

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.20574258

THE IMPACT OF A STRUCTURED SEQUENTIAL WRITING PROCEDURE ON COLLABORATIVE WRITING COMPETENCE OF IRAQI EFL FOURTH PREPARATORY SCHOOL LEARNERS

Radhwan Ali Baiee and Kadhim Muhammad Musa AlShammari²^{1,2}University of Babylon, Collage of Basic EducationReceived: 04/04/2026
Accepted: 20/05/2026Corresponding Author: Radhwan Ali Baiee
(bas855.rdhwan.ali@student.uobabylon.edu.iq)

ABSTRACT

Writing is one of the most difficult skills for the learners of English as a foreign language (EFL) as it involves the combination of linguistic knowledge, cognitive organization and communication skills. Iraqi EFL preparatory school learners are likely to experience problems in idea generation, structuring written texts, and in collaborative writing activities. Hence, the present study aimed to examine the effect of Structured Sequential Writing Procedure on the collaborative writing competence of Iraqi EFL fourth preparatory school students. The study was designed as quasi-experimental with a pretest-posttest control group design. The experiment was carried out from October 15, 2025, to January 7, 2026. Sixty learners from Al-Imam Ali Preparatory School in Babylon Governorate, Iraq, participated in the study and were equally assigned to an experimental group and a control group. The experimental group was instructed using the Structured Sequential Writing Procedure while the control group was instructed using the traditional method. A collaborative writing achievement test was given as a pretest and posttest. Cronbach's alpha was used to determine the reliability of the instrument, and the results were .79 and .89. The results showed no statistically significant differences between the two groups in the pretest. The results of the posttest, however, showed a statistically significant difference in favor of the experimental group, $t(58) = 7.09$, $p < .05$. The effect size was large (Cohen's $d = 1.83$) which showed the effectiveness of the instructional procedure in improving the learners' collaborative writing competence.

KEYWORDS: Structured Sequential Writing Procedure, Collaborative Writing Competence, EFL Writing Instruction, Iraqi EFL Learners, Writing Proficiency.

1. INTRODUCTION

Writing is regarded as one of the most complex skills in the learning of English as a foreign language (EFL) because it involves a combination of linguistic knowledge, cognitive organization and communicative competence. Writing is a more complex process than speaking, requiring careful planning, idea generation, grammatical accuracy, vocabulary selection, and logical organization of information to create meaningful written texts. For this reason, it is very hard for many EFL learners to develop good writing skills (Hyland, 2003).

In the current educational landscape, writing is an important skill that is increasingly used in academic and work-related communication. Students should be able to communicate clearly to present arguments in a coherent manner and communicate effectively in written discourse. Thus, improving students' writing ability has been one of the major aims in English language teaching (ELT) (Harmer, 2004).

Writing is an important skill in L2 acquisition process, but it is still a problem for many Iraqi EFL learners. Students often have trouble with vocabulary, grammatical mistakes, lack of organization of ideas, and lack of coherence in written texts. In Iraqi EFL classrooms, traditional teacher-centered teaching is still dominant, and students are not provided with enough opportunities to interact, discuss, and collaborate with each other in writing tasks. These instructional methods can have a negative impact on students' involvement, motivation, and effective writing competence (Al-Furaiji, 2022).

Second language writing research suggests that writing is an important tool in L2 learning because it enables learners to process L2 language more deeply, organize ideas systematically, and to be aware of the gaps in their knowledge. According to Schmidt's (2012) noticing hypothesis, the more learners notice the differences between their language production and target language structures, the more they improve their language skills.

Writing activities give learners opportunities to do such cognitive processing and self-monitoring.

The emphasis in language teaching has been on learner-centered and cooperative learning in recent years. Cooperative learning promotes positive interdependence, individual accountability, and active involvement of learners. The use of collaborative activities in writing teaching can help students to produce ideas, organize the content and revise the written text collaboratively, so that students' writing ability and the writing learning

process can be improved. Johnson and Johnson (1999) state that cooperative learning fosters positive interdependence, individual accountability, and the active involvement of learners. Collaborative activities in writing instruction can facilitate students' ability to generate ideas, arrange content, and revise written texts together, which can enhance both the quality of writing and the student learning process (Pardede, 2024).

Collaborative writing has therefore become an increasingly popular subject in EFL teaching and learning as it allows students to construct knowledge socially through interaction and sharing of responsibility. Collaborative writing is also well based on social constructivist theory that emphasizes the role of social interaction and collaborative meaning construction in the learning process (Vygotsky, 1978).

Collaborative Writing, Cooperative Learning, and Process-Based Writing (PBW) have been given a lot of attention in the international EFL research field, but there is not much empirical evidence in the field of application of these approaches in Iraqi preparatory schools. In most Iraqi EFL classrooms, teacher-centered instructional strategies prevail and give little chance for learners to have structured collaboration opportunities in writing tasks. In addition, research has tended to focus on collaborative writing or cooperative learning as general learning strategies, rather than considering the use of a carefully designed step-by-step procedure that effectively leads the students through brainstorming, discussion or brainstorm and discussion, selection of ideas, drafting, peer review, and revision. Therefore, there is a need to conduct empirical studies to examine the effect of structured collaborative writing procedures on the collaborative writing competence of the learners in preparatory schools in Iraq. This study aims to fill this gap by investigating the effect of the Structured Sequential Writing Procedure (SSWP) on the collaborative writing competence of fourth preparatory school students of the English Language in Iraq.

The Structured Sequential Writing Procedure (SSWP) is an instructional strategy that can be used to help develop collaborative writing competence. This instructional procedure is intended to provide a series of interrelated steps for structuring writing instruction from idea generation to the production of a final written product.

The process that was used in the present study was brainstorming, group discussion, idea selection, drafting, peer review, revision, and teacher feedback. Structured instructional procedures can alleviate the

cognitive load of writing tasks and offer learners organized support during the writing process (Flower & Hayes, 1981).

Although collaborative learning and process-based writing instruction have been emphasized in recent educational studies, few studies have investigated the impact of structured sequential writing procedures on collaborative writing competence in the context of preparatory schools in Iraq. Therefore, the aim of the present study is to investigate the impact of a Structured Sequential Writing Procedure on collaborative writing competence of fourth preparatory school students in the field of EFL in Iraq.

The present study was quantitative experimental study that aimed at investigating the effect of Structured Sequential Writing Procedure (SSWP) on the collaborative writing competence of fourth preparatory school learners in Iraq.

2. METHOD

The present study used a quantitative experimental design to examine the effect of a Structured Sequential Writing Procedure (SSWP) on the collaborative writing competence of fourth preparatory school learners in Iraq. Quantitative experimental research is widely used in educational studies because it allows researchers to objectively and systematically study the relationship between instructional treatments and learning outcomes (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

A quasi-experimental pretest-posttest control group design was used. This design is very appropriate for educational research as it allows the researcher to compare the performance of an experimental group that receives an instructional treatment with the performance of a control group that receives conventional instruction. Both groups are tested before and after the instructional treatment to see if there are statistically significant differences between them (Campbell et al., 2001). Table 1. illustrates the design of the method followed in this study.

Table 1: Research Design of the Study.

Group	Pretest	Treatment	Posttest
Experimental	Administered	Structured Sequential Writing Procedure	Administered
Control	Administered	Traditional Method	Administered

The experiment was conducted in the academic year 2025-2026, from October 15, 2025 to January 7, 2026. The experimental group received instruction using the SSWP, which consisted of a series of

recursive writing stages: brainstorming, group discussion, idea selection, drafting, peer review, revision, and teacher feedback.

Participants

This study was conducted with 60 Iraqi EFL fourth preparatory school students in Al-Imam Ali Preparatory School in Babylon Governorate in the 2025-2026 academic year. The participants were two intact fourth preparatory classes in the school. The two classes were randomly allocated to the experimental group or the control group. The final sample of learners was 60, 30 of whom were assigned to each group after the repeater learners were excluded to ensure homogeneity of the groups. The age of the learners was between 16 and 17 years and the mother tongue of the learners was Arabic. Table 2 shows the distribution of study participants.

Table 2: Distribution of Study Participants.

Group	Number of students	School	Level
Experimental	30	Al-Imam Ali Prep School	Fourth Preparatory
Control	30	Al-Imam Ali Prep School	Fourth Preparatory

The experimental group was instructed by the SSWP and the control group was instructed by the traditional teacher-centered instructional strategy. Equivalence between the two groups was established prior to the experiment by comparing students' scores on the pretest and their previous English achievement scores. No significant difference was found between the pretest scores of the experimental and control groups ($t = 0.86$, $p = .393$), indicating that the two groups were comparable before the instructional treatment was implemented. Quasi-experimental designs are often employed in educational research, where intact classes are used because it is hard to fully randomize within schools. Quasi-experimental designs are considered suitable in educational research where naturally occurring classroom groups are to be maintained. (Campbell et al., 2001).

3. RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

The main instrument used in the present study was a collaborative writing achievement test to measure the collaborative writing competence of fourth preparatory school learners in Iraq. In educational studies, research instruments play a vital role in collecting quantitative data concerning the variables under study. (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

The collaborative writing test was used twice: as a pretest before the instructional treatment was

implemented and as a posttest at the end of the experiment. The pretest was employed to ensure the equivalence of the experimental and control groups, and the posttest was employed to measure the effect of the SSWP on the learners' collaborative writing competence.

The test was designed using the instructional objectives and a Table of Specifications created by the researcher to ensure that the test content matched the skills being tested. The test was split into five sections to evaluate the learners' collaborative writing skills as a whole: reading comprehension, grammar and language functions, vocabulary, guided writing, and opinion writing. Collaborative writing activities included students working cooperatively in small groups to brainstorm, discuss possible answers, organize information, and develop a written product as a group. Specific writing criteria were used to evaluate the final written products: idea development, organization, vocabulary, grammatical accuracy, and coherence. These are regarded as important aspects of good writing in EFL settings (Hyland, 2003). The instrument was pilot tested, validated and analyzed for reliability before the main experiment to ensure the accuracy and consistency of measurement. The educational instruments used must have acceptable validity and reliability, so that the results of the research can be trusted (Graziotin et al., 2020).

The guided writing and opinion paragraph tasks were evaluated using an analytical scoring rubric developed by the researcher. The rubric assessed five dimensions of writing performance: content and relevance, organization and cohesion, grammar and sentence structure, vocabulary and word choice, and mechanics. Each criterion was scored separately, and the combined scores constituted the learners' overall writing performance score. The use of an analytical rubric provided a systematic and objective framework for evaluating the quality of learners' written products (Brown, 2004; Weigle, 2002).

4. PILOT STUDIES

Prior to the main experiment, two pilot studies were carried out to investigate the clarity, applicability, timing, validity and reliability of the research instruments and instructional procedures. Pilot studies are used to determine possible issues with test administration, instructions, timing and measurement procedures prior to the actual experiment (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

The first pilot study was carried out with 16 EFL fourth preparatory school learners from Al-Kindy Preparatory School in Babylon Governorate, Iraq.

The learners were split into four groups of four learners. This pilot study aimed to assess the clarity and complexity of the pretest items, the appropriateness of the instructions, and the time needed to complete the collaborative writing tasks.

Based on the findings of the first pilot study, some test items were modified due to some learners' difficulty in understanding some of the instructions and writing tasks. Further, the pilot study revealed that collaborative group work took longer than anticipated. The planned test time was 40 minutes, but the average test time was about 50.25 minutes. So, certain test items, instructions and testing times were adjusted before the main experiment. As shown in Table 3, the groups completed the test within 47–58 minutes, with mean scores ranging from 30.00 to 42.5.

Table 3: Pilot Study Completion Times and Mean Scores.

Group	Completion time (minutes)	Mean score
A	49	41.00
B	58	30.00
C	47	42.50
D	47	40.25

Note. Each group consisted of four students.

The second pilot study was carried out to investigate the reliability and internal consistency of the collaborative writing test. The reliability of the analysis was carried out by using Cronbach's alpha coefficient which is widely used in educational research to determine internal consistency of research instruments (Taber, 2018). The reliability coefficients for the pilot administrations were acceptable (.79 and .89), indicating that the instrument had acceptable internal consistency and was appropriate for use in the main study.

5. VALIDITY OF THE INSTRUMENT

Validity is the extent to which a research instrument measures what it is supposed to measure. Validity is an important property of measurement in educational research as it is important that the empirical data reflect the construct being investigated (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Validity also has an inherent connection to the meaningfulness and appropriateness of the interpretations and conclusions made from test scores.

The collaborative writing achievement test in the present study was content validated. Content validity is the degree to which the items of an

instrument cover the instructional objectives and the content domain to be measured (Fives & Barnes, 2018). A Table of Specifications (TOS) was created to ensure the content validity of the instrument using the instructional objectives, behavioral objectives, and course content addressed during the intervention period. The TOS was used as a blueprint during test construction, with a balanced representation of writing skills and linguistic components. By systematically linking instructional content with measurable learning outcomes, the use of a TOS increases the quality and representativeness of researcher-made assessments (Notar et al., 2004).

After initial construction, the test and its associated TOS were presented to a panel of experts and jury members in the fields of English language teaching, linguistics and educational measurement. The panel judged the instrument according to the following criteria: (a) appropriateness of test items with respect to the objectives of the study, (b) clarity of directions and language, (c) appropriateness of test items for fourth preparatory school learners, (d) appropriateness of the collaborative writing tasks, and (e) comprehensive coverage of targeted writing skills. The final test items included several structural and phrasing changes that were suggested by the jury members to optimize the test items for the pilot runs and the main experiment. Expert peer review is still one of the most important methods used in educational research to ensure content validity prior to field implementation.

6. RELIABILITY OF THE INSTRUMENT

Reliability refers to the consistency, stability and reproducibility of a research instrument. A good instrument provides stable and reliable measures when it is used in similar environments, so that the empirical results are stable and reliable (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Cronbach's alpha coefficient is a widely accepted index of internal consistency in educational research and was used to assess the reliability of the collaborative writing achievement test. (Taber, 2018). Cronbach's alpha is a measure of interdependence of the items and an estimate of the uniformity of the items in measuring the underlying construct.

The second pilot study data were analyzed using SPSS statistical software to carry out the reliability analysis. The instrument consisted of 25 collaborative items. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the first administration of the analysis was .79, and for the second administration was .89, both of which exceeded typical standards. In general, methodological literature deems internal consistency

coefficients of .70 or higher as acceptable instrument reliability for educational evaluation (Taber, 2018). Table IV shows that the test demonstrated acceptable reliability in Pilot Study 1 ($\alpha = .79$) and high reliability in Pilot Study 2 ($\alpha = .89$).

Table 4: Reliability Statistics for the Collaborative Writing Achievement Test.

Pilot administration	Cronbach's α	Number of items
Pilot Study 1	.79	25
Pilot Study 2	.89	25

The internal consistency coefficients showed that the assessment tool was stable and reliable enough to be used to assess the collaborative writing competence of the sample population. Thus, the test was considered psychometrically acceptable for use in the main experiment.

7. INSTRUCTIONAL PROCEDURES

This study's instructional model was based on process-based writing instruction and cooperative learning models. The experimental group received the SSWP intervention, while the control group received the traditional Iraqi EFL classroom instruction which is the conventional teacher-centered approach. The instructional treatment was from October 15, 2025, to January 7, 2026, for the 2025–2026 school year. The same thematic units were taught to both groups of participants from the same textbook,* English for Iraq: Fourth Preparatory Student's Book and Activity Book*. Classroom delivery, however, varied according to the group assignment.

The experimental group was given an organized series of collaborative writing stages that were designed to take the learners through a recursive process from initial idea generation to a final text product. The pedagogical sequence progressed in five stages.

Brainstorming and Idea Generation Learners brainstormed ideas about the writing prompts given, both as individuals and as a group. This phase was designed to activate background schemata and to provide divergent thinking before drafting.

Group Discussion and Idea Exchange Learners engaged in small group cooperative discussions where they debate ideas, clarify intentions and negotiate meaning. Small group dynamics improve student participation, verbal interaction and collective understanding of academic tasks. (Johnson & Johnson, 1999).

Drafting the Paragraph Learners worked together to create a first draft of their paragraph with the combined ideas from the discussion phase. At

this stage, conceptual expression and macro-structural organization were more important than mechanical and grammatical accuracy.

Peer Review and Feedback Groups shared drafts and provided specific comments on paragraph structure, thematic unity, word selection, and sentence structure. Long-term writing development and deep cognitive engagement are supported by peer interaction and reciprocal critiques. (Hyland, 2003).

Teacher Feedback and Revision The teacher thoroughly checked the drafts and provided focused corrective and formative feedback. Learners were able to make changes and edits to their text based on peer and instructor feedback in an iterative manner to enhance the quality of the text to the final product.

The sequence is theoretically based on process writing theory which views writing as a recursive cognitive process of planning, drafting and revising (Flower & Hayes, 1981), and social constructivist theory which states that learning is a function of collaborative interaction and social meaning construction (Vygotsky, 1978). In contrast, the control group was instructed according to teacher-centered procedures, which involved the teacher presenting the target topic, modelling structures and asking students to write paragraphs on their own with limited peer interaction.

Throughout the instructional treatment, learners in the experimental group were organized into small collaborative groups consisting of four members. Group composition remained stable during the intervention period to promote familiarity, cooperation, and shared responsibility. During each writing activity, group members worked together to generate ideas, discuss alternatives, select relevant information, draft paragraphs, and revise their written products. The collaborative structure encouraged active participation and collective decision-making throughout the writing process (Johnson & Johnson, 2009; Storch, 2013).

8. DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

Data was collected systematically for 12 weeks of experimental period. The collaborative writing achievement test was initially used as a pretest to establish baseline equivalence between the cohorts. After the 12 weeks teaching period, a parallel version of the instrument was administered as a post test to assess the changes in collaborative writing competence. Testing conditions, classroom contexts and durations were standardized for both groups. The pretest and posttest responses were scored using the same analytical scoring rubric to ensure

consistency across administrations. Each script was evaluated according to five criteria: content, organization, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics, and the scores obtained for each criterion were summed to obtain the final score. Analytical scoring procedures are considered more objective because they evaluate multiple dimensions of writing separately rather than assigning a single overall score. The scoring was done in a double blind fashion to ensure objectivity.

Table 5: Analytical Scoring Rubric for Assessing Learners' Writing Performance.

Criterion	2 Points (Excellent)	1 Point (Adequate)	0 Point (Weak)
Content and Relevance	Fully addresses the task with clear, relevant, and well-developed ideas	Addresses the task with generally relevant ideas and some supporting details	Provides limited, unclear, or irrelevant ideas
Organization and Cohesion	Ideas are logically organized with effective use of cohesive devices	Ideas are generally organized with limited use of cohesive devices	Ideas lack logical organization and cohesion
Grammar and Sentence Structure	Demonstrates accurate and varied grammatical structures	Contains some grammatical errors that do not impede meaning	Contains frequent grammatical errors that interfere with comprehension
Vocabulary and Word Choice	Uses varied and appropriate vocabulary effectively	Uses adequate vocabulary with occasional inaccuracies	Uses limited, repetitive, or inappropriate vocabulary
Mechanics (Spelling and Punctuation)	Contains few or no spelling and punctuation errors	Contains some minor spelling and punctuation errors	Contains frequent mechanical errors that distract the reader

As shown in Table 5, learners' writing performance was evaluated across five dimensions: content and relevance, organization and cohesion, grammar and sentence structure, vocabulary and word choice, and mechanics. Each criterion was scored on a three-point scale ranging from 0 to 2 points. The scores obtained across the five criteria were summed to produce the final score for each writing task, resulting in a maximum score of ten points per task. The use of an analytical rubric allowed for a more detailed and objective assessment of learners' writing performance (Brown, 2004; Weigle, 2002).

The empirical data were collected and analyzed

by SPSS software. Performance was summarized using descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations). Variance between the cohorts was then analyzed using inferential statistical testing. An independent samples t-test was conducted to test for pretest equivalence and to compare posttest gain scores. In educational designs with intact classes, the independent samples t-test can be used to determine if the mean differences observed between two independent conditions are statistically significant. (Campbell et al., 2001).

Initially, the experimental group and the control group were equivalent as revealed by the pretest analysis, which showed that the mean difference between the two groups was not statistically significant, $t(58) = 0.86$, $p = .393$. Gain scores were used to calculate posttest effects. Cohen's d effect size was used to assess the practical meaningfulness of the intervention. In educational contexts, the use of effect size measures along with significance values can be used to determine if statistically significant differences have practical classroom value (Cohen, 1992).

9. RESULTS

The aim of the present study was to investigate the impact of a Structured Sequential Writing Procedure (SSWP) on the collaborative writing competence of the fourth preparatory school learners in the field of EFL in Iraq. The pretest and post test data were statistically analyzed with SPSS software. Descriptive statistics and inferential statistical procedures were used to determine whether there were statistically significant differences between the experimental and control groups.

The results of the statistical analysis of the pretest scores revealed that there was no statistically significant difference between the experimental and control groups before the instructional treatment was implemented. The experimental group had a mean score of 15.50 ($SD = 5.15$) and the control group had a mean score of 14.33 ($SD = 5.36$). The independent samples t-test calculated value was 0.86, $t(58) = 0.86$, $p = .393$, which showed that the two cohorts of participants were statistically equivalent at the start of the experiment. Table 5 indicates no significant difference between the two groups on the pretest ($t = 0.86$, $p = .393$), confirming their baseline equivalence.

Table 6: Pretest Equivalence of the Experimental and Control Groups

Group	N	M	SD	t	p
Experimental	30	15.50	5.15	0.86	.393
Control	30	14.33	5.36		

After the 12 week instructional intervention, posttest gain scores for both groups were analyzed. The inferential results showed that there was a significant difference between the experimental and control groups in favor of the experimental group. The experimental group had a mean gain score of 3.02 ($SD = 6.27$) while the control group had a negative mean gain score of -7.98 ($SD = 5.74$). The calculated t value was $t(58) = 7.09$, $p < .001$, suggesting that the difference in performance between the two conditions was statistically significant. Table 6 shows a significant difference in gain scores in favor of the experimental group ($t = 7.09$, $p < .001$).

Table 7: Gain Scores of Experimental and Control Groups.

Group	Gain	SD	t	p
Experimental	3.02	6.27	7.09	<.001
Control	-7.98	5.74		

In addition, an effect size analysis was performed using Cohen's d to determine the size of the instructional treatment effect. The analysis showed a large effect size (Cohen's $d = 1.83$), indicating that the SSWP had a significant practical educational effect on learners' collaborative writing competence based on the standard interpretive criteria (Cohen, 1992). To provide additional statistical validation, Hedges' g correction and Glass's delta were also calculated, confirming a consistent and robust intervention effect across metrics.

Table 8: Effect Size Statistics for the Instructional Intervention.

Effect size type	Value
Cohen's d	1.83
Hedges' correction	1.81
Glass's delta	1.92

The findings of the statistical analysis confirmed that the learners who were taught using the Structured Sequential Writing Procedure with the 5-3-1 strategy showed significant differences in their performance outcomes in collaborative writing tasks in comparison with the learners who were taught using the traditional teacher-centered writing instruction.

10. DISCUSSION

The findings of the present study showed that the Structured Sequential Writing Procedure (SSWP) had a positive and significant effect on collaborative writing competence of fourth preparatory school students in Iraq. The statistical analysis showed that the experimental group had significantly

demonstrated higher posttest gain scores than the control group, supporting the effectiveness of the collaborative writing process. This marked improvement can be attributed to the architectural framework of the SSWP, which systematically organized the writing process into distinct, manageable phases, guiding learners recursively from initial idea generation to the production of a polished final written text. Writing in a foreign language is a high cognitive overload; dividing the writing process into individual stages—such as brainstorming, discussion, drafting, peer review, and revision were all effectively mitigated the cognitive load. This aligns with the cognitive process model of writing proposed by Flower and Hayes (1981), which frames writing as a recursive cognitive operation requiring continuous planning, organizing, and transforming of ideas. The structured progression of the SSWP appears to have supported learners as they navigated these complex cognitive demands.

In addition, the performance improvements can be related to the cooperative learning environment created during the treatment time. This structured interaction motivation, while also encouraging students to actively participate in their education. It resulted in higher learner participation, self-confidence and intrinsic motivation in the writing activities. As emphasized by Johnson and Johnson (1999), cooperative learning frameworks promote positive interdependence, individual accountability, and active peer engagement, which altogether stimulate academic achievement. The findings further indicate that the collaborative tasks allowed learners to benefit from peer scaffolding and social knowledge construction. Group discussions and peer review sessions provided regular opportunities for students to clarify their conceptual intentions, identify linguistic errors, and receive immediate formative feedback from peers and the instructor. Collaborative writing activities enhance the overall quality of student texts because the social negotiation inherent in the tasks prompts learners to make more conscious, informed decisions regarding syntax, vocabulary selection, and rhetorical organization (Hyland, 2003).

The large effect size obtained in this study (Cohen's $d = 1.83$) underscores the fact that the instructional treatment resulted in significant practical value as well as its statistical significance. In the field of education, large effect sizes, significant learning effects and changes in student performance profiles (Cohen, 1992). Consequently, the SSWP can be understood to have played an essential role in developing the collaborative writing competence of

this sample.

The findings of this study are empirical and support the literature which highlights. The significance of process-based writing instruction and cooperative learning frameworks in driving EFL writing achievement (Hyland, 2003; Johnson & Johnson, 1999). The ability to take responsibility and interact socially in writing tasks directly improves idea generation, text organization and grammatical correctness. But some caveats should be mentioned when considering these results. This study was carried out in one of the preparatory schools in Babylon, so it was not possible to generalize the results to other schools in the Babylon, due to the limitations of the study. Governorate with a relatively small sample size, the generalizability of the transfer of outcomes to other educational settings should be done with caution.

11. CONCLUSION

Based on the empirical findings, it can be concluded that the Sequential Writing Procedure is an effective instructional methodology for enhancing collaborative writing competence of Iraqi EFL fourth preparatory school learners. The inferential analysis revealed that the learners who were given this structured, sequential pedagogical intervention proved to be significantly more effective than those who received traditional teacher-centered instruction.

The study illustrates how a sequential, collaborative approach provides for learners scaffolding to help with idea generation, information organization, logically negotiate semantic meaning, and create coherent text.

Furthermore, cooperative writing environments have obvious benefits in terms of student involvement, engagement, and motivation. The chance to give and take feedback, debate directly enhances learners' writing skills by providing them with concepts and helping them in the writing process.

The large effect size confirmed that the intervention had a significant educational effect in practice. In this regard, the SSWP is a viable alternative to traditional teacher-centred approaches as it promotes active learner engagement and collaboration.

Writing is frequently taught using conventional teaching techniques in Iraqi preparatory schools, which offer few chances for significant teamwork. The current study adds to the expanding corpus of research on collaborative writing instruction by providing empirical evidence from a localized Iraqi

EFL context. This work advances the field of English language instruction in the setting of preparatory education and supports the global trend toward cooperative and process-oriented approaches to second language (L2) writing pedagogy.

12. RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of the findings and conclusions compiled in this study, the following pedagogical recommendations are proposed:

1. EFL teachers are encouraged to apply Structured Sequential Writing Procedures in their writing classrooms to enable students to systematically organize their thoughts, minimize writing anxiety, and enhance the quality of their writing.
2. To maximize student involvement, mutual accountability, and classroom engagement, cooperative learning practices should be intentionally incorporated into curricula.
3. Ministry curriculum designers and educational planners in Iraq should actively introduce process-based writing tasks and explicit collaborative writing rubrics in the next edition of the national EFL textbooks, for example, English for Iraq.
4. There is a need to educate teachers on modern and learner-centered teaching approaches in teacher training programs, pre-service teacher preparation courses, and teacher professional development workshops, with an emphasis on how to manage small group collaborative writing dynamics.
5. Teachers should be encouraged by educational supervisors to lessen their dependence on traditional, lecture-based teaching and learning and to use communicative approaches that focus on co-learning, exchange of feedback and active interaction among peers.
6. Structured, cooperative instructional models should be expanded to other core language areas such as critical literacy skills, oral communication and reading comprehension.

13. SUGGESTION FOR FURTHER RESEARCHS

To expand upon the findings and address the contextual limitations of the present study, the following directions for future research are suggested:

1. Future studies may focus on the effects of the SSWP on other language skills, e.g., speaking proficiency, reading comprehension strategies, or critical thinking dispositions in EFL contexts.
2. Parallel studies should be conducted at different educational levels (intermediate schools, secondary schools, higher education institutions) to confirm the educational potential of structured collaborative writing at different age groups and language levels.
3. Longitudinal research designs should be used to monitor the long-term retention of collaborative writing skills and to see how far collaborative writing skills can be transferred to independent, individual writing tasks over time.
4. Future research might explore the relationship between technology and process writing and how digital collaborative tools, shared cloud documents, and online peer-review tools change student interaction in the context of the SSWP.
5. The relationship between structured collaborative writing and affective variables such as writing anxiety, self-efficacy, learner attitudes and motivation should be investigated.
1. Qualitative and mixed-method studies are needed to gain deeper and more nuanced understanding of students' and teachers' perceptions of the difficulties and successes they encountered in implementing collaborative writing procedures.
6. Future empirical studies are recommended to be conducted with larger samples from stratified random sampling in different governorates in Iraq to enhance the external validity and generalizability of these results.

Author Contributions: Author Contributions: Conceptualization, R.A.A. and K.M.M.A.; methodology, R.A.A.; validation, R.A.A. and K.M.M.A.; formal analysis, R.A.A.; investigation, R.A.A.; data curation, R.A.A.; writing—original draft preparation, R.A.A.; writing—review and editing, R.A.A. and K.M.M.A.; visualization, R.A.A.; supervision, K.M.M.A.; project administration, R.A.A. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Acknowledgements: The authors would like to thank the participating school, teachers, and students for their cooperation and support during the conduct of this study. The authors also appreciate the valuable comments

and suggestions provided by the reviewers, which contributed to improving the manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Al-Furajji, M. A. (2022). Teacher-centered approaches in Iraqi EFL classrooms and their effects on learner participation.
- Anderson, G., & Arsenault, N. (1998). *Fundamentals of educational research*. Routledge.
- Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices*. Pearson Education.
- Campbell, D. T., Shadish, W. R., & Cook, T. D. (2002). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for generalized causal inference*. Houghton Mifflin.
- Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112(1), 155–159.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Fives, H., & Barnes, N. (2018). Table of specifications. In B. B. Frey (Ed.), *The SAGE encyclopedia of educational research, measurement, and evaluation* (pp. 1688–1690). SAGE Publications.
- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 32(4), 365–387.
- Graziotin, D., Lenberg, P., Feldt, R., & Wagner, S. (2020). Psychometrics in behavioral software engineering: A methodological introduction with guidelines. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology*, 29(4), 1–36.
- Harmer, J. (2004). *How to teach writing*. Pearson Education.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1999). *Learning together and alone: Cooperative, competitive, and individualistic learning* (5th ed.). Allyn & Bacon.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2009). An educational psychology success story: Social interdependence theory and cooperative learning. *Educational Researcher*, 38(5), 365–379.
- Notar, C., Zuelke, D., Wilson, J., & Yunker, B. (2004). The table of specifications: Insuring accountability in teacher-made tests. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 31(2), 115–129.
- Pardede, P. (2024). Collaborative writing in EFL contexts and learner interaction.
- Schmidt, R. (2012). Attention, awareness, and individual differences in language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 32, 27–50.
- Storch, N. (2013). *Collaborative writing in L2 classrooms*. Multilingual Matters.
- Taber, K. S. (2018). The use of Cronbach's alpha when developing and reporting research instruments in science education. *Research in Science Education*, 48(6), 1273–1296.
- Tavakol, M., & Dennick, R. (2011). Making sense of Cronbach's alpha. *International Journal of Medical Education*, 2, 53–55.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Weigle, S. C. (2002). *Assessing writing*. Cambridge University Press.