



Scaffolding, Collaboration, and Feedback in Task-Based Arabic Writing: Evidence from an Indonesian Islamic Boarding School

السقالات اللغوية والتعلم التعاوني والتغذية الراجعة في الكتابة العربية القائمة على المهام:

أدلة من معهد إسلامي بإندونيسيا

Ammar Ahmed Mohammed Al Wesabi^{1*}, Dindin Solahudin², Isop Syaifei³, Nanang Kosim⁴

^{1,2,3,4}Postgraduate Program in Islamic Education, UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung, Indonesia

*Corresponding E-mail: ammarwosabi112@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study examines how linguistic scaffolding, collaborative writing, and feedback operate as interconnected pedagogical mechanisms in task-based Arabic writing instruction. It reports a focused qualitative classroom-process analysis embedded within a broader research-and-development study conducted at an Islamic boarding school in Bogor, Indonesia. The analysis centered on 14 male upper-secondary students who participated in a ten-period task-based writing program. Data were obtained from classroom observations, interviews, instructional documents, classroom writing activities, and implementation records, and were analyzed thematically by tracing patterns of linguistic support, peer interaction, feedback engagement, and revision. The findings show that linguistic scaffolding helped learners access vocabulary, structures, and task expectations before writing; collaborative work enabled them to generate ideas, compare expressions, and negotiate linguistic choices; and teacher and peer feedback directed attention to unresolved problems that were subsequently addressed through revision. These mechanisms operated sequentially and recursively rather than independently. The study contributes a process-oriented explanation linking linguistic scaffolding, collaborative meaning-making, feedback and noticing, revision, and meaningful Arabic writing. The findings imply that effective task-based writing requires coordinated support across the writing process rather than the assignment of communicative tasks alone.

Keywords: Arabic writing, collaborative writing, feedback, linguistic scaffolding, task-based language teaching

مستخلص البحث

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى تفسير كيفية عمل السقالات اللغوية، والكتابة التعاونية، والتغذية الراجعة بوصفها آليات تربوية مترابطة في تعليم الكتابة العربية القائمة على المهام. وتعرض الدراسة تحليلاً نوعياً مركّزاً لعمليات الصف ضمن دراسة أوسع في البحث والتطوير أُجريت في معهد إسلامي بمدينة بوغور في إندونيسيا. وركّز التحليل على أربعة عشر طالباً من المرحلة الثانوية العليا شاركوا في برنامج للكتابة القائمة على المهام استمر عشر حصص تعليمية. وجمعت البيانات من الملاحظات الصفية، والمقابلات، والوثائق التعليمية، وأنشطة الكتابة الصفية، وسجلات التنفيذ، ثم خلّلت موضوعياً من خلال تتبع أنماط الدعم اللغوي، والتفاعل بين الأقران، والاستجابة للتغذية الراجعة، والمراجعة التحريرية. وأظهرت النتائج أن السقالات اللغوية يسهّرت وصول الطلاب إلى المفردات والتراكيب وفهم متطلبات المهمة قبل الكتابة، وأن الكتابة التعاونية أتاحت توليد الأفكار ومقارنة التعبيرات والتفاوض حول الاختيارات اللغوية، في حين وُجّهت تغذية المعلم والأقران الراجعة انتباه الطلاب إلى المشكلات اللغوية والنصية التي عولجت لاحقاً من خلال المراجعة. وتبيّن أن هذه الآليات تعمل بصورة متتابعة وتكرارية لا بصورة منفصلة. وتتمثل إسهامات الدراسة في تقديم تفسير إجرائي يربط بين السقالات اللغوية، وبناء المعنى بصورة تعاونية، والتغذية الراجعة والملاحظة، والمراجعة، والكتابة العربية الهادفة. وتشير النتائج إلى أن نجاح التعليم القائم على المهام يتطلب تكامل الدعم اللغوي والتعاون والتغذية الراجعة والمراجعة عبر مراحل الكتابة، لا مجرد تقديم مهام تواصلية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الكتابة العربية، الكتابة التعاونية، التغذية الراجعة، السقالات اللغوية، التعليم القائم على المهام

Citation:

Al Wesabi, A. A. M., Salahudin, D., Syaifei, I., Kosim, N., & Mardani, D. (2026). Scaffolding, collaboration, and feedback in task-based Arabic writing: Evidence from an Indonesian Islamic boarding school. *Al-Muyassar: Journal of Arabic Education*, 5 (3), 851–868.

INTRODUCTION

Writing is one of the most demanding productive skills in learning Arabic as a foreign language because learners must coordinate several linguistic resources at the same time. To produce even a short connected text, they need to control Arabic orthography, word formation, grammatical structures, vocabulary selection, sentence organization, cohesion, and the development of ideas. These demands become more visible when learners move from copying and isolated exercises to purposeful writing. In Indonesian Arabic classrooms, difficulties in writing are often not limited to one linguistic area. Wijaya and Aman (2024), for example, identified both linguistic and non-linguistic problems among learners of Arabic writing, including slow writing, difficulty distinguishing connectable and non-connectable Arabic letters, differences in educational background, and limited practice. Related needs-based studies also show that Arabic writing instruction must respond to learners' actual linguistic difficulties and communicative purposes rather than relying only on predetermined grammatical content (Hakim, 2019; Rustamaji et al., 2024; Yasmar et al., 2025).

A persistent pedagogical problem is that writing instruction can remain heavily oriented toward explanation of rules, controlled exercises, and teacher correction. Such practices may strengthen explicit knowledge, but they do not necessarily provide sufficient experience in generating ideas, planning, composing, reviewing, and revising meaningful texts. Recent studies in Arabic language education have therefore explored alternative forms of support. Basith (2025) examined website-based e-learning as a means of improving Arabic writing, while Amaliyah et al. (2025) investigated the Think-Pair-Share strategy and demonstrated the potential of structured peer interaction in writing instruction. Melani et al. (2026) showed that visual scaffolding through the Picture-and-Picture strategy can assist learners in organizing ideas, developing vocabulary, and constructing Arabic sentences. Romadhon et al. (Romadhon et al., 2026) proposed a corpus-based instructional model that moves learners through concept presentation, guided corpus exploration, analytical exercises, guided writing production, and reflection with feedback. Collectively, these studies indicate a shift from viewing Arabic writing as the reproduction of correct forms toward viewing it as a supported process of text production.

Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) offers a useful framework for advancing this shift because it organizes learning around the completion of meaningful outcomes

rather than the manipulation of isolated forms (Ellis, 2003; Long, 2015; Nunan, 2004). In task-based writing, learners use language as a resource to achieve a communicative goal, while attention to linguistic form can be incorporated before, during, and after task performance. Willis (1996) conceptualizes task-based instruction through pre-task, task-cycle, and post-task phases. Applied to writing, these phases can activate background knowledge, prepare vocabulary and structures, support planning and drafting, facilitate discussion of linguistic choices, and create opportunities for feedback and revision. Planning is especially important in second-language writing because it helps writers allocate attention and organize ideas before production (Johnson & Tabari, 2023). Task selection should also arise from learners' actual communicative needs rather than from a generic sequence of activities (Gilabert, 2023). However, assigning a communicative task does not by itself explain how learners are enabled to perform it; for learners with limited lexical and grammatical resources, task performance may depend on the pedagogical support embedded within the process.

One such support is linguistic scaffolding. Scaffolding can make task demands manageable by providing temporary assistance that enables learners to perform beyond what they could accomplish independently. In Arabic writing, this support may include vocabulary preparation, model texts, guided questions, sentence patterns, visual prompts, and clarification of the expected written outcome. The relevance of scaffolding is reinforced by recent Arabic-writing research. Melani et al. (2026) found that visual scaffolding helped students address difficulties in vocabulary and idea organization. In a different context, Cheng et al. (2024) showed that teacher scaffolding supported high-school foreign-language learners' affective, behavioral, and cognitive engagement with written feedback and revision. Alshahrani and Storch (2025), however, provide an important qualification: scaffolded written corrective feedback supported writing accuracy, but it was not consistently superior to unscaffolded feedback across all targeted structures. Their findings suggest that scaffolding is most meaningful when it is responsive to learner needs and aligned with learners' ability to interpret and act on assistance.

A second mechanism is collaboration. Writing is often assessed as an individual product, yet collaborative writing can create opportunities for learners to verbalize ideas, negotiate language choices, identify problems, and jointly construct solutions. Elabdali's (2021) meta-analysis of 33 studies found advantages for collaborative writing, particularly in accuracy and overall rubric-based performance, although the

accumulated evidence also varied according to study design. Research on collaborative writing further emphasizes that its value lies not merely in placing students in groups but in the interaction through which they discuss content and language (Li & Zhang, 2023; Storch, 2019; Zhang & Plonsky, 2020). This mechanism is especially relevant to task-based Arabic writing, where learners may need peer support to generate vocabulary, compare grammatical alternatives, organize sentences, and sustain engagement during composition. The Think-Pair-Share findings reported by Amaliyah et al. (2025) also suggest that structured peer participation has practical potential in Arabic writing classrooms.

A third mechanism is feedback. Feedback can connect initial text production with noticing, correction, and revision, but its value depends on how learners interpret and use it. Mao et al. (2024), in a synthesis of 50 naturalistic classroom studies of written corrective feedback, identified teacher practices, learner responses, stakeholder beliefs, and feedback-related motivation and emotions as major dimensions of feedback research. Scherer et al. (2024) likewise found that feedback can improve writing outcomes across first-, second-, and foreign-language settings, including secondary-school contexts, while effects differ according to feedback level, learner group, and feedback source. For task-based writing, feedback becomes particularly important when it is followed by an opportunity to revise. Revision turns correction into action and can support the self-regulatory processes through which learners monitor and improve their writing (Teng & Zhang, 2020).

Taken together, the literature provides strong support for task-oriented writing, scaffolding, collaboration, and feedback, but these strands have often been investigated as separate interventions, strategies, or effectiveness variables. Arabic-writing studies have examined technological media, collaborative strategies, visual support, corpus-based instruction, and needs-based materials, whereas international L2-writing research has developed substantial evidence on collaborative writing and feedback. Relatively less attention has been given to how linguistic scaffolding, collaborative text production, and continuous feedback operate together as an interconnected classroom process within task-based Arabic writing, particularly in Indonesian Islamic boarding-school settings. This gap is important because a task may fail to generate meaningful writing if learners lack the linguistic resources to begin, opportunities to negotiate ideas during production, or feedback that leads to revision.

Accordingly, this study examines task-based Arabic writing as a process supported by three interrelated pedagogical mechanisms: linguistic scaffolding, collaboration, and feedback. Its novelty lies in explaining not merely whether task-based instruction improves writing outcomes, but how these mechanisms work together to move learners from rule-focused exercises toward meaningful text production. The study addresses four questions: (1) How does linguistic scaffolding support students during task-based Arabic writing activities? (2) How does collaborative writing shape students' participation and linguistic decision-making? (3) How do teacher and peer feedback contribute to reviewing and revision? and (4) How do these mechanisms collectively reshape Arabic writing practices from rule-focused exercises toward meaningful text production? By answering these questions, the study aims to provide a process-oriented account of task-based Arabic writing and to offer practical guidance for teachers who need to balance linguistic support, learner interaction, feedback, and communicative writing goals.

RESEARCH METHOD

This article reports a focused qualitative analysis of classroom processes generated during the implementation phase of a broader research-and-development study on task-based Arabic writing instruction. The broader project followed an adapted Borg and Gall (1983) framework comprising needs analysis, model development, expert validation, preliminary testing, classroom implementation, and effectiveness evaluation. The present article does not treat model development or statistical effectiveness as its primary concern. Instead, it examines how linguistic scaffolding, collaborative writing, teacher and peer feedback, and revision operated during task-based writing activities. Selected quantitative results from the broader study are used only as contextual support for interpreting the instructional process.

The research was conducted during the 2025/2026 academic year at Ma'had Miftah Al-Jannah Akbar, Bogor, Indonesia. The broader study population consisted of 37 male upper-secondary students learning Arabic as a foreign language. Ten students participated only in preliminary instrument testing. The remaining 27 students, aged 16–17 years, formed two intact classes: 14 in the experimental group and 13 in the control group. Because this article investigates the mechanisms of task-based instruction, the main classroom-process data were derived from the 14 experimental-group students who experienced the task-based writing program over ten instructional periods. Control-group data were not treated as a primary qualitative source because those students did

not participate in the instructional processes examined here.

The program was organized through pre-task, task-cycle, and post-task phases. The lessons addressed Arabic orthography, accurate word writing, basic grammatical structures, and sentence construction and organization. During the pre-task phase, students received vocabulary preparation, model expressions, relevant structures, prompts, and guided discussion. During the task cycle, they planned and produced texts individually, in pairs, or in small groups through sentence arrangement, description, paragraph writing, dialogue, problem solving, letters, reports, summaries, and error-correction tasks. The post-task phase involved presentation, attention to language forms, teacher and peer feedback, correction, and revision.

Data were collected through classroom observations, interviews, instructional documents, classroom writing activities, and implementation records. Observations focused on students' responses to linguistic support, idea preparation, peer interaction, vocabulary and grammatical choices, responses to teacher guidance, reviewing, and revision. Interviews with teachers, administrators, and selected students provided information about previous writing practices, perceived difficulties, changes during task-based instruction, and responses to collaboration and feedback. Instructional documents, task sheets, assessment criteria, and classroom writing samples were examined to compare intended procedures with observed practice.

Qualitative data were analyzed thematically through repeated reading, initial coding, category development, and relational interpretation. Codes captured recurring processes such as vocabulary preparation, model use, idea generation, requests for linguistic assistance, peer discussion, comparison of expressions, joint error identification, teacher prompting, peer comments, correction, and text revision. These codes were grouped into four analytical categories: linguistic scaffolding, collaborative meaning-making, feedback engagement, and revision. The analysis then examined relationships among the categories—for example, whether scaffolding facilitated participation, whether collaboration exposed linguistic choices, and whether feedback led to reformulation or revision. Evidence from observations, interviews, documents, and classroom products was compared across sources to strengthen interpretive credibility.

Quantitative findings from the broader study were used only as supporting context. The experimental and control groups showed no statistically significant baseline

difference, whereas the experimental group later achieved higher overall posttest performance and significant pretest–posttest improvement. These statistics were not reanalyzed as the principal findings of this article. This analytical separation ensures that the article addresses a distinct question: how scaffolding, collaboration, feedback, and revision operated together during Arabic writing instruction rather than whether the developed model was effective.

Written permission to conduct the study was obtained from the institution, and parental or guardian consent was secured because the student participants were minors. Participant identities were protected during data handling and reporting, and the information collected was used solely for scholarly purposes.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

From Rule-Focused Instruction to Scaffolded Writing Preparation

The initial classroom evidence showed that Arabic writing instruction was largely organized around rule explanation, controlled exercises, and direct correction. Grammar and orthography were presented explicitly, followed by examples and exercises designed to reproduce targeted forms. This pattern provided a clear linguistic structure but gave students relatively few opportunities to generate ideas, select vocabulary, organize content, and construct extended texts. Observation and interview data also showed multidimensional difficulties involving letter formation, short and long vowels, *hamzah*, forms of *tā'*, omitted or substituted letters, *tanwīn*, *shaddah*, pronoun selection, agreement, word order, sentence connection, and idea sequencing. These problems suggest that knowledge of individual rules did not automatically transfer into text production. Similar difficulties have been reported where Arabic learners have limited practice and heterogeneous educational backgrounds (Wijaya & Aman, 2024), while needs-based studies emphasize aligning writing materials with learners' actual linguistic and communicative problems (Hakim, 2019; Rustamaji et al., 2024; Yasmar et al., 2025).

The task-based program responded by redefining the pre-task phase as a site of linguistic scaffolding. Before students were expected to write, the teacher activated relevant knowledge, clarified the intended written outcome, reviewed useful vocabulary and grammatical structures, and provided model expressions, prompts, or guided discussion. Students could discuss possible content or examine examples before drafting. These supports reduced the distance between recognizing a rule and mobilizing it in writing. They also addressed the practical problem identified in the needs analysis:

students often knew isolated forms but hesitated when required to begin a text or connect ideas.

The value of scaffolding became most visible when tasks moved beyond isolated sentences. Learners who initially hesitated to start were better able to participate when vocabulary, models, and task expectations were accessible. Support did not replace writing; it made the writing demand manageable while leaving students responsible for selecting ideas and producing the final text. Recent Arabic-writing studies similarly show the value of structured support. Melani et al. (2026) found that visual scaffolding can assist idea organization and sentence construction, while Romadhon et al. (2026) proposed a progression from guided exploration toward writing production and reflection. In the present study, scaffolding functioned as an integral part of task performance rather than as an additional technique.

Scaffolding also had an affective function. Students had previously expressed anxiety about errors and requested more opportunities to prepare vocabulary and discuss ideas. When task expectations and linguistic resources were made explicit, students did not have to begin from a blank page without support. This appeared to reduce uncertainty and make participation more attainable. Cheng et al. (2024) likewise show that teacher scaffolding can support cognitive, behavioral, and emotional engagement with writing feedback and revision. At the same time, the classroom evidence cautions against equating scaffolding with extensive teacher control. If support becomes too prescriptive, a communicative task can revert to a controlled exercise; if it is insufficient, learners may be unable to participate meaningfully.

The support therefore needed to be responsive rather than uniform. Orthographic and lexical difficulties often required immediate prompting, whereas grammatical choice and sentence organization sometimes required discussion or examples. This aligns with Alshahrani and Storch (2025), who found that scaffolded corrective feedback was not uniformly superior across all linguistic targets. In the present study, linguistic preparation served as the first mechanism in a broader process: it activated relevant knowledge, reduced task difficulty, and prepared students to use available resources during collaborative production.

Collaborative Writing as Shared Linguistic Problem Solving

The second mechanism was collaboration. Pair and small-group work occurred during planning and text production through sentence arrangement, description,

paragraph writing, dialogue construction, problem solving, letters, reports, summaries, reformulation, and error correction. Its value did not lie simply in increasing interaction. Collaboration became pedagogically significant when students used peers to generate ideas, compare expressions, identify linguistic problems, and make decisions about the emerging text.

One important function of collaboration was to expand access to linguistic resources. A learner who could not immediately recall a word or determine an appropriate expression could discuss the problem with peers rather than wait exclusively for teacher intervention. Peer suggestions were not always correct, but language choices became discussable: learners could propose a form, question it, compare alternatives, and reconsider it during production. This is consistent with collaborative writing as joint linguistic decision-making. Storch (2019) emphasizes the pooling of knowledge during shared text production, while Li and Zhang (2023) and Zhang and Plonsky (2020) show that collaborative writing creates opportunities to discuss content, organization, and linguistic form.

Collaboration was particularly important during planning. Classroom implementation showed that students increasingly discussed topics, gathered ideas, selected vocabulary, and organized content before drafting. Planning together reduced the need for each learner to generate all content and language independently and turned writing into a sequence of decisions. This complements evidence that planning helps second-language writers organize ideas and allocate attention before production (Johnson & Tabari, 2023). In Arabic writing specifically, Amaliyah et al. (2025) demonstrated the potential of structured peer participation through Think-Pair-Share. The present study extends that insight by embedding collaboration within a broader task cycle rather than treating it as a stand-alone cooperative strategy.

The findings also accord with Elabdali's (2021) meta-analysis, which found overall advantages for collaborative writing, particularly in accuracy and holistic performance, while also showing variation across research designs. This qualification is important: collaboration does not automatically produce learning. Its value depends on whether learners actually engage in shared linguistic processing. In the observed task-based lessons, students compared expressions, discussed possible errors, and used peers as linguistic resources. These activities made language-related decisions visible before the teacher supplied final feedback.

Collaboration also redistributed classroom responsibility. Under the earlier

teacher-centered pattern, the teacher explained rules, provided exercises, and corrected responses. During task-based work, the teacher increasingly acted as a facilitator and source of targeted assistance, while students assumed greater responsibility for planning, composing, reviewing, and revising. Errors could be noticed and discussed during production rather than only identified after performance. Peer interaction did not replace teacher expertise, but it created an intermediate space between explanation and independent writing. In this way, collaboration converted prepared linguistic resources into shared meaning-making and linguistic problem solving.

Feedback as a Resource for Reviewing and Revision

The third mechanism was feedback. In the task-based program, teacher and peer feedback were incorporated into task performance and followed by opportunities to review, correct, reformulate, and revise. This shifted the function of correction. Rather than merely indicating whether a form was right or wrong after completion, feedback became part of an iterative process through which students could reconsider choices while the text was still developing. The distinction is important: correction identifies a problem, whereas feedback becomes pedagogically productive when learners interpret information and act on it.

Teacher feedback remained necessary because students continued to encounter orthographic, lexical, grammatical, and sentence-level problems that peers could not always resolve. During task completion, the teacher responded selectively to emerging difficulties, directed attention to problematic forms, clarified alternatives, and encouraged students to return to the text. Attention to form was therefore retained within meaningful language use. A spelling error, inappropriate pronoun, agreement problem, or poorly organized sentence became not only a rule violation but an obstacle to producing a clearer written product.

Peer feedback provided a complementary perspective. Because students had already engaged in collaborative planning and production, reviewing one another's writing extended shared problem solving. Students examined expressions, identified possible errors, and considered alternatives before the text was finalized. Yu and Lee (2016) and Vuogan and Li (2023) show that peer feedback can contribute to L2 writing when instructional conditions support meaningful engagement. The present findings similarly suggest that peer comments were most useful when students had a clear task, sufficient linguistic preparation, and an opportunity to revise afterward.

Revision was therefore central because it transformed feedback from information into action. Students receiving a comment or recognizing a problem had to decide how to modify the text, whether by correcting orthography, changing vocabulary, reformulating a structure, reorganizing a sentence, or improving connections between ideas. This interpretation is consistent with Mao et al. (2024), who stress learner engagement in naturalistic feedback contexts, and with Scherer et al. (2024), whose meta-analysis found an overall positive effect of feedback while showing that effects vary by learner and feedback characteristics. Revision also supports the self-regulatory processes through which learners monitor and improve written performance (Teng & Zhang, 2020).

The evidence further indicates that feedback worked best as responsive scaffolding rather than a uniform correction procedure. Some orthographic problems could be signaled directly, whereas grammatical or organizational problems sometimes required explanation, questioning, or examples. Alshahrani and Storch (2025) and Cheng et al. (2024) likewise emphasize the importance of matching support to learners' needs and engagement. In the observed classroom, an error could become a temporary feature of a developing text: students could detect it, discuss it, receive guidance, modify it, and continue writing. Feedback therefore supported both accuracy and communicative production by connecting noticing with revision.

Integrating Scaffolding, Collaboration, and Feedback: A Process Mechanism of Task-Based Arabic Writing

The findings are most informative when the three mechanisms are examined as an interconnected process. Linguistic scaffolding prepared learners to enter the task; collaborative interaction enabled them to mobilize and negotiate available resources; feedback directed attention to unresolved linguistic and textual problems; and revision required learners to act on that information. Each mechanism performed a different function, yet its pedagogical value partly depended on what occurred before and after it.

Table 1. Classroom Evidence for the Integrated Pedagogical Mechanism

Mechanism	Evidence from classroom data	Pedagogical function
Linguistic scaffolding	Vocabulary preparation, model expressions, relevant structures, prompts, guided discussion	Reduces entry difficulty and prepares learners for task participation
Collaborative writing	Pair/small-group planning, comparison of expressions, shared error identification	Makes linguistic choices discussable and supports shared problem solving
Teacher and	Comments and guidance during or after	Directs attention to unresolved

peer feedback	task production	linguistic and textual problems
Revision	Correction, reformulation, and text improvement after feedback	Converts noticing and feedback into textual change
Role redistribution	Teacher facilitates and targets support; students plan, draft, review, and revise	Increases learner responsibility while retaining instructional guidance

Source: Classroom observations, interviews, instructional documents, and implementation records.

The relationship between scaffolding and participation was visible when vocabulary support, models, prompts, and clarification reduced the demands of beginning a task without determining every linguistic choice for the learner. These resources subsequently became material for collaborative production. During pair or group work, students used, questioned, compared, and recombined the prepared language while solving textual problems. Collaboration in turn increased opportunities for noticing because competing expressions and possible errors became visible in interaction.

Peer interaction, however, did not guarantee that every problem would be identified or correctly resolved. Teacher feedback therefore supplemented collaborative decisions when learners remained uncertain, while peer feedback allowed students to examine writing from a reader's perspective. Feedback became consequential only when students returned to the text and revised it. The dominant pedagogical relationship can thus be described as linguistic scaffolding, collaborative meaning-making, feedback and noticing, revision, and meaningful Arabic writing. This is an analytical sequence rather than a rigid linear model: learners could return to linguistic support during collaboration, seek assistance while revising, or reconsider vocabulary after receiving feedback.

This recursive interpretation is important for TBLT. Meaningful outcomes are central to task-based pedagogy, but the present findings show that developing Arabic learners may require coordinated support to reach those outcomes. Tasks alone may be inaccessible when learners lack vocabulary, grammatical control, or confidence; excessive explanation, however, risks returning instruction to rule-centered practice. Task design must therefore balance meaningful outcomes with temporary and responsive support. This principle is consistent with needs-to-task design, in which task demands are derived from learners' actual communicative and linguistic requirements (Gilabert, 2023).

Recent Arabic-writing studies have demonstrated benefits from technological resources, visual scaffolding, structured peer interaction, and corpus-supported

production (Amaliyah et al., 2025; Basith, 2025; Melani et al., 2026; Romadhon et al., 2026). International L2-writing research separately provides evidence on collaborative writing and feedback (Elabdali, 2021; Mao et al., 2024; Scherer et al., 2024). The contribution of the present study is not to claim that scaffolding, collaboration, or feedback is independently new, but to show how these elements can operate sequentially and recursively as mutually reinforcing mechanisms within task-based Arabic writing.

The integrated process also clarifies the teacher's role. Moving toward task-based writing did not reduce the importance of teaching; it made intervention more selective and process-oriented. The teacher prepared linguistic resources, monitored collaboration, responded to emerging difficulties, provided feedback, and guided revision. Learners, meanwhile, took greater responsibility for generating content, evaluating alternatives, responding to peers, and improving texts. Task-based writing therefore redistributed instructional responsibility rather than transferring it entirely from teacher to learner.

From Rule-Focused Practice to Meaningful Arabic Writing

The combined findings indicate a broader transformation in how Arabic writing was organized. Before the program, writing largely followed a pattern of rule explanation, controlled exercise, and teacher correction. During task-based instruction, formal knowledge was repositioned within a sequence of linguistic preparation, planning, collaborative production, feedback, revision, and meaningful written outcomes. Grammar and orthographic accuracy were not removed; they were pursued as resources for clearer communication and improved texts.

The distinction therefore concerns the position of the learner in the writing process. In the earlier pattern, the teacher largely determined the linguistic content, presented correct forms, and evaluated responses. In the task-based pattern, the teacher still provided essential support, but students generated content, selected language, discussed alternatives, responded to feedback, and revised. Meaningful writing should not be equated with completely unsupported writing: developing learners may require substantial preparation before they can participate independently.

This synthesis answers the fourth research question. Linguistic scaffolding, collaborative writing, and feedback collectively reshaped Arabic writing by distributing support across the writing process and positioning revision as part of learning rather than as a final correction stage. The resulting practice was more participatory, iterative, and meaning-oriented while retaining structured attention to linguistic accuracy. Task-

based Arabic writing therefore functioned not as a collection of communicative activities but as a coordinated process through which learners moved from knowledge of language forms toward the purposeful production and improvement of Arabic texts.

Supporting Outcome Context and Practical Implications

The process interpretation was also consistent with the selected quantitative results from the broader study, although these outcomes are treated here only as contextual evidence rather than as a second effectiveness analysis. The experimental and control groups did not differ significantly at baseline ($p = .395$). After the intervention, the experimental group showed higher overall posttest performance than the control group ($p = .003$) with a large effect ($r = .57$), and the experimental group also improved significantly from pretest to posttest ($p = .001$; $r = .89$). These figures do not demonstrate that scaffolding, collaboration, or feedback statistically mediated the improvement, because no mediation analysis was conducted. They do, however, show that the classroom changes described qualitatively occurred alongside a meaningful improvement in writing performance.

This distinction is important for the contribution of the article. The quantitative evidence answers whether performance changed, whereas the classroom-process analysis offers a plausible pedagogical account of what learners and the teacher were doing while that change occurred. The evidence suggests that no single activity can adequately explain the instructional shift. Vocabulary preparation without meaningful production would remain preparatory; collaboration without linguistic focus could become simple task sharing; feedback without revision could remain passive information; and revision without adequate support could reproduce uncertainty. The mechanisms became pedagogically useful because they were coordinated across stages of writing.

For classroom practice, the findings therefore point to four design principles. First, pre-task support should be sufficient to make writing accessible but should not predetermine the final text. Second, collaborative activity should require shared decisions about meaning and language rather than merely dividing work among group members. Third, teacher and peer feedback should be selective, comprehensible, and connected to the specific difficulties learners encounter. Fourth, every substantial feedback episode should be followed by an opportunity to revise so that noticing becomes visible textual change. These principles translate TBLT from a general

commitment to meaningful tasks into a practical sequence for Arabic writing classrooms.

The findings also have implications for the gradual development of learner independence. Scaffolding was most useful when it was temporary and responsive: students needed more assistance when linguistic demands exceeded their immediate resources, but continued teacher control would have limited the shift toward learner responsibility. Collaborative planning and peer review provided intermediate forms of support between teacher explanation and independent writing. Over time, such support can be reduced as learners become more able to generate vocabulary, monitor forms, evaluate alternatives, and revise without external prompting. This gradual transfer of responsibility is consistent with the broader process orientation of the study and helps explain why task-based writing should be designed as a developmental sequence rather than as a one-time communicative activity.

CONCLUSION

This study shows that the pedagogical value of task-based Arabic writing does not lie in assigning communicative tasks alone, but in coordinating the support that enables learners to complete those tasks meaningfully. Linguistic scaffolding helped students enter the writing process by providing accessible vocabulary, structures, models, and task expectations. Collaborative writing then created a space for generating ideas, comparing expressions, negotiating linguistic choices, and solving textual problems with peers. Teacher and peer feedback directed attention to unresolved difficulties, while revision required learners to transform that feedback into textual change. These mechanisms operated sequentially and recursively rather than as isolated techniques. The study therefore explains task-based Arabic writing as an integrated process linking linguistic scaffolding, collaborative meaning-making, feedback and noticing, revision, and meaningful written production. Through this process, instruction shifted from rule explanation, controlled exercises, and end-stage correction toward a more participatory and iterative practice in which linguistic accuracy was developed within purposeful text production.

The study contributes to Arabic writing pedagogy by showing that scaffolding, collaboration, feedback, and revision gain pedagogical value when they are coordinated across the writing process. For teachers, this suggests that communicative tasks should be accompanied by appropriate linguistic preparation, opportunities for peer interaction, responsive feedback, and structured revision rather than treating writing as a single-stage product. The findings should nevertheless be interpreted within the research

context: the classroom-process analysis focused primarily on 14 male students in one institution, covered a relatively short intervention, and involved the researcher centrally in implementation. Future studies should test the process mechanism across longer interventions, different proficiency levels, female and mixed-gender groups, multiple teachers, and other institutional settings. Research could also examine how particular forms of scaffolding and feedback influence specific dimensions of Arabic writing and how learners develop greater independence as support is gradually reduced.

REFERENCES

- Alshahrani, A., & Storch, N. (2025). Investigating the effectiveness of scaffolded feedback on EFL Saudi students' writing accuracy: A longitudinal classroom-based study. *Assessing Writing*, 63, 100910. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2024.100910>
- Amaliyah, P. K., Maswani, M., & El Zahraa, F. (2025). The effectiveness of using the Think-Pair-Share strategy in teaching Arabic writing skills. *Al-Muyassar: Journal of Arabic Education*, 4(2), 321–344. <https://doi.org/10.31000/al-muyassar.v4i2.13545>
- Basith, A. (2025). E-learning as a solution for Arabic writing skills: A website-based approach. *Al-Muyassar: Journal of Arabic Education*, 4(1), 197–213. <https://doi.org/10.31000/al-muyassar.v4i1.12910>
- Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (1983). *Educational research: An introduction* (4th ed.). Longman.
- Cheng, X., Gao, L. X., & Liu, Y. (2024). The enactment of positive emotions via teacher scaffolding: The case of Chinese high school EFL learners' engagement with teacher written feedback. *System*, 124, 103375. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103375>
- Elabdali, R. (2021). Are two heads really better than one? A meta-analysis of the L2 learning benefits of collaborative writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 52, 100788. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2020.100788>
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Gilabert, R. (2023). Where second language acquisition and language education meet: The transfer from task-based needs analysis to task design. *Education Sciences*, 13(10), 1015. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13101015>
- Hakim, M. K. B. A. (2019). Needs analysis of Arabic guided writing material using task-based learning. *Jurnal Al Bayan: Jurnal Jurusan Pendidikan Bahasa Arab*, 11(2), 281–304. <https://doi.org/10.24042/albayan.v11i2.5263>
- Johnson, M. D., & Tabari, M. A. (2023). Planning in second-language writing: A research synthesis and meta-analysis. *System*, 118, 103152. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2023.103152>
- Li, M., & Zhang, M. (2023). Collaborative writing in second-language classrooms: A research agenda. *Language Teaching*, 56(1), 94–112. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444821000318>
- Long, M. H. (2015). *Second language acquisition and task-based language teaching*. Wiley Blackwell.
- Mao, Z., Lee, I., & Li, S. (2024). Written corrective feedback in second language writing: A synthesis of naturalistic classroom studies. *Language Teaching*, 57(4), 449–477. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444823000393>
- Melani, R., Mustar, P., Y., U., K., M., Sarip, M., & Hussein, A. H. A. (2026). Visual scaffolding through the Picture-and-Picture strategy: Evidence from a quasi-experimental study of Arabic writing instruction. *Al-Muyassar: Journal of Arabic Education*, 5(1), 392–410. <https://doi.org/10.31000/jev8pz45>
- Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Romadhon, I. F., Muassomah, & Arifa, Z. (2026). Employing the linguistic corpus in

- teaching Arabic writing skill: A proposed instructional model for the Arabic program. *Al-Muyassar: Journal of Arabic Education*, 5(2), 727–748. <https://doi.org/10.31000/wj6e7x52>
- Rustamaji, R., Anhar, A., Nurlaila, R., & Rifki, M. (2024). A needs analysis for developing Arabic writing materials: A study at a higher education institution. *Arabiyatuna: Jurnal Bahasa Arab*, 8(1), 255–282. <https://doi.org/10.29240/jba.v8i1.9825>
- Scherer, S., Graham, S., & Busse, V. (2024). How effective is feedback for L1, L2, and FL learners' writing? A meta-analysis. *Learning and Instruction*, 93, 101961. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2024.101961>
- Storch, N. (2019). Collaborative writing. *Language Teaching*, 52(1), 40–59. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444818000320>
- Teng, L. S., & Zhang, L. J. (2020). Empowering learners in the second- and foreign-language classroom: Can self-regulated learning strategies-based writing instruction make a difference? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 48, 100701. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2019.100701>
- Vuogan, A., & Li, S. (2023). Examining the effectiveness of peer feedback in second-language writing: A meta-analysis. *TESOL Quarterly*, 57(4), 1115–1138. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3178>
- Wijaya, A. C., & Aman, M. (2024). Problems of learning to write Arabic for eighth graders at Islamic Junior High School Muhammadiyah 48 Cikupa Tangerang. *Al-Muyassar: Journal of Arabic Education*, 3(1), 12–19. <https://doi.org/10.31000/al-muyassar.v3i1.9298>
- Willis, J. (1996). *A framework for task-based learning*. Longman.
- Yasmar, R., Adam, F. M., Machmudah, U., Kurniawan, R., & Suja, A. (2025). Needs analysis of teaching materials for kitābah using genre-based pedagogy. *Arabiyatuna: Jurnal Bahasa Arab*, 9(1), 117–132. <https://doi.org/10.29240/jba.v9i1.12665>
- Yu, S., & Lee, I. (2016). Peer feedback in second-language writing, 2005–2014. *Language Teaching*, 49(4), 461–493. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444816000161>
- Zhang, M., & Plonsky, L. (2020). Collaborative writing in face-to-face settings: A substantive and methodological review. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 49, 100753. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2020.100753>