

Please cite this paper as follows:

Pourverdi, F., Ahmadi-Azad, Sh., & Nabifar, N. (2025). Effect of Teaching Through Different Types of Flipped Classroom on Iranian Advanced EFL Learners' Writing Performance. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, 13 (53), 143-157.

Research Paper

Effect of Teaching Through Different Types of Flipped Classroom on Iranian Advanced EFL Learners' Writing Performance

Fattaneh Pourverdi¹, Shima Ahmadi-Azad^{2*}, Nesa Nabifar³

¹Ph.D. Candidate, Department of English Teaching, Sarab Branch, Islamic Azad University, Sarab, Iran

f_pourverdi@gmail.com

²English teaching department, Sarab branch, Islamic Azad University, Sarab, Iran

sh.ahmadiazad@gmail.com

³Assistant Professor, Department of ELT, Tabriz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran

n.nabifar@iaut.ac.ir

Received: September 08, 2024

Accepted: November 05, 2024

Abstract

Writing proficiency is a key factor in the development of language skills, and there are different approaches to writing development. This study sought to investigate the effect of flipped classroom, interactive classroom, and the integration of two approaches on Iranian advanced English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners' writing performance. Eighty-five Iranian learners enrolled in EFL programs at the Sokhan English Institution in Guilan, Iran, participated in this quasi-experimental research. There were both males and females. After homogenizing them with the Oxford Placemen, they were divided into three experimental groups: the flipped classroom, the interactive classroom, and the integration of two approaches. Three instruments were used to collect data: The Oxford placement test, the pre-test, and the post-test of writing. They had 13 sessions of treatment. Data analysis by ANCOVA revealed that both flipped classroom, and interactive classroom positively impacted the writing skills of EFL learners. However, the group receiving the integration of flipped and interactive approaches treatment outperformed in its effect on learners' writing performance. The current research findings could assist creators of textbooks, educational organizers, material developers, language institutions, educators, and students in creating a more effective environment for learning foreign languages and enhancing writing skills.

Keywords: EFL learners, Flipped Classroom, Interactive Classroom, Writing

مهارت نوشتاری یک عامل کلیدی در توسعه مهارت های زبانی است و رویکردهای مختلفی برای توسعه نوشتار وجود دارد. این پژوهش به دنبال بررسی تأثیر کلاس درس معکوس، کلاس تعاملی و تلفیق دو رویکرد بر عملکرد نوشتاری زبان آموزان ایرانی پیشرفته انگلیسی به عنوان زبان خارجی (EFL) بود. در این پژوهش نیمه تجربی، هشتاد و پنج زبان آموز ایرانی ثبت نام دوره های زبان انگلیسی در مؤسسه انگلیسی سخن در گیلان شرکت کردند. هم نر بودند و هم زن. پس از همگن کردن آنها با افراد آکسفورد، آنها به سه گروه آزمایشی تقسیم شدند: کلاس درس معکوس، کلاس درس تعاملی، و ادغام دو رویکرد. برای جمع آوری داده ها از سه ابزار استفاده شد: آزمون تعیین جایگاه آکسفورد، پیش آزمون و پس آزمون نوشتاری. آنها ۱۳ جلسه درمان داشتند. تجزیه و تحلیل داده ها توسط ANCOVA نشان داد که هر دو کلاس درس معکوس و کلاس تعاملی به طور مثبت بر مهارت های نوشتاری زبان آموزان EFL تأثیر می گذارد. با این حال، گروهی که درمان ادغام رویکردهای معکوس و تعاملی را دریافت کردند، در تأثیر آن بر عملکرد نوشتاری فراگیران عملکرد بهتری داشتند. یافته های تحقیق فعلی می تواند به سازندگان کتاب های درسی، سازمان دهندگان آموزشی، توسعه دهندگان مواد، مؤسسات زبان، مربیان و دانش آموزان در ایجاد محیط مؤثرتری برای یادگیری زبان های خارجی و افزایش مهارت های نوشتاری کمک کند.

کلمات کلیدی: زبان آموزان زبان انگلیسی، کلاس درس معکوس، کلاس درس تعاملی، نوشتن

Introduction

English, widely acknowledged as the language of communication, has already gained global adoption in both spoken and written form (Ariyanti & Fitriana, 2017). Writing can be defined as using diverse symbols to articulate opinions and engage in interpersonal communication through these symbols (Klein, 1985). Grabe and Kaplan (1996) propose that writing entails the exploration of meaning within an abstract triangle comprising the writer, the reader, and the message itself. Celce-Murcia (2001) draws attention to the arduous nature of achieving proficiency in writing, asserting that "the ability to express one's ideas in writing in a second or foreign language with reasonable coherence and accuracy represents a significant accomplishment; indeed, many native speakers of English never truly master this skill" (p. 204).

Thus, writing proficiency is a key factor in the development of language skills and becomes evident during communication (Veramuthu & Shah, 2020). Additionally, writing represents the most complex element of the language learning process (Singer & Bashir, 2004). While often seen as the simple construction of grammatically correct sentences, effective writing requires coherence, with the use of cohesive devices being essential for reader comprehension (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). In essence, the various components of a text must work together to create meaning within a given context (Carrell, 1982; Witt & Faigley, 1981). Matsuda (2001) found that many writers, particularly those with limited experience, benefit greatly from a clear understanding of writing strategies, which can be developed through practice. As a result, students need guidance that helps them adopt effective strategies for independent learning, or, as Wenden (1998) suggested, they require explicit instruction on how to navigate the learning process.

Therefore, having writing abilities is crucial for students to thrive in their studies and social interactions as well as in their future professional endeavors. It involves a range of skills requiring an understanding of the matter and the ability to express thoughts creatively. For students learning English as a foreign language (EFL), mastering writing is especially vital since it aids in grasping academic subjects and fostering clear communication (Vurdien, 2020). It's also worth noting its crucial role in entrance exams and various written tasks like application letters and theses (Al-Jarrah et al., 2018; Ibrahim et al., 2016). As technology continues to shape our world these days, writing has gained ground not just within academic circles but also in our day-to-day activities, like crafting emails and conducting business across borders effectively. Due to the proliferation of technological advancements, people nowadays use written English communication more frequently than spoken communication (Jabali, 2018).

Teachers must strike a delicate balance between explicit instruction and authentic writing opportunities (Wei et al., 2023). Matsuda (2001) found that, especially for novice writers, it is beneficial to have a clear understanding of specific strategies, which they can integrate through intentional practice. As a result, students require instructional guidance that encourages the use of strategies to achieve success in independent learning, or, as articulated by Wenden (1998), explicit instruction on how to navigate a learning scenario. It is critical to instruct learners on how to use proficient composition strategies. The recent emphasis on the process of learning rather than the content necessitates effective learning and the implementation of specific learning strategies.

The conventional perception of education has long been centered around the transmission of knowledge from educators to students within the confines of the classroom. Nevertheless, in recent years, there has been a growing inclination to deviate from this established framework (Vitta & Al-Hoorie, 2023). In light of the ever-evolving technological landscape, novel approaches that challenge the dominance of teachers in instructional settings have emerged within diverse educational spheres. Among these approaches, the flipped model, the interactive



model, and the integration of flipped + interactive models can stand out as a response to the evolving dynamics of teaching and learning (Bergmann & Sams, 2012). A flipped classroom, also called an inverted classroom, refers to a teaching methodology that inverts traditional teaching methods (Altemueller & Lindquist, 2017). In other words, what is traditionally done in the classroom should be done at home, and what is traditionally done as homework should be done in the classroom (Bergmann & Sams, 2012). Numerous educators who adopt the flipped model envision a transformation of classroom dynamics; wherein extensive lectures are substituted with carefully structured, student-focused engagements (Maynard, 2019). Given that interactive activities have been a fundamental aspect of teaching in contemporary foreign language instruction for a considerable period of time, such as task-based instruction and two-way information tasks, educators highly appreciate the flipped classroom pedagogy due to its ability to reduce the amount of time spent on explicit content instruction and instead allow for a greater emphasis on the meaningful utilization of a second language (L2) during class sessions (Moranski & Kim, 2016).

A flipped classroom often focuses on making instructional videos, in the form of lectures, for students to watch prior to the class. Therefore, during the class, the teacher has more one-on-one time to spend with students (Bergmann & Sams, 2013). Each class starts with a short discussion about the content that has already been delivered through video (Bergmann & Sams, 2012), and much of the class time is spent solving problems and working on the lecture content (Altemueller & Lindquist, 2017). After learners' questions are answered, they are given the assignment for the day (Bergmann & Sams, 2012). During class time, the teacher's role is radically different. The teacher performs the role of a learning coach and facilitator, and learning is student-driven and practical (Altemueller & Lindquist, 2017). The teacher does not present information. Alternatively, he has a tutorial role. The teacher devotes his time to walking around the room, helping students with concepts they have problems with (Bergmann & Sams, 2012). Compared to traditional teaching methods, flipped learning allows students to address learning challenges during online discussions and encourages participation from those who may be reluctant to speak up in class. While the traditional lecture format enables teachers to efficiently deliver content within a limited time frame, its teacher-centered approach limits interaction between teachers and students. As a result, students often passively receive the material presented and tend to replicate the instructor's ideas when completing assignments. This passive learning style prevents students from fully developing their skills, as they have little opportunity to practice what they have learned during the lecture (Bass, 2012; Wallace, Walker, Braseby, & Sweet, 2014). In contrast, FL offers students the chance to engage in a more personalized learning process by reversing the traditional delivery method. Outside the classroom, students focus on lower-level cognitive tasks, such as acquiring knowledge and understanding, while in class, they participate in higher-order cognitive activities like application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation, supported by their peers and teacher. The primary goal of the flipped classroom model is to enhance student performance and engagement during in-class sessions (Seedoyal-Seereekissoon, 2017).

Interactive writing is an instructional method rooted in the language experience approach (LEA), which emphasizes developing oral language and drawing on personal experiences. In an LEA session, learners freely share their thoughts and experiences on a given topic while the teacher records their input. The concept of shared writing emerged by blending aspects of LEA, where writing lessons are centered around a common event or experience, and the teacher writes the text with active student involvement. While acquiring writing skills is essential, understanding the fundamental purpose of language—effective communication—is equally important (Shawaqfeh et al., 2024). For writing to be meaningful, students must draw from their personal experiences, knowledge, and language abilities within their social environments



(Johnson & Sullivan, 2020). Interactive writing provides a framework for fostering this authentic writing. Craig (2006) emphasized that interactive writing is a flexible approach, allowing teachers to adapt lessons to the developmental needs and interests of their students. Through interactive writing, students create texts with real-life applications, such as recipes, biographies, maps, reports, lists, letters, and labels for murals. It is a dynamic process where teachers and students collaborate to craft a meaningful text while engaging in discussions about the writing process.

In the Iranian EFL context, dissatisfaction with the ineffectiveness of traditional language teaching methods has been growing (Naghdi-pour, 2016; Rahimi & Rezaee, 2023). Among the language skills, writing is particularly challenging for instructors due to students' limited experience with written expression. Having been primarily exposed to audio-visual mediums, many students are novices when it comes to writing. To foster success, it is crucial to incorporate writing as an integral part of foreign language learning from the outset of instruction.

Numerous studies have highlighted the effectiveness of various learning approaches for students. Both flipped classrooms and interactive writing have shown promising results individually, but there has been no investigation into their combined effect on EFL learners' writing skills. This presents an opportunity to explore the potential benefits of integrating these two approaches into the EFL context.

Therefore, this study attempted to seal the gap and augment the value of existing studies of flipped classrooms and interactive writing with the aim of addressing the following questions:

RQ1. *Does teaching writing through a flipped classroom have a positive significant effect on the writing performance of Iranian advanced EFL Learners?*

RQ2. *Does teaching writing through interactive writing have a positive significant effect on writing performance of Iranian advanced EFL Learners?*

RQ3. *Does teaching writing through integration of interactive writing and a flipped classroom have a positive significant effect on writing performance of Iranian advanced EFL Learners?*

RQ4. *Is there any significant difference among Iranian advanced EFL learners' writing performance receiving flipped classroom, integrative writing, and integration of flipped and integrative writing?*

Literature Review

Ma (2020) conducted a study on the effectiveness of flipped learning in an EFL reading course. The participants were undergraduate preservice teachers in China. It was suggested in the study that flipped classroom improved learners' reading skills. When looking at the Iranian context, Sin and Siahpoosh (2020) conducted a study on the effect of FL on students' reading comprehension. Like other studies, they also found out that the students in the experimental group performed better than those in the control group.

Enfield (2020) conducted a study examining the impact of flipped classroom as an instructional method with fifty university students in the USA. The findings demonstrated a positive effect of flipped classroom on student learning outcomes.

Similarly, Hee Young Kang and Hae Ran Kim (2021) investigated the impact of flipped classroom in healthcare education, concluding that the blended learning approach significantly enhanced all aspects of student learning.

In another study, Kawinkoonlasate (2021) focused on Thai EFL learners and found that flipped classroom positively influenced their language development, with students expressing a willingness to review materials before each class. Additionally, Majed and Muhammad (2020) explored the effectiveness of the Interactive Writing Strategy (IWS) in improving the writing



skills of eleventh-grade male students, with results showing a positive response to the IWS intervention.

Coloquit et al. (2020) explored the effectiveness of an interactive writing technique (IWT) in improving undergraduate students' basic writing skills. Mixed-methods approach, using pre- and post-tests to evaluate changes in writing proficiency. Results showed a significant increase in writing proficiency scores among students who participated in the IWT program compared to a control group. Additionally, qualitative data offered valuable insights into how IWT helps identify and address student writing deficiencies. These findings suggest that IWT not only enhances students' fundamental writing skills but also provides educators with a clearer understanding of their students' writing strengths and areas for improvement.

Arman (2021) investigated the effect of interactive journaling on the writing skills and attitudes of seventh-grade students. Although interviews conducted after the intervention suggested that students felt their writing self-efficacy and attitudes had improved, statistical analysis did not show significant changes between the pre- and post-tests. Additionally, no significant improvements were observed in writing performance.

Methodology

Research Design

This research utilized a quantitative design. The quantitative study, which is a quasi-experimental design, included the pre-test and post-test, and the purpose is to measure the impacts of the flipped, interactive classroom approach and integration of a filled classroom with interactive writing on advanced Iranian EFL learners' writing performance.

Participants

This study followed a quasi-experimental, pre-test-post-test design. In order to carry out this study, 71 advanced participants were put into one control group ($N = 18$) and three experimental groups: group A ($N = 17$), group B ($N = 17$), and group C (19). There were initially 85 learners. All participants were chosen from different branches of the Sokhan English Institution in Guilan, Iran, and were native speakers of Persian. In fact, they were in four intact classes. The Quick Placement Test (QPT) was administered to the participants in order to make sure that they were homogeneous. Those learners whose scores deviated one standard deviation below the mean on the test were considered the participants of the study. Three of these classes were randomly selected as experimental groups (A, B, and C), and the other class was selected as a control group. Moreover, at the end of the treatment, those who were absent for more than two treatment sessions (only one student) were excluded from the analysis.

Instrument

In this study, three instruments were used as follows:

Oxford Placement Test (OPT). The first instrument was the Quick Placement Test (QPT). In order to make sure that the participants were advanced, the test was administered to the initial EFL learners. The learners whose test scores deviated one standard deviation below or above the mean were selected as the participants of this study.

Pre-test

The second instrument of the study was the writing task. To measure the writing ability of the participants, IELTS Academic Writing task 2 (2024) was employed as the pre-test and post-test of the study. In order to provide the topic of writing in a pre-test among different topics, one was

selected randomly by three IELTS instructors who had 10 years of experience in teaching. The topic was a problem-solution essay:

One problem faced by almost every large city is traffic congestion.

What do you think the causes are??

What solutions can you suggest?

The learners were asked to write about it in 40 minutes, or at least 250 words.

Post Test

To compare what happened to participants after the treatment phase to the participants' writing performance, IELTS writing tasks (Task 2) were administered as post-tests. In order to reduce the degree of familiarity of the pre-test, it was rephrased: "Congested roads are a common issue in growing metropolitan areas. What do you believe are the primary causes of this challenge, and what practical solutions can you offer to address it?"

The participants were supposed to complete the task in 40 minutes. The learners were supposed to either present their point of view with convincing evidence or challenge an alternative point of view. They were also asked to write in a style that was easy to follow and cohesive and use English accurately and appropriately. They were given 40 minutes and were asked to apply at least 250 words.

Procedure

The study began in September 2021, when the researcher invited 85 EFL learners to participate in the study. All of them were informed about the purpose of the study. The participants were notified of the general purpose of the study and informed that their performance on the tests would not affect their course outcome. All the participants willingly took the tests during class periods. At the beginning of the study, there were 85 learners from two branches of the Sokhan English Institution in Guilan, Iran, based on the QPT, about seventy-one of whom were selected as the participants of the study, so nonrandom sampling was used for the selection of participants because they were from four intact classes. They were put into one control group (N = 18) and three experimental groups: group A (N = 17), group B (N = 17), and group C (19). All of the groups had the same materials that the teacher used in their classes. American English File 5, 2nd edition (Latham-Koenig & Oxenden, 2013) was used in this study as the course book. And IELTS Advantage Writing Skill by Richard Brown and Levis Richards (2018).

In experimental group A (flipped classroom), prior to each class session, learners were provided with an instructional video from YouTube or other video-sharing platforms. Each video included a lecture teaching a specific section of the writing process for task two. The instructor shared the video with the learners through their flash drives or cloud-based instant messaging services such as Telegram. The learners watched the video before class and might start the exercise at home. The teacher began the writing session by spending a few minutes discussing the video provided before the class to solve the learners' doubts surrounding the information presented in the video. After checking the learners' understanding regarding the educational point in the videos, when necessary, the teacher offered a complementary explanation. At this stage, the learners compared their own understanding with the teacher's and gained in-depth knowledge. Moreover, the teacher gave them feedback by providing commentaries in the class. The rest of the whole writing session was devoted to actual writing practice (i.e., doing homework). They were given support while completing the task, and instant feedback on their performance was provided. They were also taught how to use the videos in an effective way. In short, the researcher, as an instructor, created instructional materials that cover the necessary content for Task 2 of the IELTS writing section.



Experimental group B, referred to as the interactive writing group, had a distinctive method for teaching writing. The main objective of this group was to cultivate interactive and cooperative writing experiences between the students and the instructor. Throughout the interactive writing technique, both the learners and the teacher actively participated in conversations and agreements to establish the content and structure of their writing. Instead of the teacher only prescribing the themes or tasks, the learners had a substantial influence in determining what they were going to write about. The objective of this strategy was to augment student involvement and motivation by empowering them with a feeling of ownership and authority over their writing assignments. The instructor played a crucial part in this process by demonstrating various writing to the learners because, in interactive writing, process-based writing should be applied, so the teacher step-by-step discussed the stages of different types of task two of the IELTS. While the learners were constructing their writings, the teacher exhibited proficient writing strategies, offering explicit illustrations for the learners to watch and acquire knowledge from. This modeling methodology facilitated the cultivation of a constructive mentality among the learners, empowering them to effectively imitate the teacher's tactics and enhance their writing proficiency. The instructor provided the type of writing and discussed it, and the learners provided their opinions. The teacher then discussed how to paraphrase the topic, the synonymy of words, the structure, the number of paragraphs they should write, and strategies for a good introduction and conclusion.

In experimental group C (interactive writing + flipped classroom), the participants experienced a combination of procedures from experimental groups A and B. Since some class time was saved in a flipped classroom, during the class and while the learners were doing their homework, they had enough time to enjoy interactive writing processes. They completed their writing tasks as homework during the class and enjoyed their teacher's feedback.

In the control group, however, writing was taught traditionally. The teacher explained the structure of every lesson in the class, so she applied the product-based writing strategy in the class. Then, learners were asked to start their writing task during the class and complete it at home.

In order to assess writing tasks before and immediately after 13 sessions of treatment, IELTS writing tests (task 2), adopted from samples of IELTS writing tests, were given to all four groups as a pre-test and post-test. In both the pre-test and the post-test, all groups were given a time limit of 40 minutes to complete the task. The participants' writings were given a score range of 0-9. The classes were held twice per week. Each session took 90 minutes, of which 30 were devoted to working on writing. To measure writing performance, two raters scored the tasks.

Scoring System Procedure

The tasks were evaluated and rated by two expert raters. The raters employed an analytic rubric of IELTS to evaluate participants' responses on four different levels: (1) task achievement, (2) coherence and cohesion, (3) lexical resource, and (4) grammatical range and accuracy. Raters for IELTS Writing Task 2 use a standardized rubric known as the IELTS Writing Band Descriptors. This rubric was developed and provided by the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) governing body. The band descriptors outline the specific criteria and characteristics that raters should consider when assessing test-takers' writing responses. The IELTS Writing Band Descriptors provide detailed descriptions for each band level, ranging from Band 1 (non-user) to Band 9 (expert user).

Results

Participants Selection

The practical phase of this study began with selecting the participants. To do so, Quick Placement Test (QOPT) was administered to a group of 85 students, which enabled the researcher to draw a



sample of 71 homogenous learners. Those learners whose scores deviated one standard deviation below the mean on the test were considered as the participants of study.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics of Initial and Selected Participants' Score on OPT

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Initial participants	85	28.00	47.00	37.8471	4.53428
Selected participants	71	33.00	42.00	37.8169	2.36226
Valid N (listwise)	71				

As reported in Table 4.1, the initial group of 85 participants had the mean of 37.84 and standard deviation of 4.53 in their OPT. Accordingly, those whose scores fell within the range of $\text{Mean} \pm 1 \text{ SD}$ (33.31 and 42.53) were selected as homogenous participants.

Answering the First Research Question

To answer the first research question addressing the effectiveness of teaching writing through a flipped model on writing performance of Iranian advanced EFL learners, Paired Sample t-test was run.

Table 2

Paired Samples Statistics

	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
pre-test of flipped	5.5000	17	.98425	.23872
post-test of flipped	6.2941	17	.84887	.20588

As shown in table 2, the mean score for flipped group before the intervention was 5.50, with a standard deviation of .98. After the intervention, the mean score for flipped increased to 6.29, with a standard deviation of .84. This analysis suggests that the flipped group had a positive effect on writing skill, as the mean score increased from before to after the intervention.

Table 3

Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences				t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference			
					Lower	Upper		
pre-test of flipped	post-test of flipped	-.794	.4351	.10553	-1.01	-.570	-7.52	.000

Table 3 shows the results of a paired samples test on the paired differences between pre-test and post-test measurements. The t-value is -7.52 with a corresponding p-value of .00, <.05 indicating a significant difference between the two measurements. The mean difference is -.79, with a standard deviation of .43 and a standard error mean of .10. The 95% confidence interval of the difference ranges from -1.01 to -.57. These results suggest that there is a significant difference between the pre- and post-measurements.



Answering the Second Research Question

To answer the second research question exploring the efficacy of interactive writing on writing performance of Iranian advanced EFL Learners, another paired sample t-test was conducted.

Table 4

Paired Samples Statistics

	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
pre-test of interactive	5.6176	17	.87553	.21235
post-test of interactive	6.3235	17	.84671	.20536

As shown in table 4, the mean score for interactive writing group before the intervention was 5.61, with a standard deviation of .87. After the intervention, the mean score for interactive writing group increased to 6.32, with a standard deviation of .84. This analysis suggests that the intervention positively influenced writing skill, as the mean score increased from before to after the intervention.

Table 5

Paired Samples Test

	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
pre-test of interactive - post-test of interactive	-.705	.469	.113	-.947	-.464	-6.19	16	.000

Table 5 shows the results of a paired samples test on the differences between pre- and post-test scores. The t-value is -6.19, with a corresponding p-value of .00, <.05. This indicates that there was a significant difference between the pre- and post-test scores. The mean difference is -.70, with a standard deviation of .46 and a standard error of .11.

Answering the Third Research Question

To answer the third research question investigating the effectiveness of teaching writing through integration of interactive writing and a flipped model on writing performance of Iranian advanced EFL Learners, another Paired Sample t-test was calculated.

Table 6

Paired Samples Statistics

	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
pre-test of flipped and interactive	5.4211	19	.78640	.18041
post-test of flipped and interactive	7.1105	19	.69434	.15929

As shown in table 6, the mean score for the integration of interactive writing and a flipped group before the intervention was 5.42, with a standard deviation of .78. After the intervention, the mean score for integration of interactive writing and a flipped group increased to 7.11, with a

standard deviation of .69. This analysis suggests that the intervention positively influenced writing skill, as the mean score increased from before to after the intervention.

Table 7*Paired Samples Test*

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
pre-test of flipped and interactive - post-test of flipped and interactive		-1.68	.452	.103	-1.90	-1.471	-16.29	18	.000

Table 7 shows the results of a paired samples test on the differences between pre- and post-test scores. The t-value is -1.68, with a corresponding p-value of .00, <.05. This indicates that there was a significant difference between the pre- and post-test scores. The mean difference is -1.68, with a standard deviation of .45 and a standard error of .10.

Answering the Fourth Research Question

To answer the fourth research question investigating any significant difference among Iranian advanced EFL learners' writing performance receiving flipped classroom, integrative writing, and integration of flipped and integrative writing, ANCOVA was run.

Table 8*Descriptive Statistics*

treatment	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Control	5.6389	.87120	18
Flipped	6.2941	.84887	17
Interactive	6.3235	.84671	17
Flipped & interactive	7.1105	.69434	19
Total	6.3535	.96167	71

Descriptive statistics for the post-test scores on the writing skill reveal that the group that received integration of flipped and interactive instruction achieved the highest mean score ($M = 7.11$, $SD = .69$), followed by the interactive group ($M = 6.32$, $SD = .84$), flipped group ($M = 6.29$, $SD = .84$), and the control group ($M = 5.63$, $SD = .87$). These results suggest potential improvements in writing skill for the groups that received integration of flipped and interactive instruction, interactive, and flipped compared to the control group. However, further analysis is needed to determine the statistical significance of these observed differences.

Table 9*Tests of Between-Subjects Effects*

Source	Type Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
--------	---------------------	----	-------------	---	------	---------------------

Corrected Model	53.854 ^a	4	13.463	81.652	.000	.832
Intercept	6.626	1	6.626	40.184	.000	.378
pre-test	33.698	1	33.698	204.36	.000	.756
treatment	22.236	3	7.412	44.951	.000	.671
Error	10.883	66	.165			
Total	2930.810	71				
Corrected Total	64.737	70				

a. R Squared = .832 (Adjusted R Squared = .822)

Table 9 shows the results of a one-way ANCOVA that investigated the effects of flipped, interactive, integration of flipped and interactive, and traditional instruction on EFL learners' writing skill. A covariate (pre-test scores) was also included in the analysis to account for any initial differences in writing skill between the groups.

The results demonstrate that there is a significant effect of the treatment type on writing skill ($F(3, 66) = 44.95, p = .00$). This means that students who received flipped, interactive, integration of flipped and interactive, and traditional instruction performed differently on the post-test of writing skill.

Table 10
Pairwise Comparisons

(I) treatment	(J) treatment	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig. ^b	95% Confidence Interval for Difference ^b	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
control	flipped	-.655*	.137	.000	-1.029	-.282
	interactive	-.591*	.137	.000	-.965	-.217
	flipped & interactive	-1.534*	.134	.000	-1.898	-1.171
flipped	control	.655*	.137	.000	.282	1.029
	interactive	.064	.139	1.000	-.315	.443
	flipped & interactive	-.879*	.136	.000	-1.248	-.510
interactive	control	.591*	.137	.000	.217	.965
	flipped	-.064	.139	1.000	-.443	.315
	flipped & interactive	-.943*	.136	.000	-1.313	-.573
flipped & interactive	control	1.534*	.134	.000	1.171	1.898
	flipped	.879*	.136	.000	.510	1.248
	interactive	.943*	.136	.000	.573	1.313

Based on estimated marginal means

*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

b. Adjustment for multiple comparisons: Bonferroni.

The post-hoc analysis yielded statistically significant differences ($p < .05$) in post-test writing scores between the control and flipped groups, the control and interactive groups, and the control and the integration of flipped and interactive groups. Moreover, it was found that there is no significant difference between flipped and interactive groups ($p > .05$); while the integration of flipped and interactive were in statistically significant difference with flipped and interactive groups ($p < .05$). However, a closer examination of the means suggests that the integration of flipped and interactive group achieved the highest mean score, potentially indicating a greater positive impact on learners' writing skill compared to other groups.



Discussion

The present study aimed to quantify the impact of various pedagogical approaches on the writing proficiency of advanced Iranian EFL learners. These approaches included a flipped classroom, interactive instruction, and the combined integration of both flipped and interactive elements. The findings from the first research question underscored the efficacy of flipped instruction in enhancing learner writing skills. Notably, the research yielded statistically significant results that corroborated previous studies by Ebadi et al. (2017), Boyraz and Ocak (2017), Fathi and Rahimi (2018), Hsieh et al. (2016), Mohammadi et al. (2019), and Karimi (2017). These findings unequivocally demonstrate that flipped instruction has a statistically significant positive influence on developing writing proficiency in EFL learners. Interestingly, the present study diverges from research conducted in other disciplines (Findlay-Thompson & Mombourquette, 2014; Hotle & Garrow, 2016), which did not observe a significant improvement in student performance with flipped instruction. This discrepancy highlights the potential influence of subject-specific factors. The inherent nature of language acquisition, which thrives on pre-class preparation and active practice, might render flipped classrooms particularly well-suited for EFL contexts.

Flipped classrooms typically involve pre-class exposure to grammar points. This preparation potentially heightens learners' awareness, allowing them to readily identify the target structure's usage during class sessions. This deeper level of processing, as Leow and Mercer (2015) suggest, leads to better retention of learning materials. Flipped instruction, therefore, may facilitate the efficient proceduralization and automatization of explicit grammatical knowledge. In line with this notion, DeKeyser (2015) argues that flipped learning creates conditions conducive to proceduralization, ultimately supporting the automatization of learned material. Amiryousefi (2017) highlights that paired and group activities within flipped learning foster a stress-free learning environment compared to traditional settings. These activities provide opportunities for collaborative and cooperative learning, enhance input and output opportunities, and ultimately generate high-quality interaction. Wette (2015) suggests that collaborative and scaffolded learning allows students to achieve beyond their individual capabilities with the support of peers and teachers. This aligns with Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) theory, positing that learners can extend their learning beyond their current abilities through collaborative interaction. Scholars like Hanjani (2016) and Wigglesworth and Storch (2009) further argue that collaborative language learning activities provide greater opportunities to use the language communicatively, leading to improved L2 (second language) skills. The confluence of these pedagogical elements likely explains why participants in the flipped learning conditions of this study improved in terms of writing skills.

The results of the second research question investigated the effectiveness of interactive writing on EFL learners' writing proficiency. The results mirrored those of Storch (2005), who found that collaboratively written texts displayed superior accuracy compared to individually produced ones. Similarly, Nixon and McClay (2007) observed that interactive groups achieved higher scores in terms of communication quality, organization, and linguistic appropriateness. Jafari and Ansari's (2012) research, focused on Iranian EFL learners, yielded analogous results. Their findings suggested that learners engaged in interactive writing produced more accurate texts than their independent counterparts. They attributed this improvement to heightened motivation to focus on grammatical accuracy and participation in the revision process.

Furthermore, the study's outcomes aligned with Jalili and Shahrokhi's (2017) investigation in terms of both accuracy and complexity, despite employing a picture description task as a prompt for a different participant pool (adults). Likewise, Jafari and Ansari's (2012) findings regarding writing accuracy were corroborated, even though their study utilized dyads (pairs) for interactive work.



However, the present study's findings diverge from those of Dobao (2012), who identified no statistically significant differences in syntactic and lexical complexity between interactive and independent writing. These contrasting results might be attributable to variations in group size and the learners' second language (Spanish in Dobao's study). Similarly, Storch (2005) found no significant difference between individual and collaborative groups, potentially due to the brevity of the writing task and the limited sample size. Finally, Watanabe's (2014) research presented conflicting evidence, suggesting that learners produced a statistically significant greater number of words when writing independently. This discrepancy might be explained by independent writing encouraging a higher volume of written text, potentially influenced by the participants' use of their first language as a learning tool (Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003) and differences in scoring methodologies employed in Watanabe's study.

Aligning with the prior research questions, the findings from the third research question demonstrated that integrating flipped and interactive elements positively impacted learners' writing proficiency. Furthermore, the fourth research question yielded even more compelling results, revealing the superiority of this combined approach compared to groups utilizing solely flipped or interactive methods. This finding underscores the potential for a synergistic instructional strategy that capitalizes on the strengths of both flipped classrooms and interactive learning.

Building upon the insights gained from research questions one and two, this integrated approach seems particularly well-suited for EFL learners. Research question one established the effectiveness of flipped classrooms in fostering writing development. Flipped elements ensure learners arrive prepared for interactive activities, maximizing the benefit of peer feedback and collaboration. This pre-class preparation likely allows them to focus on specific writing skills and strategies, as identified in question one, which can then be actively practiced and refined during interactive sessions.

Conclusion

This study sought to investigate the effect of integrating these two approaches on Iranian advanced EFL learners' writing performance. To meet this end, 71 Iranian learners enrolled in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) programs at the Sokhan English Institution in Guilan, Iran. Participants wrote an essay as a pre-test. Post-test: Administered after the treatment phase, this test used a slightly modified version of the pre-test topic to assess any improvements in writing due to the implemented strategies. The study findings provide strong evidence that the integration of flipped and interactive approaches creates a robust learning environment that caters to various learning styles. Learners can solidify foundational knowledge and strategies through flipped activities and then actively apply and refine them through collaborative practice.

There are several reasons why applying these two approaches led to significant improvements in the writing performance of EFL learners across all aspects measured in the study: these align with proponents of active learning that such autonomy activates higher-order thinking skills like problem-solving, decision-making, and critical analysis. Additionally, they encourage meaningful learning by prompting learners to actively connect incoming information with their existing knowledge base.

Some suggestions are recommended for future studies based on the study's limitations and the problems the researcher encountered. Further studies are suggested to investigate the effectiveness of these approaches on other language-learning skills, such as speaking, reading, and listening. Further study may investigate the role of integration of these approaches and background knowledge in other EFL classrooms, such as science technology, business administration, or those leaning into English for Specific Purposes (ESP). The last suggestion is that this study would be directed to material developers for writing courses and EFL teachers to



consider flipped and interactive as practical techniques and approaches for enhancing EFL learners' writing comprehension ability.

References

- Al-Jarrah, T., Mansor, N., Rashid, R., Bashir, I., & Al-Jarrah, J. (2018). EFL students' attitude toward using metacognitive strategies in writing. *English Language Teaching*, 11(10), 162. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v11n10p162>
- Altemueller, L., & Lindquist, C. (2017). Flipped classroom instruction for inclusive learning. *British Journal of Special Education*, 44(3), 341-358.
- Ariyanti, A., & Fitriana, R. (2017, October). EFL students' difficulties and needs in essay writing. In *International Conference on Teacher Training and Education 2017 (ICTTE 2017)* (pp. 32-42). Atlantis Press.
- Bergmann, J., & Sams, A. (2013). *Flipped learning model increases student engagement and performance*.
- Bass, R. (2012). Disrupting ourselves: The problem of learning in higher education. *EDUCAUSE review*, 47(2), n2.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (2001). Language teaching approaches: An overview. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rd ed., pp. 3-12). Heinle & Heinle.
- Coloquit, L. M. P., Canabal, L. A., & Paderan, M. P. C. (2020). Improving students' English writing proficiency through interactive writing technique. *Journal of English Education and Linguistics*, 1(1), 72-81.
- Grabe, W., & Kaplan, R. (1996). *Theory and practice of writing*. London and New York.
- Ibrahim, M. E. E., Eljack, N. S. A., & Elhassan, I. B. M. (2016). The effect of argumentative essay writing strategies on enhancing English as a foreign language learners critical thinking skill. *Sudan University of Science and Technology Deanship of Scientific Research Journal of Humanities Sciences*, 17(2), 18-22.
- Jabali, O. (2018). The impact of flipped learning on the academic performance of ESL learners. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 15(1), 23.
- Johnson, L. P., & Sullivan, H. (2020). Revealing the human and the writer: The promise of a humanizing writing pedagogy for Black students. *Research in the Teaching of English*, Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English* (Original work published 1976).
- Kang, H. Y., & Kim, H. R. (2021). Impact of blended learning on learning outcomes in the public healthcare education course: a review of flipped classroom with team-based learning. *BMC Medical Education*, 21, 1-8
- Klein, M. L. (1985). *The development of writing in children: Pre-K through grade 8*.
- Ma, G. (2020). The effectiveness of synchronous online flipped learning in college EFL reading course during the COVID-19 epidemic.
- Maynard, J. (2019). Redefining the traditional classroom: Teaching in the 21st century. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, 47(4), 495-510.
- Moranski, K., & Kim, F. (2016). Flipping lessons in a multi-section Spanish course: Implications for assigning explicit grammar instruction outside of the classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 100(4), 830-852.
- Pakpahan, N. H. (2020, December). The use of flipped classroom during covid-19 pandemic. In *International Joint Conference on Arts and Humanities (IJCAH 2020)* (pp. 286-291). Atlantis Press



- Shawaqfeh, M., Taha, H., & Atia, L. (2024). Interactive writing in EFL classrooms: Exploring teacher and student perceptions. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 11(2), 156-171.
- Singer, B. D. (2004). Developmental variations in writing composition skills.
- Seedoyal-Seereekissoon, M. (2017). *Flipped classroom and its impact on student performance and engagement*. In Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Information Communication Technologies in Education (ICICTE).
- Talaat, H. A. (2021). A proposed strategy based on interactive writing approach to develop primary stage pupils' EFL descriptive writing skills and their self-efficacy. *مجلة القراءة والمعرفة*, 21(٢٣١-٢٣٠), ٧٣-٧٣.
- Veramuthu, P., & Shah, P. M. (2020). Effectiveness of collaborative writing among Secondary school students in an ESL classroom. *Creative Education*, 11(1), 54-67.
- Vurdien, R. (2020). Enhancing writing skills via mobile learning and wikis. In *Recent developments in technology-enhanced and computer-assisted language learning* (pp. 99)
- Witte, S. P., & Faigley, L. (1981). Coherence, cohesion, and writing quality. *College Composition & Communication*, 32(2), 189-204.

