



Effects of Think-Write-Pair-Share on EFL Students' Paragraph Writing Performance

Simeneh Wassie Mesele^{1,*}, Sualih Mussa Akalu¹, Simachew Gashaye Yesigat¹

¹Department of English Language and Literature, College of Social Sciences and Humanities, Debre Markos University, POB 269, Debre Markos, Ethiopia.

Abstract

Writing argumentative paragraph presents considerable challenges for learners of English as a foreign language, as it requires advanced linguistic competence, critical reasoning, and coherent organization of ideas. This study examined the effects of the Think–Write–Pair–Share (TWPS) instructional strategy on the argumentative paragraph writing performance of students at Debre Markos University and analyzed their reflections on its implementation. Employing a quasi-experimental design, students were assigned to a treatment group receiving TWPS-based instruction and a comparison group receiving conventional instruction. Quantitative data were analyzed using paired-sample t-tests to assess within-group improvements and independent-sample t-tests to compare post-intervention performance between groups. The results revealed that, although both groups improved over the course of the intervention, the treatment group demonstrated markedly greater gains than the comparison group. Analyses of post-intervention performance and learning gains further confirmed the superior effectiveness of the TWPS strategy. Students' reflections indicated that the strategy fostered collaborative engagement, facilitated richer idea development, strengthened argumentation, and enhanced paragraph coherence. Collectively, these findings affirm that TWPS is an effective and structured pedagogical approach for improving argumentative paragraph writing in EFL contexts.

Keywords: TWPS; argumentative writing; collaborative learning; quasi-experimental study.

*Corresponding author email: eyuelsimeneh@gmail.com, Phone: 0946162016

Article information: Received: 21 November 2025 Revised: 20 January 2026

Accepted: 25 February 2026 Available online: 31 March 2026

Doi: <http://doi.org/10.20372/ajids.2026.2485>

1. Introduction

Argumentative writing is one of the most complex academic tasks for EFL learners. Unlike narrative or descriptive writing, it demands that students adopt a clear stance, support it with logical reasoning and evidence, and organize their ideas cohesively. Many EFL students struggle with generating strong claims, structuring arguments logically, maintaining coherence, and using language accurately, which often results in weak or unpersuasive argumentative paragraphs (Hyland, 2019). These persistent difficulties highlight the need for instructional strategies that can scaffold learners' thinking processes while strengthening their linguistic and organizational skills.

In response to these challenges, scholars increasingly advocate for collaborative and student-centered approaches in writing instruction (Rahmawaty, Normuliati, & Sabarun, 2023). One strategy that has demonstrated particular promise is the Think–Write–Pair–Share (TWPS) technique. TWPS extends the traditional Think–Pair–Share model by integrating an explicit writing phase, allowing learners to first reflect individually, then transform their ideas into written form, refine them through peer discussion, and finally articulate them in a whole-class setting (Edutopia, 2024). This sequence not only facilitates deeper cognitive engagement but also provides EFL learners with structured opportunities to develop and evaluate arguments before sharing them publicly.

The effectiveness of TWPS is grounded in principles of cooperative learning, which emphasize collaboration, knowledge-sharing, and collective problem-solving. Cooperative learning encourages students to exchange perspectives, justify their reasoning, and negotiate meaning within groups, all of which are essential for constructing strong argumentative paragraphs. It also helps learners develop critical thinking, enhance communication skills, and take responsibility for their own ideas while benefiting from peer support (Kharisma&Hidayati, 2018). Although the approach centers on learner interaction, teachers remain crucial as facilitators who guide discussion, monitor understanding, and ensure purposeful engagement.

Given these strengths, the TWPS technique holds significant potential for improving argumentative writing proficiency among EFL learners. By providing structured time for reflection, writing, peer feedback, and whole-class sharing, TWPS supports students in generating clearer claims, organizing arguments more logically, and articulating ideas with greater confidence. Thus, in this study, TWPS is employed as a collaborative writing strategy designed to address the specific challenges EFL learners face in producing coherent, well-reasoned argumentative paragraphs.

This study is guided by the following objectives:

1. To explore the effects of TWPS on students' argumentative paragraph writing performance.
2. To assess students' reflections about the use of TWPS strategy in enhancing their argumentative paragraph writing performance.

Accordingly, two research questions frame this investigation:

1. What effects does TWPS have on students' argumentative paragraph writing performance?
2. What are students' reflections on the use of TWPS in enhancing their argumentative paragraph writing performance?

2. Literature Review

2.1 Argumentative Writing in the EFL Context

Producing argumentative texts in an EFL environment requires far more than a command of grammar and vocabulary. Successful argumentation involves critical analysis, the capacity to synthesize and respond to differing viewpoints, and the ability to present claims in a logical and convincing manner (Stapleton, 2001). Despite this, numerous studies show that EFL learners often encounter persistent challenges when constructing written arguments. Their compositions frequently reveal issues such as imprecise or weak thesis statements, limited support for key ideas, and inadequate connection between argumentative points. These difficulties are commonly

linked to restricted familiarity with argumentative writing conventions and a lack of systematic instructional support (Ferris, 2018; Stapleton, 2001).

Such recurring challenges underscore the importance of instructional approaches that cultivate not only linguistic accuracy but also higher-level reasoning abilities. Incorporating critical-thinking practices into writing lessons enables learners to evaluate evidence more thoughtfully, consider opposing perspectives, and craft arguments that are both logical and nuanced (Paul & Elder, 2014). Additionally, collaborative learning methods including guided peer interaction and structured group dialogue offer students chances to articulate their reasoning, engage with alternative viewpoints, and refine their language through immediate feedback (Johnson, Johnson, & Holubec, 2013). When these cognitive and linguistic supports are integrated, EFL learners are better equipped to produce argumentative texts that demonstrate clarity, coherence, and persuasive depth, ultimately narrowing the gap between language ability and critical reasoning skills.

2.2 Collaborative Learning and the Evolution from TPS to TWPS

Collaborative learning, rooted in Vygotsky's (1978) social constructivist framework, posits that knowledge emerges through social interaction, dialogue, and cooperative problem-solving. In the context of writing instruction, such approaches encourage learners to actively engage with peers, exchange perspectives, and critically assess one another's contributions, fostering both cognitive and metacognitive growth (Storch, 2013; Oxford, 2017). Working collaboratively allows students to receive formative feedback, negotiate meaning, and co-plan written texts, ultimately enhancing coherence, argumentation, and overall writing quality (Bruffee, 1999; Storch, 2013).

Beyond cognitive benefits, collaborative learning positively impacts affective and motivational dimensions of writing. By offering a supportive space for idea sharing, it helps reduce the anxiety often associated with EFL writing and promotes learner autonomy and confidence (Kessler, 2012; Oxford, 2017). Collaborative tasks also stimulate higher-order thinking skills, such as critical evaluation, synthesis of multiple perspectives, and justification of arguments, as learners negotiate and defend their ideas collectively (Johnson, Johnson, & Holubec, 2013). In EFL classrooms, where limited language proficiency can hinder participation, collaborative

writing provides scaffolding that supports both language development and argumentative skills, allowing learners to internalize academic discourse patterns and gradually assume more responsibility for their learning (Storch, 2013; Swain, 2005).

Among these collaborative strategies, Think–Pair–Share (TPS), introduced by Lyman (1981), is a widely implemented method that structures classroom interaction into three stages: individual reflection, pairing with a peer, and group discussion. This design promotes equitable participation, encourages active engagement, and strengthens oral communication skills (Lyman, 1981; McTighe & Lyman, 1988).

Expanding on this framework, Think–Write–Pair–Share (TWPS) adds a dedicated writing phase, in which learners first organize and express their ideas in written form before collaborating with a partner and sharing with the larger group. Incorporating writing offers multiple pedagogical advantages: it encourages deeper reflection, supports coherent argumentation, and allows for more accurate use of language, reducing anxiety while improving grammar and vocabulary (Stapleton, 2001; McTighe & Lyman, 1988). Subsequent pairing and sharing stages further enhance learning through negotiation of meaning, peer feedback, and collective knowledge construction (Storch, 2013).

In EFL contexts, TWPS effectively addresses both cognitive and linguistic dimensions of writing. It not only strengthens students' argumentative performance by improving idea organization, clarity, and persuasiveness but also cultivates critical thinking and reflective learning. By integrating individual reflection, structured writing, and collaborative dialogue, TWPS provides a comprehensive framework for enhancing both the quality of student writing and higher-order cognitive skills in EFL classrooms

2.3 Empirical Evidence on TWPS in Language Learning

Empirical research indicates that Think–Write–Pair–Share (TWPS) positively impacts various aspects of language learning. TWPS enhances reading comprehension by promoting active engagement and collaborative discussion (Zarei & Khalessi, 2011) and supports vocabulary development and grammatical accuracy through organized writing and peer interaction (Abdelrahman, 2014). In writing, TWPS strengthens argumentation skills by fostering critical

thinking, structured idea development, and evidence-based reasoning (Fang, 2016). Affective benefits have also been reported, including reduced writing anxiety and increased confidence, as the reflective and collaborative structure of TWPS creates a supportive learning environment (Tran, 2020). However, most studies focus on general writing or reading, with limited research on TWPS's effects on argumentative paragraph writing in EFL contexts, highlighting the need addressed by the present study.

3. Research Design

This study employed a quasi-experimental design with pre-test and post-test control groups to investigate the effects of Think–Write–Pair–Share (TWPS) on EFL students' argumentative paragraph writing performance. A quasi-experimental design was selected because random assignment of participants to groups was not feasible in the university context. This design facilitated a comparison between an experimental group, which received TWPS-based instruction, and a comparison group, which followed conventional teaching methods, enabling assessment of the intervention's effectiveness (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

3.1 Participants

The study involved 132 EFL students who were enrolled in the Management department at Debre Markos University College of Business and Economics. The department registered three groups of students, each comprising 44 students. Based on the pretest scores of argumentative paragraph writing performance, all three groups were comparable in their English language proficiency. Consequently, a lottery method was used to identify the treatment group, the comparison group, and the excluded group. As a result, Group One was selected as the treatment group (n = 44), receiving instruction through the TWPS strategy, while Group Three was chosen as the comparison group (n = 44), following conventional writing instruction. Group Two was excluded from the study.

3.2 Instruments

The primary instrument for assessing students' argumentative paragraph writing performance was an analytic rubric developed specifically for this study. This rubric evaluated five

dimensions: Content, Organization, Language Use (Grammar), Vocabulary, and Mechanics, with each category rated on a five-point scale from 1 (Needs Improvement) to 5 (Excellent). The evaluation allocated 35% to Content, 25% to Organization, 15% to Language Use (Grammar), 15% to Vocabulary, and 10% to Mechanics, aligning with common analytic scoring practices in second-language writing assessment. Research supports these categories, demonstrating that effective L2 writing evaluation incorporates content, organization, lexical resources, grammar, and mechanics, which show strong inter-rater agreement when clearly defined (Shabani&Panahi, 2020). Similarly, writing rubrics used in EFL contexts often include these components, and studies have shown that these criteria contribute to the construct validity of writing assessments when aligned with instructional objectives (Phetsangkhad et al., 2022). Two experienced EFL instructors independently scored the students' paragraphs using the rubric, achieving high inter-rater reliability (Cohen's $\kappa = 0.89$), ensuring consistent and reliable scoring. The rubric facilitated a comprehensive evaluation of both linguistic and cognitive aspects of students' argumentative writing.

3.3 Reflective Journals

Reflective journals were employed to collect qualitative data on students' writing performance following the Think–Write–Pair–Share (TWPS) strategy. Such journals document learners' observations and experiences (Scarry&Scarry, 2011) and have been shown to promote engagement and higher-order thinking, thereby supporting writing development (Estrada &Rahman, 2014). In this study, they offered insights into students' progress in composing argumentative paragraphs. The prompts were carefully structured to guide reflection on idea generation, organization, clarity, coherence, vocabulary, and grammar, while still allowing expressive flexibility (Hyland, 2009). Guided questions were included to support meaningful reflection, as learners often require direction in reflective writing (Henter&Indreica, 2014). Pseudonyms were used to ensure confidentiality.

A thematic analysis was undertaken to explore patterns of writing development evident in students' reflective journals. To ensure analytic depth and methodological rigor, seven journals were randomly selected from the 44 participants in the experimental group. This selection aligns with Bolton's (2018) recommendation that qualitative analyses of reflective writing typically

involve 5–10 participants to allow for intensive interpretive engagement. In qualitative research, sample adequacy is determined by data richness, analytic manageability, and the likelihood of achieving thematic saturation rather than statistical proportionality. The selected journals provided sufficiently detailed, information-rich accounts to support robust theme generation, thereby enhancing the credibility of the analysis.

Analysis focused on argumentative paragraph writing, with reflections organized around the central theme of the perceived effect of TWPS on writing performance. This approach revealed that TWPS enhanced students' critical thinking, writing skills, and ability to construct well-reasoned argumentative paragraphs.

3.4. Procedures of the Experiment

As indicated in the pilot study, the experiment was conducted over eight weeks, with the same instructor teaching both the experimental and comparison groups in the Basic Writing Skills course to ensure consistency in implementation. To facilitate the intervention, six carefully selected Think–Write–Pair–Share (TWPS) instructional prompts were developed and administered differently across groups: the comparison group received conventional writing instruction, whereas the experimental group engaged with the prompts through the structured TWPS strategy. The prompts were chosen for their relevance, significance, and capacity to stimulate engagement through elements of surprise and controversy, encouraging discussion, debate, and analytical reasoning. They provided sufficient supporting information for informed argumentation and were structured, concise, and feasible within the course timeframe to meet pedagogical and cognitive standards. To align the activities with students' interests while maintaining content equivalence, participants ranked multiple prompt options, and the most preferred topics were used for both groups; however, the experimental group employed structured TWPS-guided prompts to support systematic idea generation and organization in paragraph writing.

3.4.1 The Think-Write-Pair-Share (TWPS) Strategy for Teaching Writing Skills

The Think-Write-Pair-Share (TWPS) strategy is an instructional method that promotes active engagement, collaboration, and critical thinking. Students first reflect individually (“think”) and

organize their ideas in writing (“write”), then discuss with a partner (“pair”) and share with the class (“share”), enhancing understanding and reasoning. Research shows that TWPS improves students’ writing performance and critical thinking skills in various educational contexts (Mutia, 2021; Basha, 2024).

In the Pair phase, students share their written responses with a partner or small group, actively listening and exchanging perspectives. The Share-phase expands this dialogue to a whole-class discussion, facilitated by the instructor, where students present insights gained from their partners, engage in debate, and reflect on the evolution of their thinking. This reflection encourages meta-cognition and promotes deeper learning.

Finally, students complete an Individual Written Production task, synthesizing ideas from discussions to produce a coherent argumentative paragraph. Throughout the TWPS process, the instructor provides clear guidance, maintains a supportive and inclusive classroom environment, and facilitates discussions to ensure equitable participation. By following this structured approach, students enhance their critical thinking, communication, and collaboration skills while developing a deeper understanding of the topic (Garmston & Wellman, 2016).

3.4.2 The Conventional Method of Teaching Writing Skills

In the conventional writing approach, students were taught to follow fixed paragraph and essay structures, emphasizing clear topic sentences, supporting details, conclusions, and standard formats (introduction, body, and conclusion). Instruction relied on models and templates, with strong attention to grammar, punctuation, and style to ensure clarity and academic conformity. Assessment focused mainly on the final product rather than the writing process.

While this method supports logical organization and adherence to academic standards, it has limitations. By prioritizing structure over exploration, it may restrict creativity, reduce engagement, and limit opportunities for students to develop their own voices and ideas (Hyland, 2003).

3.5. Data Analysis

Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Paired-sample t-tests assessed within-group improvements, while independent-sample t-tests compared post-test results between the experimental and control groups. All analyses were performed using SPSS version 23, with significance set at $p < .05$. Qualitative data from students' reflective journals were examined through thematic analysis to identify recurring patterns related to changes in writing performance. This mixed-method approach provided a comprehensive understanding of both statistical outcomes and learners' experiences.

4. Results

This section reports the findings on the effects of the Think–Write–Pair–Share (TWPS) strategy on EFL students' argumentative paragraph writing performance, drawing on both quantitative analyses and students' reflective journal responses. Descriptive statistics first outline overall performance patterns for the Treatment (TWPS) and Comparison (conventional instruction) groups. Inferential analyses then examine within-group progress from pretest to posttest using paired-samples t-tests and assess between-group differences in posttest results and gain scores through independent-samples t-tests.

4.1. Results Based on Quantitative Data

Table 1: Descriptive Statistic

Group	Test)	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean Difference
Treatment (TWPS)	Pretest	44	48.28	10.21	
Treatment (TWPS)	Posttest	44	73.92	9.87	25.64
Comparison (Conventional)	Pretest	44	51.00	10.03	
Comparison (Conventional)	Posttest	44	63.86	9.45	12.86

As shown in Table 1, a descriptive analysis was conducted to examine students' argumentative paragraph writing performance before and after instruction. In the treatment group (TWPS), the mean pretest score was 48.28 (SD = 10.21), and the mean posttest score was 73.92 (SD = 9.87), resulting in a mean improvement of 25.64 points. In the comparison group (conventional instruction), the mean pretest score was 51.00 (SD = 10.03), and the mean posttest score was 63.86 (SD = 9.45), with a mean gain of 12.86 points.

These results indicate that both instructional methods improved students' writing performance; however, the treatment group showed a substantially larger gain, suggesting that the TWPS strategy was more effective than conventional instruction in enhancing argumentative paragraph writing skills

Table 2: Paired Samples t-test

Group (N)	Pretest M (SD)	Posttest M (SD)	Mean Difference	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Cohen's d
Treatment (44)	48.28 (10.21)	73.92 (9.87)	25.64	16.66	43	< .001	2.51
Comparison(44)	51.00 (10.03)	63.86(9.45)	12.86	8.50	43	< .001	1.28

Table 2 presents the results of paired-samples t-tests examining the effect of the Think–Write–Pair–Share (TWPS) strategy and conventional instruction on students' argumentative paragraph writing performance.

In the treatment group (TWPS), students' posttest scores ($M = 73.92$, $SD = 9.87$) were significantly higher than their pretest scores ($M = 48.28$, $SD = 10.21$), $t(43) = 16.66$, $p < .001$, with a very large effect size, Cohen's $d = 2.51$, indicating a substantial improvement following the TWPS intervention.

The comparison group, which received conventional instruction, also showed a significant increase from pretest ($M = 51.00$, $SD = 10.03$) to posttest ($M = 63.86$, $SD = 9.45$), $t(43) = 8.50$, $p < .001$, with a large effect size, Cohen's $d = 1.28$. However, the magnitude of gain in this group was smaller than that observed in the TWPS group.

Overall, both instructional methods significantly improved students' writing performance, but the TWPS strategy produced a substantially greater enhancement compared with conventional instruction.

Table 3: Independent Samples t-test (Posttest Scores)

Test	Group	N	Mean	SD	Levene's F (Sig.)	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Cohen's d
Posttest	Treatment (TWPS)	44	73.92	9.87	0.09 (.76)	4.88	86	< .001	1.04
Posttest	Comparison (Conventional)	44	63.86	9.45					

Table 3 presents the results of an independent-samples t-test comparing posttest writing scores between the treatment group (TWPS) and the comparison group (conventional instruction). Levene's test indicated that the assumption of equal variances was met, $F = 0.09$, $p = .76$.

Students in the treatment group ($M = 73.92$, $SD = 9.87$) scored significantly higher than students in the comparison group ($M = 63.86$, $SD = 9.45$), $t(86) = 4.88$, $p < .001$, with a large effect size, Cohen's $d = 1.04$.

These results indicate that the TWPS strategy was more effective than conventional instruction in enhancing students' argumentative paragraph writing performance.

4.2 Results Based on Qualitative Data

In addition to the statistical evidence, students' reflective journals provided qualitative insights into how TWPS supported their writing development. Students reported that the strategy helped them generate ideas more easily, organize their arguments more coherently, and develop confidence during writing tasks. The reflections of the journals highlighted the value of peer interaction during the "pair-share" stage, noting that discussing ideas with classmates clarified their thinking and improved their ability to construct logical arguments. Others emphasized that the "think" and "write" stages gave them time to formulate stronger claims and evidence before sharing with their peers. Overall, the reflections aligned with the quantitative results, illustrating that TWPS was perceived as a supportive, motivating, and effective approach for developing argumentative writing skills.

4.2.1 Enhanced Idea Generation and Content Development

Students consistently reported that TWPS facilitated idea generation, organization, and expansion prior to writing. The “pair” and “share” stages exposed learners to multiple perspectives, enriching paragraph content. As one student noted, *“Sharing with a partner gave me more ideas and helped me develop better content,”* while another commented, *“Before, I wrote alone and struggled to come up with ideas, but TWPS gave me time to think and discuss first.”* These findings suggest that collaborative dialogue within TWPS promotes cognitive elaboration and creativity, aligning with Vygotsky’s (1978) socio-cultural theory, which emphasizes learning through social interaction within the Zone of Proximal Development.

4.2.2 Improved Organization and Planning

The structured sequence of individual reflection, preliminary note-taking, and peer discussion also enhanced students’ ability to organize ideas logically. Participants reported, *“It helped me organize my thoughts better,”* and *“The organization of my paragraphs improved because I learned to plan before writing.”* This indicates that TWPS scaffolds procedural awareness in writing, consistent with Flower and Hayes’s (1981) process model, which highlights planning and organization as critical cognitive processes in composition.

4.2.3 Vocabulary, Language Use, and Grammar Development

Peer discussions during the “pair” stage exposed learners to new vocabulary and expressions, enhancing lexical resources and language sophistication. Students noted that listening to peers helped them use transition words like *“however”* and *“therefore”* more effectively. Additionally, the reflective and collaborative aspects of TWPS encouraged attention to grammar and sentence structure, with one student stating, *“I became more careful with my grammar and sentence structure because I had time to think and revise.”* These findings support Nation’s (2013) view that meaningful interaction facilitates incidental vocabulary acquisition and suggest that TWPS provides a platform for authentic linguistic development.

4.2.4 Effects on Argumentative Writing Performance

Quantitative results showed that students in the TWPS group outperformed peers in a conventional instruction group across all rubric categories, with the most pronounced gains in Content and Organization. The “Think” and “Write” stages allowed learners to clarify ideas and develop supporting evidence individually before peer discussion, reducing cognitive load (Sweller, 1988) and enabling less proficient learners to construct well-reasoned arguments. Subsequent improvements in Vocabulary, Grammar, and Mechanics indicate that collaborative feedback and comparison during the “Pair” and “Share” stages also promote linguistic accuracy and refinement, in line with Abdelrahman (2014) and Tran (2020).

4.2.4.1 Comparison with Conventional Instruction

Compared to conventional instruction, TWPS generated greater gains across all rubric dimensions. Although the comparison group showed some improvement, their writing often remained linear, less cohesive, and limited in critical depth, reflecting observations that conventional approaches tend to emphasize grammar and vocabulary over reasoning and argumentation (Ferris, 2018). By integrating cognitive, linguistic, and social elements, TWPS offers a more holistic and scaffolded framework for developing argumentative writing skills.

The findings further suggest that TWPS shifts writing from a solitary, linear activity to a cyclical and interactive process involving reflection, drafting, peer discussion, and whole-class sharing. This structure promotes confidence, organization, critical thinking, and linguistic growth, supporting both cognitive and social aspects of EFL writing. Consistent with prior research (Kaddoura, 2013; Al-Zahrani, 2015), the combined descriptive, inferential, and reflective evidence confirms that TWPS significantly enhanced students’ argumentative writing performance and was positively perceived as an engaging and effective instructional approach.

5. Discussion of the Findings

The findings indicate that the Think–Write–Pair–Share (TWPS) strategy significantly and positively enhanced students’ argumentative writing performance compared to conventional teacher-centered instruction. Although both groups improved from pretest to posttest, the

treatment group demonstrated markedly greater gains, and the lack of initial statistically significant differences supports the internal validity and credibility of the results. These outcomes strongly align with prior empirical research showing that cooperative learning approaches promote engagement, idea development, critical thinking, and overall writing quality more effectively than traditional teacher-centered methods.

Students' reflections further reveal that TWPS facilitated idea generation, logical organization, and coherent argument development through clearly structured individual and collaborative learning stages, consistent with socio-cultural and cognitive perspectives on writing development. Participants also reported noticeable improvements in vocabulary use, grammatical accuracy, and sentence clarity, likely supported by meaningful peer interaction and exposure to varied and authentic language use. Overall, the treatment group consistently outperformed the comparison group across all analytic rubric dimensions, whereas conventional instruction produced comparatively more limited progress, particularly in higher-order reasoning and argument sophistication. These findings strongly confirm TWPS as an effective and pedagogically sound approach for improving EFL students' argumentative writing performance.

6. Pedagogical Significance

The study highlights the practical value of the Think–Write–Pair–Share (TWPS) strategy in EFL classrooms. Teachers can guide students through structured pre-writing reflection to organize ideas and improve clarity and coherence. During the “Pair” and “Share” stages, educators facilitate peer feedback and critical discussion, promoting engagement and diverse perspectives. By emphasizing reasoning, argumentation, and linguistic accuracy, TWPS integrates reflection, collaboration, and teacher support, fostering argumentative writing skills alongside analytical, communicative, and evaluative competencies essential for EFL learners.

7. Conclusion

This study examined the effectiveness of the Think-Write-Pair-Share (TWPS) strategy in enhancing EFL students' argumentative writing and found clear evidence that TWPS leads to significantly greater improvements than conventional instruction. By combining individual cognitive processing with structured collaborative interaction, TWPS fostered richer idea

generation, more coherent organization, and noticeable linguistic gains in vocabulary, grammar, and clarity. Students demonstrated stronger argumentative structures and deeper engagement with content, outperforming their counterparts across all rubric dimensions. These results affirm that TWPS transforms writing into a more interactive, reflective, and cognitively manageable process. Overall, the study contributes meaningful evidence that TWPS is a powerful pedagogical approach for improving argumentative writing in EFL contexts.

8. Practical Implications

The findings carry several pedagogical implications for EFL writing instruction. First, the substantial gains observed with TWPS suggest that writing lessons should move beyond conventional, teacher-centered practices and incorporate structured collaborative stages that promote higher-order thinking. TWPS provides an effective framework for scaffolding the cognitive and linguistic demands of argumentative writing, particularly for learners who struggle with planning and idea development. Second, the strategy's emphasis on interaction aligns with socio-cultural principles, reinforcing the value of peer dialogue in supporting language development and conceptual understanding. Finally, because TWPS improves both content and linguistic accuracy, it offers instructors a balanced method for addressing multiple dimensions of writing proficiency simultaneously.

9. Recommendations

Based on the findings, several recommendations are proposed. Instructors are encouraged to integrate TWPS regularly into writing instruction, especially when teaching essay planning, argument construction, and revision. Teacher education programs should incorporate training on collaborative learning strategies to ensure that teachers can effectively facilitate each stage of TWPS. Curriculum designers may also consider embedding TWPS within writing syllabi to ensure consistent application across grade levels. Future research should explore the long-term effects of TWPS, its applicability to other genres of writing, and its impact on learners with varying proficiency levels. Studies that integrate classroom observation and analysis of student interactions would further deepen understanding of how TWPS supports writing development.

10. Future Research Directions

Future research on the Think–Write–Pair–Share (TWPS) strategy should investigate its long-term effects through longitudinal studies to determine whether improvements in content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and writing self-efficacy are sustained over time. Studies could also examine its application to other writing genres, such as narrative, descriptive, and expository tasks, to assess broader transferability.

Research across different proficiency levels (beginner, intermediate, and advanced) would clarify whether TWPS benefits certain learners more or supports all students equally. Additionally, contextual variables such as class size, teacher expertise, and institutional support should be considered to understand implementation effects. Further inquiry into cognitive and affective mechanisms, including strategy use, motivation, self-regulation, peer interaction, and revision practices (particularly in digital and cross-cultural contexts) would deepen understanding of how TWPS functions in language instruction.

Acknowledgements

The author expresses sincere gratitude to Dr. Sualih Mussa and Dr. Simachew Gashaye for their invaluable guidance, constructive feedback, and continuous scholarly support throughout the research process. Appreciation is also extended to DebreMarkos University for providing financial support for this study.

Declaration of Conflict of Interest

The author declares that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this manuscript.

Authors' Contributions

The author conceived and designed the study, collected and analyzed the data, interpreted the findings, and prepared the manuscript. The supervisors provided academic guidance, critical review, and constructive feedback throughout the research and manuscript development process.

11. References

- Abdelrahman, M. A. (2014a). The impact of think–write–pair–share on improving EFL learners writing performance. *International Journal of English Language Teaching*, 2(3), 45–54.
- Abdelrahman, M. A. (2014b). The impact of TWPS on students’ writing performance. *Journal of Language Teaching*, 8(3), 55–68.
- Al-Zahrani, I. Y. (2015). The effect of cooperative learning on the development of writing skills and higher-order thinking in EFL learners. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Studies*, 9(1), 1–12.
- Basha, W. F. M. (2024). Effects of online think–pair–share strategy in developing preparatory school students’ writing skills in EFL classrooms. (*Contemporary Curricula and Educational Technology Journal*), 5(4), 35–55.
<https://doi.org/10.21608/msite.2024.264666.1042> (EKB Journals)
- Bruffee, K. (1984). Collaborative learning and the conversation of mankind. *College English*, 46(7), 635–652.
- Bruffee, K. A. (1999). *Collaborative learning: Higher education, interdependence, and the authority of knowledge* (2nd ed.). Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Bolton, G. (2018). *Reflective practice: Writing and professional development* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Creswell, J. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach*. Sage.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Edutopia. (2024). Think-pair-share variations: 16 ways to up your game. Retrieved September

17, 2025, from <https://www.edutopia.org/article/think-pair-share-variations-16-ways-up-your-game>

- Estrada, J., & Rahman, H. (2014). Enhancing learning experiences through reflective journal writing. *Journal of Professional Courses*, 20(3), 45–62.
- Fang, X. (2016). Collaborative strategies in argumentative writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 50(2), 398–420.
- Fang, F. (2016). The effect of collaborative writing on EFL learners' writing quality. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 7(2), 256–263.
- Ferris, D. (2018a). *Second language writing research and pedagogy*. Routledge.
- Ferris, D. R. (2018b). *Writing for academic purposes: Instructional practices and research*. Routledge.
- Ferris, D. R. (2018c). *Writing classrooms, writing teachers, writing students* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 32(4), 365–387.
- Garmston, R. J., & Wellman, B. M. (2016). *The adaptive school: A sourcebook for developing collaborative groups* (3rd ed.). Bloomsbury.
- Gerot, L., & Wignell, P. (1995). *Making sense of functional grammar: An introductory workbook*. Antipodean Educational Enterprises.
- Henter, R., & Indreica, E. (2014). Reflective writing as a tool for developing metacognitive skills in language learning. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 128, 224–229.
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hyland, K. (2009). *Teaching and researching writing* (2nd ed.). Pearson Education.
- Hyland, K. (2019). *Second language writing*. Cambridge University Press.

- Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Holubec, E. J. (2013). *Cooperation in the classroom* (9th ed.). Interaction Book Company.
- Kaddoura, M. (2013). Think-pair-share: A teaching strategy to enhance students' critical thinking. *Education*, 133(4), 689–700.
- Kagan, S. (1994). *Cooperative learning*. Kagan Publishing.
- Kessler, G. (2012). Collaborative writing in L2 classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 45(3), 204–225. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000053>
- Kharisma, I., & Hidayati, L. A. (2018). Students' perception in learning English using Cooperative learning activity. *Project (Professional Journal of English Education)*, 1(3), 207–216. <https://doi.org/10.22460/project.v1i3.p207-216>
- Lyman, F. (1981). The responsive classroom discussion. In A. Anderson (Ed.), *Mainstreaming digest* (pp. 109–113). University of Maryland.
- McTighe, J., & Lyman, F. (1988). Cueing thinking in the classroom. *Educational Leadership*, 45(7), 18–24.
- Mutia, M. (2021). The effectiveness of using think-write-pair-share technique in teaching writing. *PROJECT (Professional Journal of English Education)*.
- Nation, I. S. P. (2013). *Learning vocabulary in another language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford, R. L. (2017). *Teaching and researching language learning strategies: Self-regulation Context* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Paul, R., & Elder, L. (2014). *The miniature guide to critical thinking concepts and tools* (7th ed.). Foundation for Critical Thinking.
- Phetsangkhad, P. K, et al. (2022). *Scoring rubric development of writing assessment for EFL*

- students. *ASEAN Journal of Religious and Cultural Research*, 5(3), 8–12.
- Purnamasari, A., & Argawati, N. O. (2020). The use of discovery learning method in teaching writing recount text to the tenth grade of SMAN Ngamprah. *PROJECT (Professional Journal of English Education)*, 3(4), 470–476.
<https://doi.org/10.22460/project.v3i4.p470-476>
- Rahmawaty, K., Normuliati, S., & Sabarun. (2023). The effect of collaborative-learning strategy on students' ability to write narrative essays. *Journal of English Language and Education*, 9(5).
- Rahmawaty, K., Sabarun, S., & Normuliati, S. (2024). The effect of collaborative-learning strategy on students' ability to write narrative essays. *Journal of English Language and Education*, 9(5), 52–61. <https://doi.org/10.31004/jele.v9i5.550>
- Reading Rockets.(n.d.).Think-pair-share. Retrieved September 17, 2025, from
<https://www.readingrockets.org/classroom/classroom-strategies/think-pair-share>
- Scarry, E., & Scarry, S. (2011). Reflective journals: A tool for capturing observations, thoughts, reactions, and opinions. *Journal of Educational Research*, 36(2), 89–105.
- Shabani, E. A., & Panahi, J. (2020). Examining consistency among different rubrics for assessing writing. *Language Testing in Asia*, 10(12).<https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-020-00111-4>
- Shopiah, S., & Anggraeni, R. (2018). Teaching recount text through Scrabble game. *Project (Professional Journal of English Education)*, 1(3), 201–206.
<https://doi.org/10.22460/project.v1i3.p201-206>
- Stapleton, P. (2001). Assessing critical thinking in argumentative writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35(1), 51–70.
- Stapleton, P. (2001). Assessing the relationship between coherence, cohesion, and writing

- Quality. *Assessing Writing*, 8(2), 147–161.
- Stapleton, P. (2001). Assessing critical thinking in the writing of Japanese university students. *Written Communication*, 18(4), 506–548.
- Storch, N. (2013). *Collaborative writing in L2 classrooms*. Multilingual Matters.
- Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. *Cognitive Science*, 12(2), 257–285.
- Sweller, J. (2010). Cognitive load theory. *Psychology of Learning and Motivation*, 53, 37–76.
- Tran, T. Q. (2020). The effects of technology-enhanced writing platforms on learners' affective factors in second language writing. *Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, 12(3), 45–60.
- Tran, T. (2020). Reducing writing anxiety through collaborative strategies. *Asian EFL Journal*, 27(4), 112–129.
- Utah State University. (n.d.). Think, pair, share. Retrieved September 17, 2025, from <https://www.usu.edu/teach/help-topics/teaching-tips/think-pair-share>
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society*. Harvard University Press.
- Zarei, A., & Khalessi, M. (2011). TWPS and reading comprehension. *Reading Improvement*, 48(1), 37–47.