.77
	5	.71**	.63**	.56
Sentences writing	1	.59**	.95**	.43
	2	.60**	.49**	.49
	3	.81**	.55**	.77
	4	.86**	.80**	.72
	5	.68**	.76**	.59
A short story writing	1	.67**	.65**	.55
	2	.74**	.92**	.58
	3	.84**	.61**	.725
	4	.87**	.64**	.79
	5	.75**	.77**	.66

* Significant at p < 0.05

**Significant at p < 0.01

The Pearson Correlation Coefficient between the sub-score and the total score of its kind, the sub-score and the total score of

the overall test, is shown in Table 2 to be statistically significant (i.e., the values are higher than 0.35). Between item sub-skills and the overall score of this type, the corrected item-total correlation is higher than the cutoff value (0.40). According to these findings, the internal consistency of the writing skills test is adequate (Leach et al., 2011).

To evaluate the reliability of the writing test, Cronbach Alpha coefficients and test-retest approach with two weeks between them was used. Table 3 illustrates the results.

Table 3: Cronbach Alpha Coefficients and Test-retest Coefficient for Each Skill of Writing and Overall Writing Test

Writing Skills	Alpha Coefficient	Test-retest Coefficient
A paragraph writing	.77	.78
Sentences writing	.75	.83
A short story writing	.82	.80
Overall	.92	.88

In Table 3, the Cronbach Alpha Coefficients for a paragraph writing, sentences writing, and a short story writing were .77, .75, and .82, respectively. It was calculated to be .92 for the entire scale, and all above the cut-off value .70 (Cronbach, 1951). Furthermore, the test-retest coefficients for a paragraph writing, sentences writing, and a short story writing were .78, .83, and .80, respectively. It was calculated to be .88 for the entire scale, and all above the cut-off value .70 (Cronbach, 1951).

Interactive Writing-Based Instructional Program

To help participants improve their writing skills and achieve the goal of the study, the researcher created an

interactive writing-based instructional program. In order to promote interactive writing among participants in the experimental group, the researcher additionally modified the writing assignments for units (9, 10, reviews 3, 11, 12, 13, and review 4).

This instructional program was created to give Jordanian EFL students in the sixth- grade the opportunity to improve their writing skills by utilizing interactive writing, which may help students write more effectively and quickly and inspire them to keep learning. The research focuses on the writing skills of EFL students. The instructional program was designed to provide Jordanian sixth-grade EFL students with practical experience to develop their writing skills through the use of interactive writing.

Objectives of the Instructional Program

The interactive writing-based instructional program for sixth-grade students' writing skills aimed to:

1. improving sixth-grade students' writing skills along the five sub-skills: ideas and development, organization, vocabulary, sentence structures, and mechanics of writing (spelling, capitalization, and punctuation).

2. raising awareness of the need for improving writing skills.

3. engaging them in different writing activities.

4. giving equal opportunities to all students to produce without fear of errors.

5. encouraging them to improve their writing skills through group discussions.

6. motivating them to write on different topics using worksheets.

7. writing with correct spelling, punctuation, and capitalization.

8. writing structured sentences.

9. using text features to summarize a story/text.

10. linking sentences into short paragraphs.

11. writing simple sentences, a short paragraph, and a short story.

Duration of the Instructional Program

This instructional program lasted for nine weeks. The writing activities of units (9, 10, reviews 3, 11, 12, 13, 14, and review 4) of Action Pack 6 were redesigned in light of using interactive writing. The writing activities of each unit were alienated into 45-minute sessions for nine weeks.

The Instructional Material

Action Pack 6 Student's Book and Activity Book's writing units (9, 10, reviews 3, 11, 12, 13, and 14) and their associated writing skills served as the foundation for the instructional materials used in this study. To include interactive writing for the participants in the experimental group, the researcher altered these skills. In this study, the teacher sets the task and the students prepare for what they will write. Then the students do the task such as writing sentences, paragraphs, or a short story. The teacher gives the students feedback and follow up work.

Procedures for Designing and Implementing the Instructional Program

To implement the current program, the following procedures were carried out:

1. Recognizing the writing skills in Action Pack 6, units (9, 10, reviews 3, 11, 12, 13, and review 4).

2. Identifying the writing skills in Action Pack 6, Student and Activity Books where interactive writing can be used.

3. Adjusting these skills in light of interactive writing.

4. Outlining the steps that must be taken for each lesson.

5. Setting aside appropriate time for each activity.

6. Testing the writing skills of the experimental and control groups before introducing the targeted interactive writing.

7. Introducing the experimental group to the focused interactive writing.

8. After instructing students in interactive writing, teaching them the intended writing skills.

9. Conducting a post-test following the program's deployment to evaluate the students' writing skills.

Validity of the Instructional Program

To ensure the program's validity, the researcher presented it to a group of English curriculum and teaching experts. The jury was requested to evaluate the course materials and provide any feedback or criticisms they might have for the researcher regarding the program that was made available. The researcher made the changes as instructed.

Teaching Methods for the Two Study Groups
Teaching the Experimental Group

1. The teacher divided the students into groups to cooperate and write.

2. The teacher facilitates a conversation with students about their shared experience as they shape sentences they will later take to print.

3. The teacher facilitates a conversation with students to develop a sentence, short paragraph, and short story.

4. Students repeat what they will write several times before beginning to write.

5. The teacher and students "share the pen".

6. Students write as much as possible.

7. The teacher asks students to reread what has been written.

8. Students revisit text to support word solving.

9. Students can follow the three writing stages and practice writing skills. In pre-writing stage, the teacher sets the task and the students prepare for what they will write. In the while-writing stage, the students do the task such as writing sentences, paragraphs, or a short story. And in the post-writing stage, the teacher gives the students feedback and follow up work.

10. At the end of the interactive writing experience, the teacher goes over some salient learning points with the students and summarizes the lesson to reinforce what has been learned.

11. Students illustrate the topic.

12. The teacher makes copies to be read and reread.

Teaching the Control Group

The control group was taught according to the Teacher's Book; Action Pack 6.

1-The teacher taught the writing exercises in accordance with the instructions in the Teacher's Book.

2. The students were informed by the teacher that they must write about the chosen topic.

3. The teacher reviewed some of the knowledge and terminology students have already mastered using the brainstorming technique.

4. The teacher added information to the board.

5. The teacher watched over and assisted students as necessary.

6. Each student completed his simple questions, a short paragraph, and a short story on his own, either in class or at home.

7. Students read the paragraphs they wrote.

Results

The researcher used the subsequent procedures to respond to the study question:

1. For the experimental and control groups, the means and standard deviations of the pre- and post-test scores in the three types of writing (paragraph writing, sentence writing, and story writing) overall were calculated.

Table 4: Means and Standard Deviations of the Overall Three Types of Writing

Group	Pre-test		Post-test	
	*Mean	S.D	*Mean	S.D
Experimental	13.55	1.85	47.74	7.14
Control	14.35	2.01	37.39	9.29
Total	**13.95**	**1.95**	**42.57**	**9.72**

*The total score is 60

Table 4 indicates that for all three types of writing, the experimental group's mean score (Mean = 47.74) is higher than the control group's mean score (Mean = 37.39).

A one-way analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was carried out, as shown in Table 5, to determine whether the teaching

strategy (interactive writing vs. conventional instruction) had a statistically significant impact on all three types of writing as a whole.

Table 5: Results of One-Way ANCOVA for the Effect of the Teaching Strategy on the Overall Three Types of Writing

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Pre-test (Covariate)	1272.578	1	1272.578	31.317	.000	.421
Teaching Strategy	1501.304	1	1501.304	36.945	.000	.462
Error	1747.335	43	40.636			
Total	87594.000	46				
Corrected Total	4251.304	45				

Table 5 demonstrates, after controlling for the pre-test data' bias in favor of the experimental group, a statistically significant difference between the two groups in the overall three types of writing. The teaching strategy explained 46.2% of the variance in the three types of writing, according to the partial eta squared value of (.462).

The means, standard errors, and standard deviations of the overall writing skills of the two groups were also calculated, both before and after adjusting for the overall pre-test results. The results are shown in Table 6.

Table 6: Adjusted and Unadjusted Means of the Overall Three Types of Writing

Group	Unadjusted Mean		Adjusted Mean	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	Std. Error
Experimental	47.74	7.14	48.31	1.33
Control	37.39	9.29	36.82	1.33

After adjusting for the variations in pre-test scores, Table 6 explains the observed differences between the two groups in the overall three types of writing post-performance. As a result,

using interactive writing improved all three types of writing produced by the experimental group after performances.

2. The means and standard deviations of the pre- and post-test results for the three types of writing (paragraph, sentence, and story writing) were calculated and are displayed in Table 7.

Table 7: Means and Standard Deviations of the Pre-Test and Post-Test Per-Level in the Three Types of Writing

Types of Writing	Group	Maximum score	Pre-test		Post-test	
			Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D
a Paragraph Writing	Experimental	20	9.74	2.51	15.96	2.38
	Control		10.57	3.76	12.43	3.44
Sentences Writing	Experimental	20	9.48	2.50	15.70	2.38
	Control		9.70	3.14	12.04	3.46
A Short Story writing	Experimental	20	10.17	3.38	16.09	2.83
	Control		11.00	3.37	12.91	3.13

Table 7 demonstrates that for each of the three types of writing, the post-test scores of the experimental groups are higher than the mean scores of the control group.

A one-way multivariate analysis of covariance (one-way MANCOVA) was performed using a multivariate test (Hoteling's Trace) to determine the effect of the teaching strategy (interactive writing vs. conventional instruction) on the linear combination of the three types of writing post-performance, as shown in Table 8.

Table 8: Results of Multivariate Test (Hoteling's' Trace) for the Effect of the Teaching Strategy on the Three Types of Writing

Effect	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
The Teaching Strategy	.518	12.093	3.000	39.000	.000	.482

Table 8 demonstrates that the teaching strategy's major effect was significant. This suggests that there are differences between the two groups' student performances in a linear combination of all three types of writing. The partial eta square value of (.482) shows that the teaching strategy is responsible for 48.2% of the variance in the linear combination of the three types

of writing. A follow-up univariate analysis (Follow-up ANCOVAs): Tests of between-subject effects) was carried out because the teaching strategy's impact is substantial, as can be shown in Table 9.

Table 9: The Effect of the Teaching Strategy on the Three Types of Writing (Per-level) after Controlling the Effect of Pre-Test Scores

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Covariate-1	Paragraph	.035	1	.035	.007	.935	.000
Covariate-2	Sentences	31.152	1	31.152	5.515	.024	.119
Covariate-3	Story	46.289	1	46.289	7.606	.009	.156
Teaching Strategy	Paragraph	169.283	1	169.283	33.444	.000	.449
	Sentences	162.456	1	162.456	28.762	.000	.412
	Story	149.770	1	149.770	24.608	.000	.375
Error	Paragraph	207.528	41	5.062			
	Sentences	231.584	41	5.648			
	Story	249.530	41	6.086			
Corrected Total	Paragraph	527.239	45				
	Sentences	541.217	45				
	Story	507.500	45				

Three types of writing showed statistically significant differences between the two groups in favor of the experimental group, as shown in Table 9. According to the partial eta squared values of .449,.412, and.375, the teaching strategy explained 44.9%, 41.2%, and 37.5% of the variance in writing sentences, paragraphs, and short stories, respectively. As a result, writing sentences, short stories, and paragraphs all benefited the most from the instructional strategy.

3. For each of the five paragraph writing sub-skills, the means and standard deviations of the pre- and post-test scores were calculated, as shown in Table 10.

Table 10: Means and Standard Deviations of the Pre-Test and Post-Test Per- the Five Sub-Skills of Paragraph Writing

A Paragraph Writing Sub-Skills	Group	Maximum score	Pre-test		Post-test	
			Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D
Ideas and Development	Experimental	4	1.78	.74	3.22	.67
	Control		1.83	.89	2.39	.89
Organization	Experimental	4	2.13	.97	3.30	.76
	Control		2.35	.88	2.78	.74
Vocabulary	Experimental	4	1.83	.78	3.00	.95
	Control		2.09	1.00	2.26	.75
Sentence Structure	Experimental	4	1.91	.73	2.96	.93
	Control		2.17	1.03	2.43	.99
Mechanics (Spelling, Capitalization, and Punctuation)	Experimental		2.09	1.00	3.48	.79
	Control	4	2.13	.81	2.57	1.04

Table 10 demonstrates that in five sub-skills of paragraph writing (ideas and development, organization, vocabulary, sentence structure, and mechanics (spelling, capitalization, and punctuation)), the post-test scores of the experimental groups are higher than the mean scores of the control group.

After adjusting for the pre-test effects, a one-way multivariate analysis of covariance (one-way MANCOVA) and a multivariate test (Hoteling's Trace) were used to examine the effects of the teaching strategy (interactive writing vs. conventional instruction) on the linear combination of the five sub-skills of paragraph writing. The results are shown in Table 11.

Table 11: Results of Multivariate Test (Hoteling's' Trace) for the Effect of Teaching Strategy on Five Sub-Skills of Paragraph Writing

Effect	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Teaching Strategy	.865	6.057	5.000	35.000	.000	.464

Table 11 demonstrates that the teaching strategy's primary impact was substantial. This demonstrates that there are differences in how well the students in the two groups perform when the subskills necessary to compose five paragraphs are combined linearly. The five paragraph writing sub-skills were integrated in a linear combination, and the partial eta square value of.464 shows that the teaching strategy accounted for 46.4% of the variance. The outcomes of a follow-up univariate analysis (Follow-up ANCOVAs: Tests of between-subject effects) are displayed in Table 12 as a result of the teaching strategy's significant influence.

Table 12: The Effect of the Teaching Strategy on Five Sub-Skills of Paragraph Writing after Controlling the Effect of Pre-Test Scores

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Covariate- S1	Ideas and Development	3.383	1	3.383	6.076	.018	.135
Covariate- S2	Organization	1.543	1	1.543	2.710	.108	.065
Covariate- S3	Vocabulary	.150	1	.150	.245	.623	.006
Covariate- S4	Sentence Structure	6.102	1	6.102	10.045	.003	.205

Covariate-S5	Mechanics	.479	1	.479	.812	.373	.020
	Ideas and Development	8.177	1	8.177	14.686	.000	.274
Teaching Strategy	Organization	3.655	1	3.655	6.417	.015	.141
	Vocabulary	7.560	1	7.560	12.333	.001	.240
	Sentence Structure	6.027	1	6.027	9.921	.003	.203
	Mechanics	11.844	1	11.844	20.072	.000	.340
	Ideas and Development	21.713	39	.557			
Error	Organization	22.213	39	.570			
	Vocabulary	23.908	39	.613			
	Sentence Structure	23.691	39	.607			
	Mechanics	23.012	39	.590			
	Ideas and Development	35.239	45				
Corrected Total	Organization	27.913	45				
	Vocabulary	38.717	45				
	Sentence Structure	43.739	45				
	Mechanics	46.978	45				

According to Table 12, there were five sub-skills of paragraph writing where there were statistically significant differences between the two groups, favoring the experimental group. The teaching strategy explained 27.4%, 14.1%, 24.0%, 20.3%, and 34.0% of the variance in ideas and development, organization, vocabulary, sentence structure, and mechanics, respectively, according to the partial eta squared values of.274,.141,.240,.203, and.340. As a result, the mechanics sub-skills had the greatest impact from the teaching strategy, which was then followed by ideas and development, vocabulary, sentence structure, and organization sub-skills.

Discussion

The results demonstrated that the experimental group's writing skills were statistically significantly different from those of the other participants. This is an illustration of how interactive writing may enhance participants' writing skills. In light of this, it can be said that interactive writing improved students in the experimental group in terms of all five writing sub-skills.

These results are relevant to the superiority of interactive writing and are in line with those of previous studies, such as those conducted by Beeding (2012), El-Salahat (2014), Jones (2015), Isnaeni (2016),Zurcher (2018), Al-Rwaily and Khdair (2019), Majed and Muhammad (2020), andColoquit, Canabal, and Paderan (2020). These studies showed that interactive writing is a useful teaching strategy for improving students' writing skills. All studies confirmed that interactive writing is useful and successful as a teaching strategy except Sukmana (2017) which showed that collaborative writing is more effective than interactive writing. The results of the study showed that interactive writing significantly improved the students' writing skills.

It's possible that interactive writing helped the experimental group of students' post-test writing skills in general and their performance on the five writing sub-skills for a variety of reasons. An interactive writing-based instructional program's structure may be one of its most important elements. To do this, a carefully planned interactive writing-based instructional program was created. The themes were well chosen, the writing skills were attentively created, and the time allowed was sufficient. They were brief and well-organized to help students come up with more intriguing subjects.

Another factor that might have helped students develop their writing skills is the fact that interactive writing encouraged collaborative work. By highlighting individual differences, interactive writing enhanced students' cooperation to finish assignments. The curriculum was designed with activities that are suitable for both individual and group work as a consequence, in order to help students, become more interested in the content they write. Instead of only listening to the teacher, students were able to learn more by actively participating in interactive writing.

Interactive writing encourages an evenly distributed learning environment that offers great opportunities for low and intermediate achievers, increases students' leadership skills and confidence in their ability to write in a foreign language, establishes cooperative learning within the same and competing groups, and enables students to learn effectively while also having a lot of fun. Additionally, interactive writing produces positive results for students' writing productivity as well as their character, which might inspire them to pursue their future goals. Therefore, the use of interactive writing by teachers is strongly recommended throughout the entire writing process. Teachers should also provide direction, assistance, corrective comments, and written feedback.

Conclusion

The following conclusions were drawn after the study's findings were discussed:

1. An instructional program focused on interactive writing improved the participants' writing skills and engagement in class activities.

2. When interactive writing was employed in the classroom, especially during writing skills courses, student involvement increased.

3. Interactive writing as a teaching strategy enhanced student performance on the post-test compared to the pre-test, demonstrating that it has a positive impact on the teaching/learning process and broadens the subject matter covered in the MOE textbook.

Recommendations

Following are some recommendations made in light of the study's findings:

1. The current instructional program should be used by EFL teachers to help students develop their writing skills and to foster interaction, communication, and the acceptance of feedback from peers and the teacher.

2. Teachers should be trained and prepared to use interactive writing in their classroom instruction, thus the ministry of education is recommended to train them by hosting seminars and workshops.

3. According to the designers of EFL textbooks, interactive writing exercises ought to be a part of the English language curriculum, particularly for grade six. Teaching EFL writing skills is now more engaging and entertaining thanks to this strategy.4. Researchers are encouraged to carry out various studies to look at how interactive writing affects other grades.

References

Adas, D., &Bakir, A. (2013). Writing Difficulties and New Solutions: Blended Learning as an Approach to Improve Writing Abilities. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 3*(9), 254-266.

Al-Khasawneh, F. (2010). Writing for Academic Purposes: Problems Faced by Arab Postgraduate Students of the Collage of Business, UUM.*ESL World, 9*(2), 1-23.

Al-Rwaily, M., & Khdair, R. (2019). The Effect of Interactive Writing Strategy on Improving the Performance of Fourth Grade Primary Students' Story Writing Skills in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.*UGJEPS, 28*(3), 514-534.

BaniYounis, R. (2016). *The Effect of a Teacher Training Program Based on Dictogloss on Improving Jordanian EFL Learners' Writing Performance.*Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation.Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan.

Beiler, I., &Dewilde, J. (2020). Translation as Translingual Writing Practice in English as an Additional Language.*Modern Language Journal, 104*(3), 533–549.

Brotherton, S., & Williams, C. (2002). Interactive Writing Instruction in a First Grade Title I Literacy Program. *Journal of Reading Education, 27*(3), 8-19.

Coloquit, L., Canabal, L., &Paderan, M. (2020). Improving Students' English Writing Proficiency through Interactive Writing Technique. *Journal of English Education and Linguistics, 1*(1), 72-81.

Dewi, R. (2014). Teaching Writing through Dictogloss.*Indonesian Journal of English Education, 1*(1), 65-76.

El-Salahat, H. (2014). *The Effectiveness of Using Interactive Writing Strategy on Developing Writing Skills among 7th graders and their Attitudes towards Writing*. Unpublished Master Thesis.Islamic University. Gaza.

Ezza, E., Alhuqail, E., &Elhussain, S. (2019). Technology-based Instructional Intervention into an EFL Writing Classroom. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences, 14*(4), 507–519.

Isnaeni, U. (2016). *The Influence of Using Interactive Writing Technique on Students' Writing Ability in Writing Descriptive Text at The Second Grade of SMPN 1 Awangpone.* Unpublished Doctoral dissertation.Universities Islam Negeri Aladdin Makassar.

Jones, C. (2008). *The Effects of Interactive Writing Instruction on Kindergarten Student's Acquisition of Early Reading Skills*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Utah State University.

Jones, C. (2015). Effects of Writing Instruction on Kindergarten Students' Writing Achievement: An experimental Study. *Journal of Educational Research, 108*(1), 35-44.

Kaplan, Z. (2022). What are Writing Skills? Forage.

Kartika, A., Susilo, S., &Natsir, M. (2018).The Effect of Silent Short Movie on EFL Writing Achievement of Vocational High School Students.*Proceedings of the 2017 International Conference on Education and Technology (2017 ICEdu Tech), 7*(2), 168–179.

Kroneberg, E. (2014). *The Advantages and Challenges of Using Interactive Writing in Writer's Workshop.*Unpublished Master Thesis, Westminster College, Utah.

Majed, N., & Muhammad, Z. (2020). The Effectiveness of Interactive Writing Strategy in Teaching Writing to EFL Preparatory School Students and their Attitudes Towards Writing. *Journal of Tikrit University for Humanities, 27*(3), 27-57.

Ministry of Education in Jordan. (2006). *General Guidelines and General and Specific outcomes for the English Language*. Jordan, Amman.

Obeiah, S., &Bataineh, R. (2016). The Effect of Portfolio-based Assessment on Jordanian EFL Learners' Writing Performance.*Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature, 9*(1), 32-46.

Pinnell, G., &McCarrier, A. (1992). *Interactive Writing: A Transition Tool for Assisting Children in Learning to Read and Write*. Martha L. King Language and Literacy Center.

Sukmana, A. (2017). *A Comparative Study between Collaborative Writing and Interactive Writing in Teaching Writing*.Unpublished Master Thesis, SebelasMaret University.

Swartz, S., Klein, A., & Shook, R. (2001). *Interactive Writing &Interactive Editing: Making Connections between Writing and Reading*. London. DominiePress, Incorporated.

Swartz, S., Klein, A., Shook, R., & Belt, M. (2001). Interactive Writing & Interactive Editing: Making Connections Between Writing and Reading. Carlsbad, CA: Dominie Press.

Wall, H. (2008). Interactive Writing beyond the Primary Grades. *The Reading Teacher, 62*(2), 149-152.

Williams. C. (2017). Learning to Write with Interactive Writing Instruction.*The Reading Teacher, 71*(5), 523–532.

Yovie, R. (2019). *The Use of Estafet Writing Method to Improve the Students Writing Ability at the Eleventh Grade of SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Ponorogo*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Universities MuhammadiyahPonorogo.

Zurcher, M. (2018). *Instructing Preschool Writers: Interactive Writing and the Writing Workshop*. Ball State University.