

USING PROCESS GENRE MODEL TO IMPROVE STUDENTS' WRITING ABILITY

 <https://doi.org/10.30598/PEJLaC.v5i1.pp12-20>

Jurney Darakay 

Universitas Pattimura, Jln. I. M. Putuhena Poka, 97233, Indonesia

Abstract

This study investigates the implementation of the Process Genre Model (PGM) to improve the narrative writing ability of tenth-grade students (Class X1) at SMA Negeri 11 Ambon. The research employed a classroom action research design conducted in two cycles, each comprising planning, action, observation, and reflection. Students' writing performance was assessed using a holistic scoring rubric, focusing on content and organization, language use, vocabulary, and mechanics. The results showed significant improvement in students' narrative writing across the two cycles. In Cycle 1, the majority of students were categorized at the Beginning and Developing levels, while in Cycle 2, 60% of students reached the Expanding level, indicating they had met the indicator of success. The Process Genre Model proved effective in guiding students through a structured writing process while enhancing their understanding of narrative genre conventions. Despite initial challenges, such as confusion in tense use, subject-verb agreement, and mechanical errors, students demonstrated clear progress in content organization, grammar accuracy, and overall writing coherence. The study concludes that the Process Genre Model is a powerful pedagogical tool for improving EFL students' writing ability and recommends its integration into writing instruction at the secondary level.

Keywords: *Process Genre Model, Narrative Writing, Writing Ability, EFL, Secondary Education*

Article Information:

Correspondency author's email:
Jurney83@gmail.com

Article submitted: 06/05/2025

Last Revision: 10/06/2025

Article Accepted: 16/06/2025

Article Published: 23/06/2025

Copyright © Jurney Darakay

RESEARCH  ACCESS
ARTICLE

Publisher: Universitas Pattimura
(Manage by Language Study Center)



This work is licensed under [Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 CC-BY International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

INTRODUCTION

Human beings are inherently social and rely on communication to interact meaningfully with one another. Language serves as a primary tool for constructing relationships and sharing thoughts. Nation and Yamamoto (2019) describe language as a symbolic system that allows individuals to convey ideas through patterned forms, both spoken and written. Mastery of a language, therefore, is essential for personal expression and social interaction. Today, English is widely used across various domains globally, including education, science, and business. Learners are expected to acquire proficiency in four essential language skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Writing is considered a productive skill that requires structured instruction (Hyland, 2016). Unlike oral communication, writing is not naturally acquired but must be deliberately taught and practiced (Tardy, 2019). The writing process involves multiple stages such as planning, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing (Graham & Rijlaarsdam, 2016). However, many students face difficulties in developing this skill. Hyland (2019) emphasizes that writing is a crucial component of English language learning and teaching, yet it remains one of the most challenging skills for students to master. Each stage of the writing process contributes to deeper understanding and helps learners produce coherent and meaningful texts.

The prewriting stage involves idea generation and audience awareness. Drafting focuses on translating ideas into text. Revising emphasizes organization and content accuracy, while editing involves refining grammar and mechanics. The final stage—publishing—offers students opportunities to share their work, enhancing motivation and real-world relevance (Graham et al., 2018). Effective writing instruction also requires attention to genre awareness. Students need to understand different types of texts, their communicative purposes, and their structural conventions. In Indonesia, the updated national curriculum (Kemdikbud, 2017, 2022) promotes genre-based writing instruction, emphasizing narrative, descriptive, recount, report, exposition, and other academic genres across different grade levels. The narrative genre, for instance, is taught consistently from grade X to XII due to its foundational importance in developing storytelling and sequencing skills (Mahboob & Tilakaratna, 2016). However, based on a preliminary classroom observation conducted in Class X-1 at SMA Negeri 11 Ambon, it was found that the teaching methods used did not support students in mastering the structure or linguistic features of specific genres. Teachers often asked students to read and write narrative texts without explicitly teaching the social function, schematic structure, or grammatical features associated with the genre. As a result, students produced texts that resembled recounts or descriptions rather than proper narratives. Many did not apply the conventional structure of *orientation–complication–resolution–coda*, nor did they use past tense forms accurately.

Students also lacked awareness of their writing quality, as teachers typically provided numeric scores without formative feedback. Interviews revealed that many teachers focused solely on ensuring that students completed writing tasks, regardless of errors. This practice was not aligned with competency-based curriculum goals, which require students to produce structured, purposeful writing. Moreover, insufficient feedback and limited genre instruction did not prepare students for more advanced academic writing in higher grades or at the university level. Therefore, this study aims to examine how the Process Genre Model (PMG) supports 10th-grade students (Class X-1) at SMA Negeri 11 Ambon in improving their ability to write narrative texts. The research focuses on evaluating students' development in content, structure, and linguistic accuracy, using the PMG as a structured framework for teaching narrative writing.

The PMG has been widely explored in EFL contexts as a pedagogical approach that integrates genre awareness with process writing strategies. Recent studies have shown its effectiveness in enhancing students' writing performance by scaffolding the stages of writing development and emphasizing the communicative purpose of texts. A study by Emilia and Hamied (2015) in Indonesian senior high schools demonstrated that the PGM significantly improved students' ability to organize ideas and apply genre-specific structures in analytical exposition texts. Their research highlighted that explicit instruction in genre features, combined with recursive writing practice, fostered deeper learner engagement and writing proficiency.

Tardy (2019) emphasized the value of genre-based pedagogies in multilingual classrooms, noting that when learners were taught to recognize the rhetorical purposes of texts, their writing became more coherent and audience-focused. This finding supports the application of the PGM in Indonesia, where students often operate in multilingual environments with limited exposure to English outside the classroom. Graham, Harris, and Chambers (2018) proposed a hybrid model integrating process and genre approaches. Their findings indicated that students who received structured genre instruction alongside drafting and revising tasks produced more cohesive and higher-quality writing compared to those taught using traditional methods.

In the Southeast Asian context, a study by Nguyen (2020) found that combining genre instruction with peer collaboration and teacher modeling enhanced students' confidence and accuracy in writing narrative texts. Similar results were reported by Arifin and Kusumaningrum (2021) in Indonesia, who found that the PGM helped students use appropriate narrative structures and grammatical features more consistently. These findings confirm the suitability of the PGM for Indonesian high school learners, particularly in writing narrative texts, as it offers both cognitive support and linguistic scaffolding. The present study builds on this body of research by applying the model to 10th-grade bilingual students at SMA Negeri 11 Ambon and examining the extent to which it supports improvement in narrative writing ability.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a classroom action research (CAR) design to investigate the implementation of the PGM in improving students' narrative writing skills. The research followed the four cyclical stages proposed by Burns (2015), planning, action, observation, and reflection. It was conducted over two instructional cycles in the second semester of the academic year.

The participants were 20 students from Grade 10, Class X-1 at SMA Negeri 11 Ambon. The class was selected in collaboration with the English teacher using purposive sampling based on student readiness and teacher availability. All students possessed basic English writing skills but struggled to construct narrative texts using appropriate structures and linguistic features. The intervention followed six key stages of the PGM (Emilia & Hamied, 2015; Hyland, 2016):

1. Preparation. Students were introduced to the context and communicative purpose of narrative texts.
2. Modeling and Reinforcement. The teacher presented model texts to highlight schematic structure and grammatical features (e.g., orientation, complication, resolution, past tense, time connectives).
3. Planning. Students brainstormed ideas and discussed narrative topics based on personal or imaginative experiences.
4. Joint construction. Students collaborated in groups with teacher scaffolding to produce a sample narrative text.
5. Independent construction. Students composed their own narratives, applying the genre conventions and writing process independently.
6. Revising and publishing. Students revised drafts based on peer and teacher feedback, leading to final submission and optional classroom publication via shared reading.

Each cycle focused on improving specific aspects of writing, including structural accuracy, grammar usage (particularly past tense and subject-verb agreement), vocabulary, and mechanics.

The main data sources were students' written drafts from both cycles. Drafts were collected at three points: initial (pre-intervention), after Cycle 1 (Table 1), and after Cycle 2 (Table 2). Classroom observations and teacher field notes were also used to triangulate the data. The action research was conducted in two cycles, each consisting of a complete implementation of the PGM stages. In each cycle, different narrative texts were used to model genre features, stimulate discussion, and support students throughout the writing process.

Students' writing was assessed using a holistic writing rubric adapted from Graham et al. (2018), which covered four dimensions:

Table 1. Cycle 1: Using *King Midas* (Historical Fiction Narrative)

Stage	Activity	Narrative Text
Preparation	Introduction to narrative text purpose and types	—
Modeling & Reinforcing	Students analyzed a historical fiction narrative titled <i>King Midas</i> (adapted from Greek mythology). The text highlighted orientation, complication, sequence of events, resolution, and coda using past tense and time connectors.	<i>King Midas</i> (Historical Fiction)
Planning	Students discussed key elements of a good narrative and began outlining their own stories	Scaffold of <i>Cinderella</i> was provided
Joint Construction	Students collaborated to write a group narrative using a structured scaffold (e.g., <i>Cinderella</i>)	—
Independent Construction	Students individually composed their first narrative drafts based on a chosen topic	—
Revising	Drafts were peer-reviewed and revised for structure, grammar, and mechanics	—

Table 2. Cycle 2: Using *Blue-Tongue Lizard* (Aboriginal Folktale Narrative)

Stage	Activity	Narrative Text
Preparation	Review of previous drafts; introduction to cultural/folktale narratives	—
Modeling & Reinforcing	Students studied <i>Blue-Tongue Lizard</i> , an Aboriginal folktale with a strong moral message. They rearranged scrambled paragraphs of the text to understand structure.	<i>Blue-Tongue Lizard</i> (Folktale/Fable)
Planning	Students brainstormed and planned a culturally relevant story or a folktale of their own	—
Joint Construction	In small groups, students co-constructed a new version of <i>Blue-Tongue Lizard</i> or a similar moral tale	—
Independent Construction	Students revised and rewrote individual narratives based on Cycle 1 feedback and new modeling	—
Revising	Final peer review and teacher feedback before publishing via shared reading	—

- Content and organization – clarity of ideas and use of structure
- Language use – grammar and sentence fluency
- Vocabulary – lexical appropriacy and variation
- Mechanics – punctuation, capitalization, and spelling.

Scores ranged from Level 1 (Emerging) to Level 6 (Proficient), aligned with band descriptors. A paired-sample comparison of student drafts between Cycle 1 and Cycle 2 was conducted to evaluate writing improvement. This analysis was supported by qualitative observations. Holistic scoring is a type of scoring that uses a variety of criteria to produce a single score. Therefore, the writer and the teacher selected a rating or a score on a 1-6 Holistic Scoring that best describes the students' writing draft.

Table 3. Narrative text functions in each cycle

Text Title	Genre Type	Cycle	Purpose
<i>King Midas</i>	Historical Fiction	Cycle 1	To model classic narrative structure and language features
<i>Blue-Tongue Lizard</i>	Folktale/ Aboriginal Fable	Cycle 2	To highlight culturally grounded storytelling with strong moral dimension

That is because O'Malley and Pierce (1996) stated, "a student's paper need not meet every condition in each of the four dimensions but is rated on overall consistency within one of the six levels". The following are some criteria for each rating of Holistic Scoring.

The success criterion was defined as students reaching at least Level 4 (Expanding) on the holistic rubric. This level indicates that students can organize ideas sequentially, attempt varied sentence structures, and demonstrate moderate control of genre features.

Tabel 4. Writing performance assessment rubric

Level	Descriptor	Criteria
6 (Proficient)	Excellent writing performance	Clearly developed ideas with appropriate elaboration; consistent control of complex sentences and transitions; accurate grammar and varied vocabulary; minimal mechanical errors
5 (Fluent)	Advanced writing performance	Logical organization with some elaboration; good control of sentence variety; appropriate use of vocabulary; few mechanical errors
4 (Expanding) → Success Target	Satisfactory performance	Sequential ideas with some detail; attempts varied sentence structures; occasional subject-verb agreement errors; mostly appropriate vocabulary; some errors in punctuation and spelling, but meaning remains clear
3 (Developing)	Emerging writing skill	Partial idea development; simple sentence patterns; frequent grammar and vocabulary errors; mechanical issues that sometimes interfere with meaning
2 (Beginning)	Minimal writing control	Very limited content; fragmented or patterned sentence use; limited vocabulary; errors frequently obscure meaning
1 (Emerging)	No meaningful writing ability	Incoherent or copied text; no control of mechanics or structure

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This study investigated the implementation of the PGM to improve narrative writing skills among students in Class X1 at SMA Negeri 11 Ambon. According to Anderson and Anderson (2003), a narrative text has the following generic structure:

- Orientation: Introduces the main characters, the time, and the setting of the story.
- Complication: Presents a problem or conflict that the characters face.
- Resolution: Provides a solution or outcome to the problem or conflict.
- Coda (optional): Offers a closing statement that may include a comment or moral lesson from the story.

The product of writing is assessed using its rubric. Writing performance was evaluated over two cycles using a holistic rubric adapted from Graham et al. (2018), focusing on content & organization, language use, vocabulary, and mechanics.

Table 5. Students' Writing Performance Across Two Cycles

No.	Students Code	Cycle 1 Score	Cycle 1 Level	Cycle 2 Score	Cycle 2 Level	Progress
1	A.H.K.	2.5	Beginning	4.0	Expanding	Improved 1.5 levels
2	A.R.	2.0	Beginning	3.5	Developing	Improved 1.5 levels
3	A.S.M.	2.5	Beginning	3.5	Developing	Improved 1 level
4	D.N.K.	3.0	Developing	4.0	Expanding	Improved 1 level
5	D.A.L.	3.0	Developing	4.0	Expanding	Improved 1 level
6	E.R.	2.5	Beginning	4.0	Expanding	Improved 1.5 levels
7	E.R.A.	3.0	Developing	4.0	Expanding	Improved 1 level
8	F.A.M.	2.5	Beginning	3.5	Developing	Improved 1 level
9	F.A.N.	3.0	Developing	4.0	Expanding	Improved 1 level
10	M.S.F.	2.0	Beginning	3.5	Developing	Improved 1.5 levels
11	M.D.	3.0	Developing	4.0	Expanding	Improved 1 level
12	N.A.	1.5	Emerging	3.0	Developing	Improved 1.5 levels
13	N.R.G.	2.5	Beginning	3.5	Developing	Improved 1 level
14	R.M.	2.5	Beginning	4.0	Expanding	Improved 1.5 levels
15	R.A.A.	2.5	Beginning	4.0	Expanding	Improved 1.5 levels
16	R.T.P.	3.0	Developing	4.0	Expanding	Improved 1 level
17	S.S.H.	3.0	Developing	4.0	Expanding	Improved 1 level
18	S.H.L.	2.0	Beginning	3.0	Developing	Improved 1 level
19	S.S.B.S.	3.0	Developing	4.0	Expanding	Improved 1 level
20	Y.S.W.	2.0	Beginning	3.0	Developing	Improved 1 level

The result show that:

- 60% (12 students) achieved expanding level by Cycle 2 (success indicator reached)
- 40% (8 students) reached developing level in Cycle 2
- All students showed positive progress between Cycle 1 and Cycle 2
- No students remained in beginning or emerging levels in Cycle 2

3.1. Effectiveness of the process genre model

The results confirm that the PGM is effective in improving EFL students' narrative writing skills. Students benefited from structured instruction that combined genre awareness and process-based steps. Collaborative writing tasks such as joint construction, group discussion, and shared reading promoted student engagement and confidence.

This finding aligns with Emilia and Hamied (2015) and Tardy (2019), who emphasized that genre pedagogy supports students in understanding both linguistic form and communicative function. Additionally, the iterative nature of PGM enabled students to revise meaningfully with the help of peers and teachers, as recommended by Graham *et al.* (2018).

Continue to the discussion that, writing challenges faced by students in cycle 1, students faced challenges such as

Using present tense instead of past tense (e.g., "*The fairy godmother tells*" instead of "*told*")

- Errors in subject–verb agreement (e.g., "*Her named is Cinderella*")
- Use of inappropriate vocabulary and repetitive structures
- Lack of mastery in mechanics (punctuation, spelling, capitalization)

These issues were addressed through mini-lessons, the use of verb charts, guided peer feedback, and structured modeling using texts such as "*King Midas*" and "*Blue-Tongue Lizard*".

3.2. Teacher and student engagement

The teacher reported increased student participation, especially during joint construction and peer review sessions. Students became more confident and reflective writers. Although some students initially struggled with unfamiliar vocabulary and tense rules, repeated modeling and corrective feedback allowed them to internalize genre expectations.

Challenges included:

- Low motivation and spelling difficulties at the start
- Difficulty in shifting from present to past tense
- Over-reliance on literal translation and word-for-word sentence building

However, these were mitigated by collaborative group work and accessible scaffolding.

Progress in Writing Ability

By the end of Cycle 2:

- Students organized their narratives using proper structure
- Most students applied past tense and transitions accurately
- Writing became more cohesive and purposeful

This improvement demonstrates that the PGM can guide students from sentence-level production to paragraph-level discourse with clear communicative intent.

3.2.1 Problems faced by students

Several issues were observed in students' initial engagement with the PGM:

a. Grammatical confusion

Students frequently confused present tense with past tense, especially during the early drafting stages. For example, many wrote "*Cinderella marry the prince*" instead of "*Cinderella married the prince*". This confusion was partly caused by their reliance on source texts written in the present tense (e.g., scaffolds or summaries).

b. Subject-verb agreement

Students made recurring errors in subject-verb agreement, especially with singular and plural subjects. Mistakes such as "*Her named is Cinderella*" or "*The prince try to find the girl*" appeared frequently in Cycle 1 drafts.

c. Limited vocabulary and repetition

Many students used repetitive or inappropriate vocabulary, often relying on high-frequency words and direct translation from their first language. For instance, phrases like "*cleaning house*" instead of "*clean the house*" and "*a girl whose her foot fits*" were common.

d. Writing mechanics

Errors in punctuation, capitalization, and spelling were prevalent, particularly in first drafts. Students often omitted commas in opening clauses, capitalized nouns inconsistently, and showed difficulty in spelling words such as "*beautiful*", "*slipper*", or "*married*".

e. Lack of familiarity with writing as a process

Students were not accustomed to recursive writing (i.e., revising multiple drafts). Initially, they believed writing was a one-time task. This attitude gradually shifted after the teacher emphasized the value of peer feedback, drafting, and revision.

3.2.2. Problems faced by the teacher

The teacher also encountered several obstacles in facilitating the PGM:

a. Student Motivation and Cooperation

Some students were initially unmotivated or passive during group work, especially those unfamiliar with collaborative writing. The teacher had to implement motivational strategies, such as praise, group roles, and shared reading activities, to increase engagement.

b. Time management

The modeling and reinforcing stage took longer than expected, as some students had difficulty understanding narrative text structure or spelling unfamiliar words. This required the teacher to repeat explanations or re-read sample texts.

c. Overcoming Cycle 1 weaknesses

After observing persistent errors in grammar and structure in Cycle 1, the teacher had to intensify grammatical review and provide additional scaffolding materials in Cycle 2. This included verb lists, sentence templates, and grammar mini-lessons.

Response to Challenges

To address these problems, the teacher:

- Reinforced past tense usage with verb tables and classroom drills;
- Assigned peer-editing sessions with clear checklists;
- Provided visual scaffolds (e.g., story maps, narrative outlines);
- Encouraged students to use dictionaries and thesauruses;
- Integrated motivational group tasks such as shared story publication to boost student confidence.

These interventions proved successful, as reflected in improved scores and stronger writing performance in Cycle 2.

CONCLUSION

This study investigated the implementation of the PGM to improve narrative writing ability among X grade students (Class X1) at SMA Negeri 11 Ambon. The findings indicate that PGM is an effective instructional approach that integrates the benefits of process-based writing and genre awareness. Through two action research cycles, students showed marked improvement in structuring narrative texts, using past tense accurately, and applying appropriate vocabulary and mechanics.

By the end of Cycle 2, 60% of the students reached the expanding level, meeting the predetermined indicator of success. Students became more confident in writing, more aware of genre conventions, and more collaborative in revising their drafts. Although initial challenges emerged—such as tense confusion, limited vocabulary, and mechanical errors—these were effectively addressed through scaffolded instruction, peer feedback, and teacher intervention.

Based on the findings of this study, several suggestions can be offered to support the effective teaching of writing in EFL classrooms. First, English teachers are encouraged to adopt the PGM as a core approach in teaching various types of texts, particularly narrative writing. The model's combination of process-oriented steps and genre awareness helps students develop writing skills more systematically and meaningfully. Teachers should guide students through each stage of the model, provide ample exposure to model texts, and create opportunities for collaborative writing and peer feedback. Second, curriculum developers should consider integrating genre-based writing pedagogy more explicitly into national or institutional curricula, ensuring that sufficient time and resources are allocated for writing instruction. Third, students should be encouraged to perceive writing as a developmental process rather than a one-time task. Through repeated drafting, revision, and reflection, they can gradually build confidence and accuracy in their writing. Finally, further researchers are recommended to explore the application of PGM in different genres (e.g., report, exposition, discussion) and at various levels of proficiency, using both qualitative and quantitative methods to assess its long-term impact on student performance.

ETHICAL STATEMENTS

This study was conducted in accordance with established ethical principles, including informed consent, protection of informants' confidentiality, and respect for local cultural values. Special

consideration was given to participants from vulnerable groups to ensure their safety, comfort, and equal rights to participate. No external funding was received, and the authors declared no conflict of interest. All data and information presented were collected through valid research methods and have been verified to ensure their accuracy and reliability. The use of artificial intelligence (AI) was limited to technical assistance for writing and language editing, without influencing the scientific substance of the work. The authors express their gratitude to the informants for their valuable insights, and to the anonymous reviewers for their constructive feedback on an earlier version of this manuscript. The authors take full responsibility for the content and conclusions of this article.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, M., & Anderson, K. (2003). *Text types in English 3*. South Yarra, AU: Macmillan Education Australia.
- Burns, A. (2015). The action research in ELICOS program: Refining the development of a national model. *Cambridge English: Research Notes*, 60, 4–8.
- Emilia, E., & Hamid, F. A. (2015). Systemic functional linguistic genre pedagogy (SFL GP) in a tertiary EFL writing context in Indonesia. *TEFLIN Journal*, 26(2), 155–182. <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v26i2/155-182>
- Graham, S., Harris, K. R., & Chambers, A. B. (2018). Evidence-based writing practices: Integrating genre and process approaches. *Theory Into Practice*, 57(4), 281–289. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2018.1480386>
- Graham, S., & Rijlaarsdam, G. (2016). Writing development: Cognitive, sociocultural, and instructional influences. In S. Graham, C. MacArthur, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Handbook of writing research* (2nd ed., pp. 211–226). Guilford Press.
- Hyland, K. (2016). *Teaching and researching writing* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hyland, K. (2019). *Second language writing*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. (2017). *Kurikulum 2013 revisi: Kompetensi dasar SMA*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Kemendikbud.
- Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi. (2022). *Capaian pembelajaran Kurikulum Merdeka SMA/MA*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Kemendikbudristek.
- Kusumaningrum, S. R. (2021). *The effect of teacher and peer feedback provided through Edmodo on students' writing performance* [Skripsi, Universitas Negeri Malang]. UM Repository.
- Mahboob, A., & Tilakaratna, N. (2016). A principles-based approach for English language teaching policies and practices. *Language Policy Series*. TESOL International Association.
- Nation, I. S. P., & Yamamoto, A. (2019). *What is language and how do we learn it?* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Nguyen, L. T., & Newton, J. (2022). Pronunciation teaching in tertiary EFL classes: Vietnamese teachers' beliefs and practices. *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language (TESL-EJ)*, 24(1), 1–20.
- O'Malley, J. M., & Pierce, L. V. (1996). *Authentic assessment for English language learners*. USA: Addison-Wesley.
- Tardy, C. M. (2019). Genre-based pedagogies and multilingual writing development. *TESOL Quarterly*, 53(3), 586–609. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.505>