



The role of classroom interaction in daily writing practice and EFL recount text writing

Ahmad Saifudin,^{*1} Adhan Kholis,² Fadhl Mohammed Awadh Gharamah,³

¹Universitas Nahdlatul Ulama Blitar, Indonesia ²Universitas Nahdlatul Ulama Yogyakarta, Indonesia

³University of Lahej, Yemen

This study investigates how daily writing practice enhances EFL students' recount text writing through classroom interaction. While previous research has demonstrated the benefits of regular writing practice, most studies have relied on quantitative measures and have paid limited attention to how writing development is mediated through classroom interaction in authentic learning contexts. Addressing this gap, the present study employs a qualitative design to explore both writing development and interactional processes in an Indonesian higher education setting. The study was conducted with 15 third-semester students enrolled in an Intermediate Writing course. Data were collected through classroom observations, students' written texts, and semi-structured interviews, and were analyzed using thematic analysis to identify patterns of interaction and trajectories of writing development over time. The findings reveal that daily writing practice led to specific improvements in idea elaboration, chronological organization, and control of past tense forms in recount texts. More importantly, classroom interaction, particularly lecturer feedback, peer discussion, and guided questioning, functioned as a mediating mechanism that supported revision, genre awareness, and self-regulated writing. Students gradually shifted from fragmented and formulaic writing to more coherent and reflective recount texts. This study contributes to EFL writing pedagogy by providing qualitative evidence that writing development is not solely driven by practice frequency but also by the quality of interaction embedded within writing activities. It highlights the importance of integrating routine writing practice with interactive, genre-based instruction to foster sustained writing development in higher education contexts.

Keywords: EFL writing; recount text; daily writing practice; classroom interaction; qualitative study

OPEN ACCESS

ISSN 2503 3492 (online)

*Correspondence:

Ahmad Saifudin

saif.ahmad123coretandinding@gmail.com

Received: 17th January 2026

Accepted: 7th March 2026

Published: 22th April 2026

Citation:

Saifudin, A., Kholis, A., Gharamah, F.M.A.

(2026). The role of classroom interaction

in daily writing practice and EFL recount

text writing. *JEES (Journal of English*

Educators Society), 11(1).

<https://doi.org/10.21070/jees.v11i1.2001>

INTRODUCTION

Writing is widely recognized as one of the most complex language skills for learners of English as a Foreign Language (EFL), as it requires the integration of linguistic knowledge, cognitive processes, and sociocultural awareness (Hyland, 2019). Unlike speaking, writing demands a higher level of accuracy, organization, and reflection, making it particularly challenging for EFL students in higher education contexts (Reima Al-Jarf, 2026; Rusmawaty et al., 2026). Despite years of formal instruction, many university-level EFL learners continue to struggle to develop coherent and meaningful written texts, especially when dealing with genre-specific writing tasks (Bitchener, J., & Ferris, 2012; Hyland, 2016).

In Indonesian EFL contexts, writing instruction has often emphasized product-oriented approaches, focusing primarily on grammatical accuracy and final outcomes rather

than on the writing process itself ([Emilia & Hamied, 2015](#)). As a result, students frequently demonstrate limited development in idea generation, text organization, and genre awareness. This issue becomes more evident in genre-based writing tasks such as recount texts, which require students to construct chronological narratives while adhering to specific schematic structures and linguistic features ([Derewianka, B., & Jones, 2016](#)). Without sufficient opportunities for continuous practice and guided interaction, students tend to reproduce formulaic texts with minimal improvement over time.

One pedagogical approach that has gained increasing attention in writing instruction is daily writing practice ([Holdings et al., 2025](#); [Reima Al-Jarf, 2026](#)). Rooted in process-based writing theory, daily writing emphasizes regular, low-stakes writing activities that allow learners to develop fluency, confidence, and control over written language through repetition and reflection ([Graham & Perin, 2007](#)). Previous studies suggest that consistent writing routines can positively influence students' writing development by fostering writing habits and reducing anxiety associated with formal writing tasks ([Lee, 2020](#); [Toba et al., 2019](#)). However, many of these studies rely heavily on quantitative measures of writing improvement, often overlooking the qualitative dimensions of how writing development unfolds in classroom settings.

From a sociocultural perspective, writing development is not merely an individual cognitive activity but a socially mediated process shaped by classroom interaction ([Cave, 2010](#); [Lei, 2008](#)). Interaction between teachers and students, as well as among peers, plays a crucial role in scaffolding learners' understanding of writing conventions, genre expectations, and linguistic choices ([Guo et al., 2026](#); [Sugiarti et al., 2026](#)). Teacher feedback, peer discussion, and guided questioning during writing activities can support learners in moving from assisted performance toward greater independence ([Hyland, 2016, 2019](#)). Therefore, examining classroom interaction is essential for understanding how pedagogical practices such as daily writing contribute to writing development.

Genre-based approaches further emphasize the importance of interaction in writing instruction. According to systemic functional linguistics (SFL), genres are socially constructed and learned through explicit instruction and meaningful engagement with texts ([Tally, 2023](#)). In framing this study, it is important to clarify the relationship between Sociocultural Theory and SFL, particularly in relation to daily writing practice and genre-based instruction. At first glance, daily writing may appear to align with a process-oriented emphasis on fluency and self-expression, while genre-based instruction is often associated with explicit attention to textual structure and linguistic accuracy. However, these perspectives are not contradictory; rather, they can be pedagogically complementary.

From a sociocultural perspective, learning occurs through social interaction, scaffolding, and guided participation. Daily writing provides repeated opportunities for students to externalize ideas, receive feedback, and refine their texts through mediated interaction ([Fathi & Rahimi, 2024](#); [Stell, 2025](#)). Meanwhile, SFL conceptualizes genre as a socially

situated text type with identifiable purposes, schematic structures, and language features. Through explicit modeling and discussion of these conventions, students gain greater control over how meaning is organized within a particular genre.

In this study, daily writing functions as sustained practice that promotes fluency and idea generation, while genre-based guidance ensures attention to organization, tense consistency, and rhetorical purpose. Interaction serves as the bridge between the two: through feedback and questioning, students gradually move from exploratory drafting toward greater control of genre conventions, balancing fluency with structural accuracy.

In the case of recount texts, learners must understand not only the linguistic features, such as past tense verbs and temporal conjunctions, but also the communicative purpose and schematic structure of the genre ([Derewianka, B., & Jones, 2016](#)). Classroom interaction provides a space for negotiating meaning, clarifying genre expectations, and refining students' writing through dialogic processes.

This study makes a novel contribution to EFL writing pedagogy by demonstrating that the effectiveness of daily writing practice is not determined solely by its frequency, but by the quality of interaction that accompanies it. In doing so, it provides empirically grounded insights into how interactive, genre-based writing instruction can be implemented in higher education contexts to support sustained and meaningful writing development.

Recount text was deliberately selected as the focus of this study because it constitutes a foundational genre in the Indonesian English curriculum and is typically introduced prior to more cognitively demanding genres, such as argumentative writing ([Ndruru et al., 2025](#); [Sufiyandi et al., 2026](#)). Its relatively clear schematic structure and identifiable language features make it pedagogically suitable for observing incremental development in text organization, tense control, and the sequencing of ideas. Addressing this gap is particularly essential, as qualitative inquiry can illuminate learners' lived experiences, the dynamics of lecturer-student interaction, and the underlying mechanisms through which writing development occurs. By foregrounding classroom processes rather than solely product-based outcomes, qualitative insights provide a more nuanced understanding of how consistent writing practice and interaction collaboratively foster sustained development in EFL higher education contexts.

Accordingly, this study investigates the contribution of daily writing practice to the development of EFL students' recount text writing through classroom interaction. The participants were third-semester students enrolled in an Intermediate Writing course at Universitas Nahdlatul Ulama Blitar. Adopting a qualitative approach, the study examines how interactional practices, such as lecturer feedback, peer discussion, and instructional scaffolding, support students' writing development. The focus extends beyond final written products to include the classroom processes that shape students' understanding of genre structure, language use, and idea development. Through the analysis of classroom observations, students' written drafts, and interview data, this study provides a detailed account of how regular writing

practice, when combined with meaningful interaction, facilitates gradual improvement in recount text writing and enhances students' awareness of genre conventions in an EFL higher education context. By examining classroom interaction alongside students' written texts, this study contributes to the growing body of qualitative research on EFL writing pedagogy and offers pedagogical implications for integrating daily writing routines in higher education contexts.

Based on the foregoing discussion, the study addresses the following research questions:

1. How does daily writing practice contribute to the improvement of EFL students' recount text writing quality in an Intermediate Writing course?
2. What types of classroom interaction emerge during the implementation of daily writing practice in recount text instruction?
3. How do classroom interactions, such as lecturer feedback, peer interaction, and instructional scaffolding, mediate students' writing development in recount texts?

METHODS

Qualitative Research Design

This study employed a qualitative research design to examine how daily writing practice contributes to the improvement of EFL students' recount text writing quality through classroom interaction. A qualitative approach was considered appropriate as the study sought to generate an in-depth understanding of the instructional processes, interactional patterns, and students' writing development within a natural classroom setting (Creswell, 2018). Specifically, the research adopted a classroom-based qualitative inquiry, emphasizing the interpretation of observed interactions, students' written texts, and participants' perspectives rather than the numerical measurement of writing outcomes.

Participants and Research Context

The participants comprised 15 third-semester students enrolled in an Intermediate Writing course at Universitas Nahdlatul Ulama Blitar. In terms of proficiency, the students were categorized as lower-intermediate to intermediate EFL learners, based on their performance in previous writing courses and the lecturer's initial assessment at the beginning of the semester. Diagnostic writing tasks administered during the first weeks of the course indicated that most students experienced difficulties in organizing ideas coherently, maintaining consistent use of past tense forms, and applying appropriate genre structures in recount texts.

The participants were not classified as advanced writers; rather, they were still developing foundational academic writing skills. This level of proficiency is particularly significant, as the effects of daily writing practice may vary across proficiency levels. For these learners, frequent short writing tasks provided structured opportunities to develop fluency while simultaneously receiving scaffolding to enhance accuracy and genre control. Clarifying the participants' intermediate proficiency level helps contextualize the findings and explains why sustained

practice, combined with classroom interaction, played a crucial role in supporting their gradual writing development.

Data Collection

Data were collected over one academic term during the implementation of daily writing practice in recount text instruction (Habeab Al-Obaydi et al., 2025; Subandowo et al., 2025). Multiple data sources were employed to ensure triangulation and to enhance the credibility of the findings (Huberman, 2014). Classroom observations were conducted to document interactional practices, including lecturer-student feedback, peer interaction, and instructional scaffolding during daily writing activities (Habeab Al-Obaydi et al., 2025; Rashidi et al., 2025). Field notes were systematically recorded to capture verbal exchanges, instructional strategies, and students' engagement (Sögüt & Belli, 2024).

The daily writing activity was implemented as a structured routine at the beginning of each class session. Students were allocated approximately 10-15 minutes to compose a short recount text in response to guided prompts related to personal experiences, recent events, or thematic topics connected to the lesson. This activity functioned as a focused in-class writing task rather than homework assignment, thereby ensuring consistent participation under the lecturer's supervision.

Students recorded their responses in a designated writing journal, enabling both the students and the lecturer to monitor progress over time. Upon completing the initial drafts, selected entries were discussed through brief peer feedback sessions or whole-class review, followed by lecturer feedback focusing on organization, appropriate use of past tense, sequencing of events, and clarity of ideas. Although occasional revisions were assigned as follow-up tasks to be completed outside class, the primary writing practice was conducted in class to maintain regularity, facilitate immediate feedback, and support interactive learning.

Data Analysis

Data analysis was conducted using a thematic analysis approach, as proposed by Braun and Clarke (2006). This approach enabled the systematic identification, analysis, and interpretation of patterns within the dataset. To ensure trustworthiness of the findings, several strategies were employed. First, prolonged engagement was established through continuous classroom observation throughout the semester, allowing the researcher to develop an in-depth understanding of instructional practices and students' writing development. Second, member checking was conducted by sharing interview summaries and preliminary interpretations with selected participants to verify the accuracy of the findings and to minimize potential misinterpretation. Third, data triangulation was employed by comparing evidence derived from classroom observations, students' written texts, and interview transcripts to identify recurring and consistent patterns.

Additionally, an audit trail was maintained to document coding decisions, theme development, and analytical reflections throughout the research process. Peer debriefing was also undertaken to review and validate emerging themes. Collectively, these procedures enhanced the credibility, dependability, and overall rigor of the qualitative analysis.

Then, the analysis specifically focused on identifying patterns of classroom interaction and examining how these interactions mediated students' development of recount text writing. Students' written texts were analyzed qualitatively by tracing changes in idea development, text organization, and the use of linguistic features characteristic of recount texts. Through this integrative analysis, the study provides a comprehensive account of how interactional processes and writing practice jointly contributed to students writing development.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The findings of this study are presented thematically to address the research questions and to illustrate how daily writing practice and classroom interaction contributed to the development of students' recount text writing quality. Three major themes emerged from the data analysis: (1) gradual improvement in recount text writing quality through daily writing practice, (2) emerging patterns of classroom interaction during daily writing activities, and (3) the mediating role of classroom interaction in students' writing development.

Theme 1: Gradual Improvement in Recount Text Writing Quality through Daily Writing Practice

The analysis of students' written recount texts revealed a gradual improvement in writing quality over the course of daily writing practice. Students demonstrated clearer idea development, more coherent text organization, and increased control over language features characteristic of recount texts, such as the use of past tense verbs and temporal conjunctions.

In the early stages, students' recount texts tended to be brief and fragmented, often lacking a clear sequence of events. As the daily writing routines were consistently implemented, students began to elaborate their experiences more fully and to structure their texts according with the schematic organization of recount texts (orientation, events, and reorientation).

One student reflected on this development during the interview:

"At first, I was confused about how to start and continue my story. But because we write every day, I become more familiar with recount structure and my ideas flow better." (Student 7)

This finding indicates that daily writing practice functioned as a form of scaffolding, enabling students to develop writing fluency and genre awareness through repeated engagement. An example from an early-stage text illustrates limited elaboration and organization:

"Yesterday I went to my grandmother house. I was happy. We eat together."

This excerpt shows minimal elaboration, with ideas presented in isolated and underdeveloped sentences. In contrast, a later text produced by the same student shows notable improvement:

"Yesterday afternoon, I went to the park and arrived at 4 p.m. First, I met my friend near the entrance. Then, we played football together for an hour. After that, we sat on a bench

and talked before I went home."

In this excerpt, the student demonstrates a clearer chronological structure using sequencing markers ("first," "then," "after that"), which improves the logical flow and coherence of the narrative.

Theme 2: Emerging Patterns of Classroom Interaction during Daily Writing Practice

Classroom observation data revealed several recurring patterns of interaction during the implementation of daily writing practice. These included lecturer-student feedback, peer interaction, and guided questioning. The lecturer frequently circulated around the classroom, providing immediate oral feedback and prompting students to reflect on their lexical choices and sentence structures. The following excerpt illustrates how guided questioning was enacted during a daily writing session:

Lecturer : *You Wrote "I was very happy that day." Why were you happy? Can you add more details?*

Student : *Because I met my old friend.*

Lecturer : *That's a good start. Where did you meet him?*

Student : *I met him in the school reunion.*

Lecturer : *Good. Since this is a recount text, can you make the sequence clearer? What happened first?*

Student : *First, I arrived at the school hall. Then I saw him near the entrance.*

Lecturer : *Excellent. Now combine those ideas into two or three sentences using past tense consistently.*

This interaction demonstrates how guided questioning functioned as a scaffold to support students in elaborating ideas, clarifying event sequences, and improving grammatical accuracy. Through such dialogic exchanges, the lecturer facilitated students' movement from initial, underdeveloped responses toward more structured and coherent recount texts.

Peer interaction was also evident, particularly during brief sharing sessions in which students exchanged drafts and discussed writing challenges. These interactions created opportunities for collaborative learning and mutual support.

An observation excerpt further illustrates this dynamic:

The lecturer asked students to read their drafts to a peer and discuss whether the sequence of events was clear. Students actively exchanged comments and asked clarification questions.

Such interactional practices contributed to the development of a supportive classroom environment that encouraged active engagement in the writing process. Moreover, they enabled students to negotiate meaning, reflect on their writing, and develop greater awareness of genre conventions through collaborative dialogue.

Theme 3: Classroom Interaction as Mediation in Writing Development

A closer analysis of the classroom data shows that the lecturer's feedback extended beyond surface-level correction. Two dominant types of feedback were identified: corrective

feedback and facilitative feedback. Corrective feedback primarily addressed linguistic accuracy, including inconsistent use of past tense forms or inappropriate lexical choice. For example, in one student’s draft, the lecturer underlined the sentence “*I go to the beach with my family*” and annotated in the margin: “*Use past tense → went. Check all verbs.*” This type of feedback enabled students to notice recurring grammatical patterns that required revision.

However, a substantial proportion of the feedback was facilitative in nature. Rather than directly rewriting unclear sentences, the lecturer provided guiding comments designed to stimulate elaboration and reflection. For example, in Student 3’s journal, following the sentence “*I felt very sad that day,*” the lecturer wrote: “*Why did you feel sad? What exactly happened? Add 1–2 sentences to explain.*” Such prompts encouraged students to expand their ideas and clarify the sequence of events.

This form of feedback was perceived positively by the students. As one participant noted:

“When the lecturer gives comments directly, I know what part should be improved. It helps me revise my writing more confidently.”

The combination of explicit correction and reflective questioning created a balanced feedback environment. Corrective feedback contributed to the development of grammatical accuracy, while facilitative feedback supported deeper idea elaboration and clearer event sequencing. Over time, students began to anticipate such questions independently, suggesting that interactional feedback gradually shifted from external guidance toward internalized self-regulation. This progression reflects a movement from assisted performance to greater learner autonomy in writing development.

Pedagogical Implications

The findings of this study offer several pedagogical implications for EFL writing instruction. First, incorporating daily writing practice into writing courses can foster students’ writing fluency, confidence, and genre awareness. Low-stakes, routine writing tasks enable learners to engage with writing as an ongoing process rather than as a one-time assessment.

Second, writing instruction should be supported by meaningful classroom interaction. Lecturer feedback, guided questioning, and peer discussion play a crucial role in mediating students’ understanding of writing conventions and supporting their development. Writing activities should therefore be designed to promote interaction rather than positioning writing as an isolated individual task.

Third, genre-based instruction can be strengthened through consistent writing practice. By repeatedly engaging students in genre-specific writing tasks, such as recount texts, lecturers can support students in internalizing schematic structures and relevant linguistic features more effectively.

These findings suggest that EFL writing courses in higher education should move beyond predominantly product-oriented approaches and instead integrate daily writing routines with interactive pedagogical strategies. Such integration can create a supportive learning environment that promotes sustained writing development and enhance learner

autonomy.

Overall, the findings demonstrate that daily writing practice, when integrated with meaningful classroom interaction, contributes significantly to the improvement of EFL students’ recount text writing quality. Writing development is not solely driven by routine practice; rather, it is mediated through interactional processes including feedback, collaboration, and scaffolding. Collectively, these findings illustrate how writing quality evolves through socially situated instructional practices within the Intermediate Writing classroom.

TABLE 1 | Indicators of Gradual Improvement in Students’ Recount Writing

Writing Aspect	Early Weeks (Weeks 1–3)	Middle Weeks (Weeks 4–7)	Final Weeks (Weeks 8–12)
Idea Development	Limited details: events briefly described	Greater elaboration; clearer explanation of events	Detailed and reflective recounts with clearer focus
Text Organization	Weak sequencing; unclear orientation	Improved chronological order; clearer structure	Consistent schematic structure (orientation, events, reorientation)
Use of Past Tense	Frequent tense inconsistency	Reduced errors; more consistent use of past tense	Largely accurate and controlled use of past tense
Coherence & Cohesion	Minimal connectors; abrupt transitions	Use of basic connectors (e.g., then, after that, finally)	Smoother transitions and clearer logical flow
Genre Awareness	Limited awareness of recount conventions	Emerging understanding of genre stages	Clear control of recount text conventions

The developmental changes presented in [Table 1](#) were identified through a longitudinal analysis of students’ journal entries collected throughout the semester. Each student’s weekly recount texts were examined sequentially to trace patterns of progression in idea development, text organization, tense consistency, and genre awareness. Rather than evaluating texts in isolation, the analysis compared early, middle, and later entries to capture shifts in writing quality over time.

These textual findings were subsequently triangulated with classroom observation notes documenting the nature of lecturer feedback, guided questioning, and peer interaction during writing sessions. In addition, interview data from both students and the lecturer provided reflective insights into how daily writing practice and classroom interaction contributed to writing development. By integrating journal analysis, observational data, and interview responses, the study ensured

that the identified improvements were grounded in multiple sources of qualitative evidence rather than relying solely on textual comparison.

This study explored how daily writing practice contributes to the improvement of EFL students' recount text writing quality through classroom interaction. The findings demonstrate that writing development is not merely the result of repeated practice but is fundamentally shaped by socially mediated instructional processes. In line with the research questions, the discussion highlights the role of daily writing as a process-oriented practice and classroom interaction as a key mediating mechanism in EFL writing development.

The first major finding indicates that daily writing practice supported gradual improvement in students' recount text writing quality, particularly in terms of idea development, text organization, and the use of genre-specific linguistic features. This finding aligns with process-based writing theory, which emphasizes writing as an iterative and developmental activity rather than a one-time product (Graham & Perin, 2007; Hyland, 2019).

Beyond its theoretical alignment, this finding holds particular significance within the Indonesian higher education context. Writing instruction in many Indonesian universities has traditionally been product-oriented, emphasizing final drafts, grammatical accuracy, and summative assessment, rather than iterative drafting and revision. In such contexts, students are often required to submit one-time assignments with limited opportunity for sustained feedback or reflective improvement.

The present study challenges this prevailing orientation by demonstrating that structured daily writing, when combined with interactive mediation, can effectively shift the focus from product to process without neglecting genre conventions. Rather than treating recount texts as isolated, graded tasks, the classroom in this study positioned writing as an evolving practice shaped through dialogue, guided questioning, and revision. Students were not merely correcting errors to meet assessment criteria; instead, they progressively developed greater control over text organization, tense consistency, and genre structure through sustained and meaningful engagement.

In this way, the study contributes locally grounded evidence that a process-oriented, yet genre-aware approach is both feasible and pedagogically beneficial within an Indonesian EFL university classroom. This contextualized insight strengthens its relevance for institutions seeking to move beyond predominantly product-driven model of writing instruction.

Consistent writing routines allowed students to develop fluency and familiarity with recount text conventions, thereby supporting earlier studies that highlight the pedagogical value of regular writing practice in EFL contexts (Lee, 2020; Toba et al., 2019). In contrast to product-oriented approaches that prioritize accuracy in isolation, daily writing created space for experimentation, reflection, and revision, processes that are essential for sustained writing development.

The findings further underscore the critical role of classroom interaction in facilitating writing development. Lecturer feedback and instructional scaffolding emerged as central interactional practices that mediated students'

engagement with recount text writing. This finding is consistent with sociocultural theory, which conceptualizes learning as a socially mediated process occurring within the zone of proximal development (Cave, 2010; Lei, 2008). Through targeted feedback and guided questioning, the lecturer supported students in progressing from assisted performance toward greater independence in writing. This progression highlights the pivotal in fostering both linguistic development and learner autonomy in EFL writing contexts (Hyland, 2019).

Peer interaction also played a crucial role in shaping students' writing development. Collaborative discussions enabled students to negotiate meaning, clarify genre expectations, and gain alternative perspectives on their writing. This finding corroborates previous research highlighting peer interaction as a valuable resource for developing genre awareness and writing confidence in EFL classrooms (Storch, 2013; Zhang, 2020). Through engagement in peer feedback, students were able to reflect on their writing practices and internalize genre conventions more effectively, supporting the view that writing development is inherently dialogic.

From a genre-based perspective, the observed improvement in students' recount text writing quality reflects the effectiveness of integrating explicit genre instruction with interactive pedagogical practices. Genre theorists argue that genres are socially constructed and learned through meaningful participation in communicative activities (Derewianka, B., & Jones, 2016; Lister, 2009). In this study, daily writing activities provided a structured yet flexible space for repeated engagement with the recount genre, while classroom interaction facilitated the negotiation of schematic structure and relevant linguistic features. This interactional engagement contributed to students' increased awareness of both the communicative purpose and organizational patterns of recount texts.

Importantly, this study extends previous research by offering qualitative insights into how daily writing practice and classroom interaction intersect in higher education EFL contexts. While earlier studies have often relied on quantitative measures to evaluate writing improvement, the present findings illuminate the processes through which writing development unfolds in authentic classroom settings. By foregrounding interactional dynamics, this study responds to calls for more qualitative research that captures the complexity of EFL writing pedagogy (Creswell, 2018; Hyland, 2016).

Overall, the discussion highlights that daily writing practice is most effective when embedded within an interactive instructional environment. Writing development is not solely driven by the frequency of practice; rather, it is shaped by the quality of interaction that supports learners' engagement with genre, language, and meaning. These findings contribute to ongoing scholarly discussions in EFL writing research and offer pedagogical implications for designing writing instruction that integrates routine practice with meaningful classroom interaction.

CONCLUSION

This qualitative study examined how daily writing practice contributes to the improvement of EFL students' recount text writing quality through classroom interaction in an Intermediate Writing course. The findings demonstrate that consistent daily writing activities supported students' gradual development in idea elaboration, text organization, and the use of genre-specific linguistic features. Importantly, the study reveals that writing improvement was not solely the result of repeated practice, but was mediated through meaningful classroom interaction, including lecturer feedback, peer collaboration, and instructional scaffolding.

By highlighting the interactional processes underlying writing development, this study contributes to the growing body of qualitative research on EFL writing pedagogy, particularly within higher education contexts. The findings support sociocultural and genre-based perspectives, which conceptualize writing as a socially situated practice shaped through dialogic engagement and instructional mediation. Furthermore, this study addresses a gap in existing literature by providing in-depth qualitative insights into how daily writing routines operate within authentic classroom settings, thereby offering a process-oriented understanding of writing development that extends beyond measurable outcomes.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to express their sincere gratitude to all individuals and institutions that contributed to the completion of this study. Special appreciation is extended to the English teachers and students who participated in the research and generously provided their time, insights, and cooperation throughout the data collection process. Their willingness to engage in the study was invaluable to the successful completion of this research. The authors also acknowledge the valuable guidance and constructive feedback provided by academic supervisors and expert reviewers, whose suggestions greatly improved the clarity and quality of this article. Appreciation is further extended to the school administration for granting permission and supporting the implementation of the research activities.

REFERENCES

- Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. R. (2012). *Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing*. Routledge.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203832400>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
<https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Cave, A. (2010). Learning How to Become a Writer in Elementary School: A Review of the Literature from Cognitive, Social Cognitive, Developmental, and Sociocultural Perspectives. *I-Manager's Journal on Educational Psychology*, 3(4), 1–13.

- <https://doi.org/10.26634/jpsy.3.4.1129>
- Creswell, J. D. (2018). Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches. *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling*, 53(9).
- Derewianka, B., & Jones, P. (2016). *Teaching language in context*. Oxford University Press.
- Emilia, E., & Hamied, F. A. (2015). Systemic Functional Linguistic Genre Pedagogy (Sfl Gp) in a Tertiary Efl Writing Context in Indonesia. *TEFLIN Journal - A Publication on the Teaching and Learning of English*, 26(2), 155.
<https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v26i2/155-182>
- Fathi, J., & Rahimi, M. (2024). Utilising artificial intelligence-enhanced writing mediation to develop academic writing skills in EFL learners: a qualitative study. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 39(1–2), 263–302.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2024.2374772>
- Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). *Writing next effective strategies to improve writing of adolescents in middle and high schools a Report to Carnegie Corporation of New York*.
- Guo, K., Zou, S., & Zou, D. (2026). Integrated feedback as networked activity: A systematic review of multi-source feedback in ESL/EFL writing through an activity theory lens. *Language Teaching Research*.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688261424479>
- Habeb Al-Obaydi, L., Shakki, F., & Pikhart, M. (2025). How does emergency remote teaching affect EFL students' writing skills? *Cogent Education*, 12(1).
<https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2500001>
- Holdinga, L., van Drie, J., & Rijlaarsdam, G. (2025). Enhancing disciplinary literacy through integrated writing and process instruction: an intervention study. *Reading and Writing*, 39(1). Springer Netherlands.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-025-10630-2>
- Huberman, M. B. M.; J. S. M. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis A Methods Sourcebook*.
<http://library1.nida.ac.th/termpaper6/sd/2554/19755.pdf>
- Hyland, K. (2016). *Teaching and researching writing*. Routledge.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315717203>
- Hyland, K. (2019). *Second Language Writing*. In *Second Language Writing*. Cambridge University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511667251>
- Lee, I. (2020). Teacher written corrective feedback: Less is more. *Language Teaching*, 53(4).
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444819000247>
- Lei, X. (2008). Exploring a sociocultural approach to writing strategy research: Mediated actions in writing activities. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17(4), 217–236. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2008.04.001>
- Lister, M. (2009). *New Media: A Critical Introduction*. Routledge.
- Ndruru, F., Suryati, N., Basthomi, Y., Rovikasari, M., & Laia, R. D. (2025). Developing and Validating a Multimodal Composing Scale in EFL Academic

- Writing: An Exploratory Factor Analysis. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 65(2), 208–230.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19388071.2025.2592211>
- Rashidi, N., Farangi, M. R., & Hosseini, A. (2025). Exploring Technology-Enhanced Learning: A Comparative Study of Online and Offline Interactive Practices in the Iranian Higher Education System. *Qualitative Report*, 30(8), 4168–4185.
<https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2025.7757>
- Reima Al-Jarf. (2026). Classroom Practices, Writing Enhancement and Creativity Among EFL Struggling Students. *A Systematic Review*. 20–38.
<https://doi.org/10.32996/jweep>
- Rusmawaty, D., Iswari, W. P., & Info, A. (2026). EFL Learners' Experiences with Flipped Classroom: A case study of students in the English. 4778, 616–631.
<https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas.v14i1.6830>
- Söğüt, S., & Belli, S. A. (2024). QR Code Enriched Writing and Speaking Practices: Insights from EFL Learners at Tertiary Level. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 12(2), 1–18.
<https://doi.org/10.30466/ijltr.2024.54921.2595>
- Stell, A. (2025). Exploring multimodality in technology-mediated collaborative writing: An activity theory. *Language Learning & Technology*, 29(3), 182–204.
<https://doi.org/10.64152/10125/73652>
- Storch, N. (2013). Collaborative writing in L2 classrooms. *Multilingual Matters*.
<https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847699954>
- Subandowo, D., Sárdi, C., & Thresia, F. (2025). An investigation of English academic writing strategies employed by Indonesian graduate students in an English medium instruction (EMI) context. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-025-00345-w>
- Sufiyandi, Emilia, E., Damayanti, I. L., & Mukminin, A. (2026). Integrating blended learning into a genre-based approach to. 10(1), 508–523.
<https://doi.org/10.22437/jiituj.v10i1.53470>
- Sugiarti, D. H., Sastromiharjo, A., & Kurniawan, K. (2026). Peer Feedback and Writing Revision in Primary Education: A Quasi-Experimental Study of Fourth-Grade Narrative Writing. 10(1), 15–27.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.22460/pej.v10i1.6928>
- Tally, R. T. (2023). Mapping Culture. In American Book Review. *Equinox Publishing*. 44(2).
<https://doi.org/10.1353/abr.2023.a906504>
- Toba, R., Noor, W. N., & Sanu, L. O. (2019). The Current Issues of Indonesian EFL Students' Writing Skills: Ability, Problem, and Reason in Writing Comparison and Contrast Essay. *Dinamika Ilmu*, 19(1), 57–73.
<https://doi.org/10.21093/di.v19i1.1506>
- Zhang. (2020). An investigation of novice ESL writers' cognitive processes and strategy use of paraphrasing. *Language Testing in Asia*, 10(1).
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-020-00104-3>

Conflict of Interest Statement: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Copyright ©2026 Ahmad Saifudin, Adhan Kholis, Fadhl Mohammed Awadh Gharamah. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.