https://doi.org/10.31538/alsuna.v9i1.10457

Alsunā Journal of Arabic and English Language

Writing Stages, Evaluation Criteria, and Pedagogical Functions in Maḥmūd Kāmil al-Nāqa's Arabic Writing Instruction: An Integrative Reconstruction for Contemporary Classrooms

Khaerul Muttakin[1*], Triani Agustin[1], R Umi Baroroh[1], Muhammad Ali Jum'ah Rahmatullah[2], Ninda Maharani[1] and Abdurrohman Hasan Al-Adawi [3]

[1]Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Kalijaga, Indonesia

[2]Institut Agama Islam Hamzanwadi Lombok Timur, Indonesia

[3]Saratov State University, Russia

Received, 18 April 2026 **Accepted, 10 June 2026**

ABSTRACT

Purpose *- This study reconstructs and integrates the writing-instruction framework advanced by Maḥmūd Kāmil al-Nāqa in Taʿlīm al-Lughah al-ʿArabīyah li-Ghayr al-Nāṭiqīn bihā, examining how his tripartite model of writing stages, evaluation criteria, and pedagogical functions can be applied in contemporary Arabic language classrooms.*

Design/methodology/approach *- The study employs qualitative document analysis of al-Nāqa's primary text, supplemented by a purposive analytical review of secondary literature on Arabic writing pedagogy. Four coding categories — writing stages, evaluation orientation, pedagogical function, and contemporary adaptation — guided thematic analysis across both the source text and the scholarly corpus.*

Findings/results *– Al-Nāqa distinguishes three developmentally ordered and overlapping writing stages: al-kitābah al-muwajjahah (guided writing), al-kitābah al-muqayyadah (constrained writing), and al-kitābah al-ḥurrah (free writing). Each stage carries distinct evaluation criteria and a defined pedagogical function within a continuum from linguistic control to expressive autonomy. Within the reviewed corpus, no prior study has produced an integrative reconstruction mapping all three dimensions simultaneously.*

Originality/value *- The study contributes an integrative pedagogical model (Figure 1) and an adaptation table (Table 4) specifying how each element of al-Nāqa's original framework translates into contemporary classroom practice, including digital and communicative extensions.*

Paper type *– Conceptual paper*

Keywords**:** *Arabic writing instruction; al-Nāqa; Writing stages; Evaluative pedagogy; Non-native speakers.*

***Corresponding author:** Khaerul Muttakin, Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Kalijaga, Indonesia. E-mail: 24204022031@student.uin-suka.ac.id

1. Introduction

Writing proficiency occupies a persistent and undertheorised place in Arabic language instruction for non-native speakers. Unlike listening and speaking, which teachers can assess

incrementally through classroom exchange, writing demands that learners simultaneously manage grammar, morphology, lexis, and discourse organisation. The difficulty is compounded in Arabic specifically: learners must internalise the conventions of Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) while navigating genre expectations that shift substantially between academic, professional, and literary registers (Cummins, 2008; Khalil & Mansouri, 2021).

Among the frameworks developed for this challenge, the work of Maḥmūd Kāmil al-Nāqa stands out for its systematic attention to both the developmental sequence of writing skill and the evaluative criteria appropriate to each stage. His *Taʿlīm al-Lughah al-ʿArabīyah li-Ghayr al-Nāṭiqīn bihā* (1985) treats mahārah al-kitābah — writing competence — not as a single skill to be practised but as a developmental achievement structured across overlapping stages, each with its own evaluative logic. That architecture is rarely reconstructed in full.

The limitation in prior scholarship is concrete. Studies drawing on al-Nāqa's work have generally extracted his stage taxonomy — the tripartite sequence of guided, constrained, and free writing — while leaving implicit the evaluation criteria and pedagogical functions he attaches to each stage (Mustofa et al., 2019; Saputra et al., 2022). A teacher who knows the three stage labels but not the evaluative principles behind them can name what learners should do at each stage, but cannot assess whether they have done it or explain why stage transition matters. That is a significant instructional gap.

This study addresses that gap through an integrative reconstruction of al-Nāqa's framework. Drawing on close reading of the primary text and a purposive analytical review of secondary scholarship, it pursues three research questions:
RQ1: What writing stages does al-Nāqa identify, and in what developmental sequence?
RQ2: What evaluation criteria does he associate with each stage?
RQ3: What pedagogical function does each stage serve, and how can these functions be adapted for contemporary Arabic classrooms?

2. Literature Review

2.1 Prior Studies on al-Nāqa's Writing Framework

The research gap this study addresses can be located precisely by examining how prior scholarship has engaged al-Nāqa's framework. The pattern, across a purposive analytical corpus constructed for this study, is consistent: prior work is either stage-focused or evaluation-focused, but not integrative. Table 1 documents this pattern.

Table 1. *Prior studies engaging al-Nāqa's writing framework and identified gaps. [a]Foundational sources pre-dating the 2015 inclusion window retained as theoretical interlocutors.*

Study	Focus	Stage taxonomy	Evaluation criteria	Pedagogical function	Integrative model
Al-Hāshimī (2009)[a]	Guided writing activities	Partial	Absent	Absent	Absent
Ṭuʿaymah & al-Nāqa (2010)[a]	Curriculum design	Present	Partial	Partial	Absent

Ibrahim & Wahab (2015)	L2 Arabic writing rubrics	Absent	Present	Absent	Absent
Mustofa et al. (2019)	Digital writing media	Partial	Absent	Partial	Absent
Hermawan & Sholeh (2021)	Free-writing in pesantren	Present	Absent	Partial	Absent
Saputra et al. (2022)	Guided composition tasks	Present	Absent	Absent	Absent
Al-Ghāmidī (2023)	Writing evaluation criteria	Absent	Present	Absent	Absent
Present study	**Integrative reconstruction**	**Present**	**Present**	**Present**	**Present**

Table 1 confirms the gap this study addresses. Sources published after 2015 engage al-Nāqa's stage taxonomy without his evaluative architecture; earlier foundational works are partial in different directions. Ibrahim and Wahab (2015) come closest to an evaluation-centred reading, but without integrating stage taxonomy or pedagogical function. To the best of the reviewed corpus, no prior study has produced the integrative reconstruction attempted here.

2.2 Theoretical Framework: Al-Nāqa's Writing Pedagogy

Maḥmūd Kāmil al-Nāqa grounds his approach to Arabic writing instruction in communicative language teaching principles adapted to the demands of MSA as a second or foreign language (Richards & Rodgers, 2014; Savignon, 2018). Writing, in his account, is a graduated competence — mahārah al-kitābah — that develops through ordered stages, each defined by a specific relationship between learner support and learner autonomy.

The foundational claim is that writing cannot be taught as a single undifferentiated activity. Different proficiency levels require different task types, different evaluative criteria, and different types of teacher feedback (Brown & Lee, 2015). This proposition forms the theoretical basis for the integrative model proposed here, and it intersects productively with process-writing approaches in L2 education (Graham & Sandmel, 2011; Hyland, 2019; Zamel, 1982).

Al-Nāqa's three-stage taxonomy distinguishes: (1) al-kitābah al-muwajjahah (guided writing), in which the learner follows explicit linguistic templates; (2) al-kitābah al-muqayyadah (constrained writing), in which structural support is reduced but thematic boundaries remain; and (3) al-kitābah al-ḥurrah (free writing), in which the learner selects topic, form, and content with minimal external constraint (al-Nāqa, 1985, pp. 198–201). Each stage is associated with a specific evaluation orientation and pedagogical function — dimensions that prior scholarship has left implicit.

The framework also reflects the specific demands of Arabic morphological complexity. The root-and-pattern system, case vowelling, and broken plurals impose learning challenges not present in other L2 writing contexts (Benmamoun et al., 2013; Ryding, 2005), making the early stages of al-Nāqa's taxonomy especially important as sites of structured practice before learners attempt autonomous production.

3. Method

3.1 Research Design

This study uses qualitative document analysis (Bowen, 2009; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016) as its primary methodological approach. Document analysis is appropriate here because the research questions concern the internal architecture of a canonical text and the adequacy of its secondary interpretations — questions requiring systematic, criterion-governed reading rather than empirical data collection. The approach is consistent with framework reconstruction studies in language pedagogy (Ellis, 2003; Nassaji, 2015).

3.2 Research Site and Participants

The primary source is al-Nāqa's *Taʿlīm al-Lughah al-ʿArabīyah li-Ghayr al-Nāṭiqīn bihā* (Mecca: Jāmiʿat Umm al-Qurā, 1985). Two chapters were analysed in full: Chapter 8 (Mahārah al-Kitābah, pp. 195–230) and Chapter 9 (Taqwīm Mahārah al-Kitābah, pp. 231–254), which contain al-Nāqa's most sustained treatment of writing stages, evaluative criteria, and pedagogical guidance for Arabic as a foreign language.

3.3 Data Collection

The secondary corpus assembled for this study is an **analytical corpus** — purposive rather than exhaustive — designed to provide scholarly context for situating al-Nāqa's framework, documenting the research gap, and identifying contemporary adaptations of comparable pedagogical frameworks. It does not aim to map the field comprehensively, and it should not be read as a bibliometric or systematic review of the Arabic writing pedagogy literature.

Inclusion criteria: (a) peer-reviewed article or book chapter; (b) direct engagement with al-Nāqa's writing framework or with Arabic writing pedagogy for non-native speakers; (c) published between 2015 and 2024, with the exception of foundational pre-2015 sources retained as theoretical interlocutors; (d) indexed in Scopus, Web of Science, or SINTA (minimum S2). **Exclusion criteria**: (a) studies focused exclusively on Arabic reading, listening, or grammar without reference to writing; (b) studies citing al-Nāqa only in passing without analytical engagement; (c) conference papers without peer review.

Table 2. *Analytical secondary corpus. [a]Pre-2015 sources retained as foundational theoretical exceptions.*

No.	Source	Type	Relevance
1	Al-Hāshimī (2009)[a]	Book chapter	Guided writing activities; foundational taxonomy
2	Ṭuʿaymah & al-Nāqa (2010)[a]	Book chapter	Stage taxonomy and curriculum design
3	Ibrahim & Wahab (2015)	Journal article	L2 Arabic writing rubrics and evaluation
4	Brown & Lee (2015)	Textbook	L2 task design and pedagogical scaffolding

5	Mustofa et al. (2019)	Journal article	Digital writing media in madrasah
6	Khaldieh (2019)	Journal article	Arabic writing assessment and CLT
7	Hermawan & Sholeh (2021)	Journal article	Free writing implementation in pesantren
8	Khalil & Mansouri (2021)	Journal article	Arabic L2 writing development contexts
9	Saputra et al. (2022)	Journal article	Guided composition task effectiveness
10	Al-Ghāmidī (2023)	Journal article	Arabic writing evaluation criteria
11	Nuha & Fajri (2023)	Journal article	Writing assessment instruments, madrasah
12	Wahab et al. (2023)	Journal article	Arabic writing skill trends in Indonesia
13	Wildana et al. (2024)	Journal article	Communicative approach to Arabic writing stages
14	Ainin et al. (2024)	Journal article	Analytic rubric for Arabic writing assessment

Source category is indicative; this corpus is purposive and analytical, not a bibliometric or systematic mapping of the field.

3.4 Analysis Procedure

Analysis proceeded through four ordered coding categories applied to both primary and secondary sources:

(1) Writing stages: Passages explicitly identifying or defining a writing stage — its name, boundaries, and sequential position — were coded and extracted, with page references recorded for all primary-source instances.

(2) Evaluation orientation: Passages specifying criteria, standards, or indicators for assessing learner output at a given stage were coded, with orientation classified as accuracy-based (model conformity), proficiency-based (linguistic control), or communicative/expressive (meaning and creativity).

(3) Pedagogical function: Passages describing what a stage is designed to accomplish — in terms of learner development, teacher role, and task design — were coded separately from stage definition and evaluation criteria.

(4) Contemporary adaptation: Passages in secondary sources discussing how al-Nāqa's framework has been applied, modified, or extended after 2000 — including digital and communicative-language-teaching adaptations — were coded for comparison with al-Nāqa's original specifications.

To illustrate how coded passages moved from primary text to model element, Table 3 presents a representative coding excerpt.

Table 3. *Representative coding excerpt: primary source passage (with transliteration) → code applied → category → element in integrative model.*

Primary source passage (al-Nāqa, 1985)	Code applied	Category	Element in integrative model
Tanqasim mahārah al-kitābah ilā thalāthat mustawayāt mutadākhilah [Writing competence divides into three overlapping levels] (p. 198)	STAGE-SEQUENCE	Writing stages	Three-stage continuum; mutadākhilah signals gradient, not discrete, zones
Wa-li-kull marḥalah maʿāyīruhā al-taqwīmīyah al-khaṣṣah [Each stage has its own specific evaluative criteria] (p. 206)	EVAL-STAGE-LINK	Evaluation orientation	Stage-differentiated evaluation; foundational to integrative claim
Lā yanbaghī an yakūn al-khaṭaʾ al-naḥwī huwa al-miʿyār al-waḥīd [Grammatical error should not be the sole criterion] (p. 218)	EVAL-SHIFT-FREE	Evaluation orientation	Free-stage evaluation is communicative/expressive, not accuracy-based
Taqlīl al-akhṭāʾ bi-l-tawjīh al-lughawī al-muqaddam [Reducing errors through the supplied linguistic guidance] (p. 200)	PED-FUNC-GUIDED	Pedagogical function	Guided stage function: error prevention via structural scaffolding

Coded passages were then mapped across categories to produce the integrative conceptual model (Figure 1) and the adaptation table (Table 4). A second reading of the primary source verified that all stage definitions, evaluative statements, and pedagogical recommendations had been captured.

4. Findings and Discussion

4.1 Writing Stages in al-Nāqa's Framework

Al-Nāqa's three writing stages form a developmental continuum arranged from maximum external support to maximum learner autonomy. The progression is stated explicitly: "*tanqasim mahārah al-kitābah ilā thalāthat mustawayāt mutadākhilah: al-kitābah al-muwajjahah, thumma al-kitābah al-muqayyadah, thumma al-kitābah al-ḥurrah*" [Writing competence is divided into three overlapping levels: guided writing, then constrained writing, then free writing] (al-Nāqa, 1985, p. 198).

The term *mutadākhilah* (overlapping) is deliberate and theoretically significant: al-Nāqa conceives the three stages not as discrete categories but as gradient zones along a support-autonomy continuum. The stages are developmentally ordered and overlapping — a learner moving from al-kitābah al-muwajjahah toward al-kitābah al-muqayyadah does not cross a sharp boundary but progressively operates with less external support. Stage 1, al-kitābah al-muwajjahah, foregrounds linguistic accuracy. Learners are supplied with model sentences or structural patterns; the primary task is to reproduce, complete, or minimally vary those models.

Teacher feedback at this stage focuses on morphosyntactic accuracy and adherence to the supplied model (al-Nāqa, 1985, pp. 199–200).

Stage 2, al-kitābah al-muqayyadah, reduces structural scaffolding while maintaining thematic and genre constraints. Sentence-level templates are withdrawn; learners write within an assigned topic and may receive lexical or discourse-level prompts. Al-Nāqa describes this as the stage of developing linguistic independence — sufficient constraint to prevent learners from exceeding their productive competence, sufficient freedom to require them to begin making independent lexical and syntactic choices (al-Nāqa, 1985, p. 202; cf. Ellis, 2003).

Stage 3, al-kitābah al-ḥurrah, grants the learner full agency over topic, genre, and organisation. Al-Nāqa reserves this stage for advanced learners: "*al-kitābah al-ḥurrah hiya al-hadaf al-nihāʾī li-taʿlīm al-kitābah, idhā yasīr al-mutaʿallim ilā al-taʿbīr ʿan afkārihi bi-shak mustaqill*" [Free writing is the ultimate goal of writing instruction, in which the learner moves toward expressing ideas independently] (al-Nāqa, 1985, p. 205).

4.2 Evaluation Criteria by Stage

Al-Nāqa's evaluative logic shifts orientation as the learner advances through the stage continuum. The clearest statement of this shift: *"inna taʿlīm al-kitābah laysa ʿamalīyatan wāḥidatan, bal hiya marāḥil mutakāmilah tabdaʾu bi-l-kitābah al-muwajjahah wa-tantahī bi-l-kitābah al-ḥurrah, wa-li-kull marḥalah maʿāyīruhā al-taqwīmīyah al-khaṣṣah"* [Teaching writing is not a single operation; it is a set of integrated stages beginning with guided writing and ending with free writing, each stage having its own specific evaluative criteria] (al-Nāqa, 1985, p. 206).

At the guided writing stage, evaluation is accuracy-based. The primary criterion is the degree to which learner output conforms to the supplied linguistic model. Al-Nāqa specifies indicators including correct verb morphology, appropriate case endings, and syntactic parallelism with the model (al-Nāqa, 1985, p. 207). Errors of commission — producing structures not sanctioned by the model — are the principal evaluative concern.

At the constrained writing stage, evaluation broadens to include coherence and lexical appropriateness. Because the model has been withdrawn, model conformity is no longer an available criterion. Al-Nāqa specifies evaluation of thematic unity, contextually appropriate vocabulary selection, and logical organisation of ideas (al-Nāqa, 1985, pp. 213–214). This shift aligns with assessment frameworks that distinguish between accuracy-based and discourse-level evaluative criteria (Weigle, 2002).

At the free writing stage, evaluation is communicative and expressive. Grammatical accuracy remains relevant but is subordinated to communicative effectiveness: *"lā yanbaghī an yakūn al-khaṭaʾ al-naḥwī huwa al-miʿyār al-waḥīd fī taqwīm al-kitābah al-ḥurrah"* [Grammatical error should not be the sole criterion in evaluating free writing] (al-Nāqa, 1985, p. 218). Evaluators should attend to idea quality, argumentative coherence, and rhetorical appropriateness to the intended audience (cf. Hyland, 2019; Hedge, 2000).

4.3 Pedagogical Functions by Stage

Each stage carries a distinct pedagogical function extending beyond skill development to include a specific error philosophy, teacher role, and task design logic. At the guided writing

stage, the function is error prevention through structural support. The teacher designs tasks that channel learner production through supplied models, minimising the probability of morphosyntactic errors that could fossilise in Arabic morphological acquisition, where error rates are predictably high at the earliest stages (al-Nāqa, 1985, p. 200; Benmamoun et al., 2013; Cumming, 2001).

At the constrained writing stage, the function shifts to error diagnosis and developmental feedback. The teacher observes which types of constraint the learner still requires, adjusting the level of topical or lexical scaffolding accordingly. This stage is characteristically diagnostic: it reveals the productive range available to the learner under partial support, supplying information the guided stage cannot provide (Ellis, 2003).

At the free writing stage, the pedagogical function is authentic communicative production. The teacher becomes an audience and a responder rather than a model-supplier or diagnostician. Evaluation at this stage aims not at correcting errors but at engaging with the learner's communicative intentions (Hyland, 2019; Hedge, 2000; Zamel, 1982).

4.4 The Integrative Model

Figure 1 presents the integrative pedagogical model reconstructed from al-Nāqa's framework. The model arranges the three writing stages along a directional continuum — from maximum external support (learner dependence) on the left to maximum learner autonomy on the right — and maps each stage against four dimensions derived from the coding procedure: learner support, evaluation orientation, pedagogical function, and teacher role. Page references to al-Nāqa (1985) are embedded in each stage column.

SUPPORT CONTINUUM

EARNER DEPENDENCE → LEARNER AUTONOMY

Dimension	STAGE 1 *Al-Kitābah al-Muwajjahah* (Guided Writing) al-Nāqa, 1985, pp. 199–200	STAGE 2 *Al-Kitābah al-Muqayyadah* (Constrained Writing) al-Nāqa, 1985, p. 202	STAGE 3 *Al-Kitābah al-Ḥurrah* (Free Writing) al-Nāqa, 1985, p. 205
Learner Support	**Maximum** Linguistic templates supplied	**Moderate** Topical/lexical prompts only	**Minimal** Learner selects topic and form
Evaluation Orientation	**Accuracy-based** Model conformity	**Proficiency-based** Coherence + lexical control	**Communicative/expressive** Ideas, argumentation, audience
Pedagogical Function	**Error prevention** via structural scaffolding	**Error diagnosis** and developmental feedback	**Authentic** communicative production
Teacher Role	**Model designer** and accuracy assessor	**Diagnostic observer** and scaffold adjuster	**Audience** and communicative responder
Target Level	**Beginning** lower-intermediate	**Lower-intermediate** intermediate	**Upper-intermediate** advanced

Figure 1. *Integrative pedagogical model of al-Nāqa's Arabic writing instruction framework: three developmentally ordered and overlapping stages mapped against learner support, evaluation orientation, pedagogical function, and teacher role along a dependence-to-autonomy continuum (al-Nāqa, 1985).*

The continuum representation captures what a simple list of stage names does not: the stages exist in a gradient relationship, and evaluative and pedagogical dimensions co-vary with the support-autonomy axis. Accuracy-based assessment applied to al-kitābah al-ḥurrah would penalise the expressive risk-taking that stage is designed to cultivate. The integrative model makes this mismatch visible and gives teachers a principled basis for adjusting both task design and evaluative criteria as learners progress.

5. Discussion

The integrative model in Figure 1 differs in kind from prior summaries of al-Nāqa's taxonomy. As Table 1 documents, earlier studies extracted stage names while leaving the evaluative and pedagogical architecture implicit. A teacher equipped only with the three stage labels can name tasks but cannot assess them, nor determine when stage transition is pedagogically warranted.

The reconstruction demonstrates that al-Nāqa's framework is not a taxonomy of task types but a coherent pedagogical architecture. Evaluation criteria are constitutive of the stages, not supplementary to them: each stage is defined precisely by what evaluators are looking for at that stage. Separating stage taxonomy from evaluation — the standard move in prior scholarship — produces a truncated reading that forfeits the framework's instructional coherence.

This finding connects to broader developments in process-oriented writing pedagogy (Graham & Sandmel, 2011; Hyland, 2019; Zamel, 1982) and communicative language teaching frameworks that specify both learning targets and evaluative criteria at each developmental stage (Richards & Rodgers, 2014; Savignon, 2018). Al-Nāqa anticipates several features of these later traditions while working within the specific constraints of Arabic as a non-native language.

One concrete implication concerns task sequencing. If al-kitābah al-muwajjahah serves primarily the function of error prevention through structural scaffolding, then moving learners prematurely to al-kitābah al-ḥurrah — a pattern reported in Indonesian Arabic-language classrooms (Hermawan & Sholeh, 2021; Mustofa et al., 2019) — removes support before learners have the productive competence to operate without it. The integrative model gives teachers a principled basis for diagnosing this misalignment and designing stage-appropriate transition criteria.

5.1 Contemporary Adaptation

Table 4 translates al-Nāqa's original framework into contemporary classroom specifications. The adaptations address instructional medium and task design; the core pedagogical logic — stage-differentiated evaluation and the support-autonomy continuum — requires no substantive revision.

Table 4. *Adaptation of al-Nāqa's writing framework for contemporary Arabic language classrooms: original model, contemporary update, and classroom implication.*

Stage	Original al-Nāqa model	Contemporary update	Classroom implication
Al-Kitābah al-Muwajjahah	Model sentences and pattern-practice drills supplied in print	Digital templates; corpus-informed model sentences; AI-assisted morphosyntactic feedback (see §5.2)	Use digital writing platforms displaying model texts alongside learner input; deploy automated feedback for morphosyntactic accuracy at this stage only
Al-Kitābah al-Muqayyadah	Thematic constraints with teacher-supplied vocabulary prompts	Genre-based task design; multimodal prompts (images, audio cues); structured peer feedback protocols	Assign genre-constrained tasks (news report, brief narrative) with vocabulary-card support; introduce peer review and student self-assessment at this stage
Al-Kitābah al-Ḥurrah	Open topic selection; teacher as audience and responder	Portfolio-based assessment; communicative audience beyond teacher (blog, letter-to-editor); holistic rubrics foregrounding ideas over accuracy	Implement writing portfolios; use holistic rubrics where idea quality and communicative effect outweigh morphosyntactic correctness; teacher responds as reader, not corrector
Evaluation criteria	Stage-differentiated criteria implicit in al-Nāqa's text; not formulated as published rubrics	Explicit, stage-differentiated rubrics co-constructed with learners before each task	Design three separate rubrics aligned to each stage; share criteria before tasks so learners can self-assess stage-transition readiness (cf. Weigle, 2002)

The most important contemporary extension is the shift from implicit to explicit evaluation criteria. Al-Nāqa's evaluative distinctions are present in his text but are not operationalised as published rubrics for learner use. Making those distinctions explicit — and sharing them before tasks — aligns al-Nāqa's framework with contemporary transparency norms in language assessment (Hyland, 2019; Nassaji, 2015; Weigle, 2002).

5.2 A Note on AI-Assisted Feedback for Arabic Writing

The contemporary update in Table 4 includes AI-assisted morphosyntactic feedback at the guided writing stage. This claim requires qualification. Current AI feedback tools for Arabic vary considerably in their capacity to handle Arabic morphological complexity — particularly the root-and-pattern system, broken plurals, and case vowelling — and most have been developed primarily for English. Tools that perform adequately on English morphosyntax can generate inaccurate feedback on Arabic, reinforcing rather than correcting learner errors (cf. Khaldieh, 2019; Benmamoun et al., 2013).

AI feedback should support, not replace, teacher judgement in Arabic writing assessment. Practitioners adopting AI-assisted feedback at the guided writing stage should treat current tools as supplementary rather than authoritative, verifying AI recommendations against teacher or native-speaker judgement before presenting them to learners. The optimism of Table 4's contemporary-update column is conditional on this qualification.

6. Conclusion

This study has produced an integrative reconstruction of al-Nāqa's Arabic writing instruction framework, demonstrating that the stage taxonomy — al-kitābah al-muwajjahah, al-kitābah al-muqayyadah, al-kitābah al-ḥurrah — is inseparable from the evaluation criteria and pedagogical functions he associates with each stage. Within the reviewed corpus, no prior study has mapped all three dimensions simultaneously; the result of that omission has been a decontextualised borrowing of stage labels that forfeits the framework's instructional coherence. The integrative model in Figure 1 and the adaptation table in Table 4 address this directly.

The primary contribution is specific: al-Nāqa's evaluation criteria are constitutive of his stages rather than supplementary to them. Each stage is what it is precisely because it targets a different evaluative orientation — from model conformity at the guided stage, through coherence and lexical control at the constrained stage, to communicative expression at the free stage. Teachers who miss this evaluative architecture are missing the instructional logic of the framework, not merely a terminological detail.

Three limitations deserve acknowledgement. First, the study relies on a single primary textual tradition — al-Nāqa (1985). Whether al-Nāqa's framework as elaborated in other publications differs in relevant respects from the account offered here cannot be determined from the present corpus. Second, qualitative document analysis involves interpretive choices that another analyst might make differently; the coding categories proposed here represent one principled approach to organising al-Nāqa's framework, not the uniquely correct one. Third, the secondary corpus is purposive and analytical in design and should not be read as a bibliometric or systematic review of the Arabic writing pedagogy literature; field-wide syntheses may identify additional studies that complicate or extend the gap analysis in Table 1. Future empirical studies examining how stage-differentiated evaluation criteria function in actual Arabic writing classrooms — and whether learners and teachers find the distinctions actionable — would test and extend the theoretical contribution offered here.

References

Ainin, M., Asrori, I., & Mujib, F. (2024). Developing an analytic rubric for Arabic writing assessment in Indonesian madrasah contexts. Alsuna: Journal of Arabic and English Language, 7(1), 45–62. https://doi.org/10.31538/alsuna.v7i1.3821

Al-Ghāmidī, N. A. (2023). Criteria for evaluating Arabic expository writing among non-native speakers: A framework analysis. International Journal of Arabic-English Studies, 23(2), 115–134. https://doi.org/10.33806/ijaes2000.23.2.2023.6

Al-Hāshimī, A. (2009). Asālīb tadrīs al-kitābah al-muwajjahah fī marḥalat al-ibtidāʾīyah. Majallat Kullīyat al-Tarbiyah, 42(1), 77–103.

Al-Nāqa, M. K. (1985). Taʿlīm al-lughah al-ʿArabīyah li-ghayr al-nāṭiqīn bihā: Ususuhu wa-manāhijuhu wa-ṭarāʾiq tadrīsihi. Jāmiʿat Umm al-Qurā.

Benmamoun, E., Montrul, S., & Polinsky, M. (2013). Heritage languages and their speakers: Opportunities and challenges for linguistics. Theoretical Linguistics, 39(3–4), 129–181. https://doi.org/10.1515/tl-2013-0009

Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. Qualitative Research Journal, 9(2), 27–40. https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027

Brown, H. D., & Lee, H. (2015). Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy (4th ed.). Pearson.

Cumming, A. (2001). Learning to write in a second language: Two decades of research. International Journal of English Studies, 1(2), 1–23.

Cummins, J. (2008). BICS and CALP: Empirical and theoretical status of the distinction. In B. Street & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), Encyclopedia of language and education (Vol. 2, pp. 71–83). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-30424-3_5

Ellis, R. (2003). Task-based language learning and teaching. Oxford University Press.

Graham, S., & Sandmel, K. (2011). The process writing approach: A meta-analysis. Journal of Educational Research, 104(6), 396–407. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2010.488703

Hedge, T. (2000). Teaching and learning in the language classroom. Oxford University Press.

Hermawan, A., & Sholeh, M. (2021). Penerapan kitābah al-ḥurrah dalam pembelajaran bahasa Arab di pesantren: Studi kasus. Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Arab dan Kebahasaaraban, 8(2), 199–218. https://doi.org/10.15408/jpbak.v8i2.21437

Hyland, K. (2019). Second language writing (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108635547

Ibrahim, A. H., & Wahab, N. A. (2015). Rubric-based evaluation of L2 Arabic writing: Criteria and rater reliability. Arab World English Journal, 6(4), 88–102. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol6no4.7

Khaldieh, S. A. (2019). Writing in Arabic as a foreign language: From theory to practice. Journal of Arabic Linguistics, 31(1), 55–78. https://doi.org/10.13173/jaraling.31.1.55

Khalil, A., & Mansouri, F. (2021). Arabic L2 writing development in immersion and non-immersion contexts: A longitudinal study. System, 96, 102406. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102406

Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Mustofa, B., Rusman, T., & Habibi, M. (2019). Pemanfaatan media digital dalam pengembangan keterampilan menulis bahasa Arab di Madrasah Tsanawiyah. Al-Arabiyah: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Arab, 15(1), 55–72. https://doi.org/10.14421/al-arabiyah.2019.151-04

Nassaji, H. (2015). Qualitative and descriptive research: Data type versus data analysis. Language Teaching Research, 19(2), 129–132. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168815572747

Nuha, U., & Fajri, I. (2023). Pengembangan instrumen penilaian keterampilan menulis bahasa Arab berbasis taksonomi Bloom. Alsuna: Journal of Arabic and English Language, 6(2), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.31538/alsuna.v6i2.2997

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). Approaches and methods in language teaching (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667305

Ryding, K. C. (2005). A reference grammar of Modern Standard Arabic. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486975

Saputra, H., Wahyudi, I., & Mujib, A. (2022). Efektivitas teknik guided writing dalam meningkatkan keterampilan menulis bahasa Arab mahasiswa. IJAZ Arabi: Journal of Arabic Learning, 5(2), 248–264. https://doi.org/10.18860/ijazarabi.v5i2.16422

Savignon, S. J. (2018). Communicative competence. In J. I. Liontas (Ed.), The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching. Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0047

Ṭuʿaymah, R. A., & al-Nāqa, M. K. (2010). Taʿlīm al-lughah ittiṣālīyan bayna al-manāhij wa-l-istrātījīyyāt. ISESCO.

Wahab, M. A., Nadhir, M., & Mukhlis, H. (2023). Systematic review of Arabic writing skill studies in Indonesia (2018–2023): Trends and gaps. Jurnal Pendidikan Islam, 9(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.14421/jpi.2023.91-01

Weigle, S. C. (2002). Assessing writing. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511732997

Wildana, W., Fathurrosyid, F., & Bashori, H. (2024). Model pembelajaran kitābah berbasis pendekatan komunikatif di Madrasah Aliyah. Alsuna: Journal of Arabic and English Language, 7(2), 78–95. https://doi.org/10.31538/alsuna.v7i2.4112

Zamel, V. (1982). Writing: The process of discovering meaning. TESOL Quarterly, 16(2), 195–209. https://doi.org/10.2307/3586792