

ENHANCING EFL STUDENTS' WRITING PERFORMANCE THROUGH PROCESS-BASED INSTRUCTION: EVIDENCE FROM ETHIOPIAN HIGH SCHOOL

Kifle Desalegn Gebre^{1*} Alemu Hailu Anshu²
^{1,2}Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

kiflegebre27@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Developing writing performance remains a challenge for many language learners, particularly when the instructions are predominantly teacher-centered and form-oriented. The study aimed to examine the effectiveness of process-based instruction on grade ten students' writing performance. This study employed a quasi-experimental design, as it was well-suited for comparing two intact groups. These sections were purposively selected from 10 sections of grade ten and subsequently assigned randomly to experimental (10C) and control (10D) groups, after pre-test. To ensure triangulation and strengthen validity and reliability, the study applied mixed methods comprising tests, questionnaires, and interviews. Questionnaires were administered to ten teachers and interviews to four, to examine their perceptions of the instruction. Quantitative data from paragraph tests and questionnaires were analyzed using a t-test and descriptive statistics, respectively, whereas qualitative data from interviews were examined thematically. The findings revealed a statistically significant improvement in writing performance for the experimental group ($t(39) = -23.213, p < .000$), supported by a strong effect size (Cohen's $d = 1.17$). Moreover, process-based instruction fostered social interaction among students and develop their motivation to write, facilitating collaborative writing practices. These results underscore process-based instruction's substantial impact on learning outcomes and emphasize stakeholders to provide professional training and equip teachers with practical skills to implement this instruction effectively and to integrate it into the language curriculum. Integration of such instruction into language education system is essential for promoting students' participation, enhancing creativity, collaborative learning, and exchanging feedback, thereby contributing to improved writing performance.

Keywords: Collaborative Learning, EFL, Feedback, Process-based instruction, Writing Performance

INTRODUCTION

In Ethiopia, foreign languages were introduced in the early 20th century during Emperor Minilik II's regime, coinciding with the emergence of modern education in the country. At the beginning, French dominated the education system due to positive relations with the French government, although Arabic and English were also used

concurrently (Daniel, 2021). These languages were adopted by the regime to facilitate foreign affairs and worldwide communication (Giday, 2020). Overtime, French influence diminished (Gerencheal & Mishra, 2018), while English gained prominence, eventually becoming the medium of instruction starting from grade one to higher level (Mulugeta, 2018). Although French competed with English as a language of instructional medium in the mid-20th century, English prevailed and established dominance in trade, education, technology, and science around the world. At present, English is used as a medium of instruction starting from high school, enabling students to engage with the digital world and succeed in academia (Belete, 2021). Consequently, syllabus designers place particular emphasis on equipping students with strong language skills.

Among language skills, writing is recognized as a pivotal skill within the education system, particularly in relation to its role in supporting essay writing, research and academic discussion (Hyland, 2003; Ishiyama, 2022). Writing is widely regarded as an essential language competency in academic contexts, especially for second language learners. However, many students encounter difficulties in producing quality texts due to insufficient linguistic elements and inadequate text organization, which negatively impacts their learning across various subjects and hinders success both within and beyond classroom activities (Nam Chi et al., 2024). In Ethiopian high schools, these challenges are evident in students' writing scores and related activities (Zelege, 2022). As a complex skill, writing requires proficiency in several interrelated components including comprehension, planning, idea organization, textual analysis, revision, editing, and the incorporation of feedback. Deficiencies in any of these areas reduce overall writing ability, thereby weakening performance in the effective use of grammar, vocabulary, and evidence (Anh, 2019; Dunn, 2021). In addition to students' limitations, contextual factors such as motivation, confidence, classroom environment, feedback practices, and collaborative learning have been shown to significantly influence students' learning outcomes (Peter & Singaravelu, 2020; Peungcharoenkun & Waluyo, 2023). Consequently, appropriate instructional strategies are necessary to support students in enhancing their writing performance, as effective writing instruction plays a vital role in the development of writing (Atanaw & Gaur, 2021; Habtamu, 2018).

Writing instruction plays a critical role in improving students' writing performance. Teachers are encouraged to adopt engaging and supportive instructional approaches, as writing requires significant cognitive skills and is therefore considered a demanding task (Peter & Singaravelu, 2020). Nevertheless, studies in Ethiopia indicate that many teachers continue to rely on product-based instruction, as a means of preparing students for the anticipated outcomes, especially for national exam. This reliance is often attributed to lack of training, poor language proficiency, shortage of time, and large class sizes (Tegegne, 2020; Zelege, 2022). In addition, students' lack of confidence and insufficient experience with writing instruction prevent their engagement in the writing activities and negatively affect their learning (Degaga, 2018). Consequently, students' writing performance remains below their grade level. These findings highlight the need for teachers to use engaging and supportive writing instruction to address the challenges which demotivate students during writing lessons. Given that writing is a cognitive process requiring active cognitive engagement, scholars such as Hyland (2003) and Flower & Hayes (1981) argue that process-based instruction (PBI) is more effective in

teaching writing, as it conceptualize writing as a recurring process and thereby fosters greater learner engagement.

PBI plays a significant role in integrating cognitive skills with subject-based knowledge (Arochman et al., 2024; Din et al., 2021), while also promoting group activities, self-learning, and positive attitudes toward writing (Zhang, 2024). It is considered engaging because it allows students to freely select topics, assume responsibility for their work, and assess their own writing structure and style (Sánchez & Lopez-Pinzon, 2019). Hyland (2003) and White & Arndt (1991) argue that structured stages are essential in supporting students to develop their skill in organizing ideas and revising drafts. Similarly, Huang et al. (2025) emphasize that continuous practice of PBI's stages is pivotal in improving learners' writing ability. Furthermore, Yeung (2019) highlights that PBI has the capacity to foster overall skill enhancement in writing.

PBI supports constructivist theory which encourages students to construct their own understanding, thereby shifting from teacher-dominated instruction to learner-based practices (Bada & Olusegun, 2015). Students engage in writing through active construction of their own meaning rather than relying on rigid guideline (Akpan et al., 2020). According to Feng (2025) and Peungcharoenkun & Waluyo (2023), PBI advances writing by facilitating constructive comments exchange, working together, and fostering critical thinking, rather than focusing solely on evaluating the finished text as a constructivist-inspired method. Furthermore, Huang et al. (2025) indicate that PBI plays a critical role in fostering learners' autonomy, developing confidence and reducing writing-related anxiety.

Previous studies have examined the effectiveness of PBI in enhancing students' writing performance across high schools and university contexts. For instance, Kadmiry (2021), in Moroccan preparatory classes, compared process-oriented instruction with product-oriented instruction and found that students who received instructional intervention consistently outperformed those relying on product-oriented instruction. Similarly, Huang et al. (2025) study in China demonstrated that PBI significantly improved experimental group's writing skills, particularly in developing content, using language, organizing, and vocabulary, although both groups, those who receiving instructional intervention and those who receiving traditional methods achieved notable progress in mechanics. Ninh & Duc (2024), focusing on Chu Van high school, further emphasized Process Writing Approach's role in enhancing students' motivation, engagement, and overall writing quality.

Evidence from Ethiopia also underscore PBI's importance. Abeje et al. (2025) reported that students using PBI outperformed their counterpart receiving traditional instruction, with both students and teachers expressing heightened interest in writing. In contrast, Zeleke's (2022) revealed that university students often persisted with traditional instruction despite teachers' positive attitude toward PBI. Hailemariam & Abie Gebeyehu (2020) highlighted poor writing skills, noting that neither students nor teachers actively practiced with PBI, while Belete (2021) observed that teachers failed to encourage students to adopt its stages. Most of these studies relied on elicited data collection, with Zeleke focusing on university level and Hailemariam and Belete on high school contexts. Notably, only Abeje's study employed objective data, conducted among high school participants, offering a modest departure from purely elicited data collection. This reliance on elicited data raises concerns about validity and generalizability, thereby

underscoring the need for further investigation into PBI's effectiveness in Ethiopian high schools as a foundation for higher level education. To address this gap, this study applied both objective and elicited data collection methods to enhance validity and credibility.

Accordingly, the study sought to answer the following research questions: (1) Does PBI significantly affect Grade 10 students' paragraph writing performance in Ethiopian high schools? (2) What are teachers' perceptions of the importance of implementing PBI in enhancing Grade Ten students' writing skills in Ethiopian high schools?

METHODS

To address the research objectives, a quasi-experimental pretest-posttest control group design was employed to investigate dependent variable. This design is appropriate to comparable intact classes; and it allows the researchers to estimate the cause-effect of PBI by comparing changes in writing proficiency between experimental and control groups. Before the intervention, the pre-test was conducted to assess learners' initial writing proficiency, whereas a post-test was offered to check the instruction's impact on students' writing skills. The researchers chose a pragmatic approach because it allows flexibility and freedom. And also, this approach matches the methodology used in this study. Pragmatism was adopted because it gives opportunities for teachers to integrate various teaching strategies in writing classes.

Participants, Setting, and Study's Sampling Techniques

This study was conducted at Bonga Bishaw W/Yohannes High School, which was located in Bonga town within the Kafa Zone of Ethiopia, in the 2024/2025 academic year. The total grade ten populations that year were 450 students, divided into ten sections. Two intact classes were selected based on administrative convenience and their comparable baseline proficiency scores. Students from section 10C (27females and 13males) and section 10D (24females and 14males) were randomly assigned to experimental and control conditions respectively. The researchers did this because both sections had nearly the same scores in their language proficiency.

Ethical Concerns of the Research

The research employed ethical considerations which included respecting participants' voluntariness, privacy, data confidentiality, and anonymity. And also, the researchers described the significance of the data in the research process. Before collecting data formally, the agreement form, which was signed, was sent to Bonga Bishaw W/Yohannes High School to obtain permission. The researchers gave detailed information about the study's objective to the school vice director and the head of English department. Furthermore, participants were told their data would be kept confidential. They were also assured their real names would remain confidential, with pseudonyms employed during the study. Researchers were further encouraged to continue data collection upon receipt of the formal approval letter from the school.

Data Collection Instruments

Prior to presenting the instruction in writing classes, learners were asked to make texts, helping the researchers identify students' existing level of writing skills. This pre-

test was presented to provide chances for learners to participate in paragraph composition. After the treatment, which took thirteen weeks, a posttest was given to determine whether the instruction played its role in enhancing students' writing ability. The post-test contained writing tasks parallel to those used in the pre-test.

The researchers adapted a writing performance rubric from Degaga (2018) to support raters use as a scoring guide to evaluate students' writing skills. Students are able to produce well-structured texts freely when they acquire the skills of developing content, organizing ideas, using language effectively, selecting appropriate vocabulary, and applying correct mechanics. Once these skills are developed, it can be concluded that learners are able to write. The rubric contained a four-tiered scoring range which was from 'Excellent to very good', 'Good to average', and 'Fair to poor', to 'Very poor'. Each section was given its weight in line with the level of its importance: content development was weighted at 30, idea organization at 20, language usage at 25, vocabulary application at 20, and minimizing mechanical errors at 5.

Data from teachers were collected through the use of questionnaires. For this study, the researchers adapted questionnaires from Graham & Harris (2017) to increase the study's validity and credibility. The questionnaire was developed based on four main variables: language competence, collaboration and feedback, motivation enhancement and reduction of writing anxiety, with challenges serving as the dependent variable and subsequently distributed to college English language instructors and college research and community members to facilitate data collection and enhance its validity. Comments and suggestions provided by instructors and research and community members were incorporated and necessary modifications were implemented. The questionnaire was administered to examine teachers' attitudes toward the use of PBI in teaching writing and to assess its impacts on students' writing performance. The 5-Likert scale was applied as it encouraged the respondents to select their preferred choice from the given options. If they feel neutral, they are free to select it. The researchers adopted the 5-Likert scale because it increases reliability. The items were classified based on their thematic relationship. These scales give opportunities for participants to select from strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, or strongly disagree.

To evaluate the teachers' reflection on the use of PBI, the interview was used to complement quantitative data collected through tests and questionnaires. Thematic analysis was applied to examine the interview data. Each piece of information was assigned an ID to facilitate categorization prior to analysis. The participants' responses were then organized to decide the relationships among the thematic categories. To ensure consistency with the quantitative results, the information gained from the interview was reviewed and classified into themes. The teachers' interviews, analyzed thematically, provided the necessary data for the development of this study.

Procedures of Data Collection

Before introducing PBI, the researchers provided opportunities for teachers to become aware of the study objectives. They offered extensive training for teachers and provided opportunities for them to attend daily lessons. They attended four hours awareness creation training for two consecutive days, with materials designed to enhance teachers' skill of implementation of PBI's stages in writing classes. Particular emphasis was given on writing stages, because they are critical for developing language

proficiency. Finally, to examine the effectiveness of the PBI and evaluate students' initial writing performance, paragraph writing test was conducted with both experimental and control groups. After pre-test, experimental group was given chances to implement writing stages in actual writing classroom. Each stage was applied within the allotted time, and teacher sought to engage students in the writing process.

Pre-writing

The study used the English for Ethiopia textbook, covering five units from unit six to ten. These units addressed paragraph writing, summarizing texts, letter writing, and interpreting graphs sections, and provided effective writing procedures and strategies. The textbook activities enhanced students' understanding and developing their writing abilities. Each lesson lasted 40 minutes, beginning with a five-minute introduction of the activity and its objectives, followed by seven-minutes in which the teacher encouraged students to brainstorm and categorize ideas.

Drafting

Students spent ten minutes constructing their ideas into meaningful sentences and paragraphs, regardless of accuracy. They were encouraged to focus on content and fluency in communicating with intended audience. At this phase, students were provided opportunities to practice freely and independently and were guided in developing outlines for their writing.

Revision

In this stage, teachers guided students to review the flow of ideas, encouraged the exchange of constructive comments among peers, and supported the production of quality texts. Students improved the readability of their texts through deletions or modifications to content and organization, which were completed within six minutes.

Editing

Students spent five minutes to edit their work in line with the feedback provided by their classmates and teachers during the revision stage. The reviews primarily addressed mechanical errors, such as spelling and punctuation, with the aim of producing well-organized and meaningful paragraphs.

Publishing

Students spent five minutes preparing their work for a target audience, after which they either presented it to the whole class or submitted it to the teacher. The teacher provided guidance to help students recognize that words they used could either a positive or negative impact on the readers. Students recognize the words they used would have either a positive or negative impact on the users. For the purpose of providing homework, students were given two minutes and instructed to write a paragraph on their preferred topic using PBI's stages.

Instruments' Validity and Reliability

High school English language teachers, directors, and PhD candidates were given the context of a paragraph written to get constructive comments and suggestions. Following the incorporation of these comments and suggestions, the tests were

administered to students for data collection. They were subsequently given written prompt situations to examine the significance of the tests. In addition, they were given a validation form to fill out. For this research, 78 test papers were evaluated by a pair of raters. To measure the scores' reliability, the Pearson correlation coefficient was used. Pre-test comparison between rater 1 and rater 2 for the group that took PBI was a correlation of .923 and for the group that took traditional approach was a correlation of .895, which suggests that there was a positive agreement between the two raters. Moving to the post-test results, the correlation for the group that took writing process was .857 and one that didn't receive was .879, both reflecting strong positive correlations and a high degree of similarity in scoring. According to the Pearson Correlation values, the two raters' ratings have positive agreement. Furthermore, Cronbach's Alpha was employed to examine the correlation among questionnaire items and their evaluation of the same concept. The obtained Alpha value of 0.796 indicated that the responses were consistent across the items.

Procedures of Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were applied to analyse quantitative data, while qualitative data were analysed through thematic analysis. The data were used to explore the teaching approach's influence on students' writing skills. To determine the significance attributes of data, descriptive statistics were utilized, which contained calculating the mean, standard deviation, and indicating the highest and lowest scores by applying the Statistical Package version 24 for Social Sciences (SPSS). To verify the assumption of normality, normality test was checked, and also prior to treatment, a homogeneity test was applied to check its uniformity. An independent sample t-test was used to accelerate comparison between control groups and experimental group's baseline scores, ensuring that any differences in the final outcomes were not due to initial inconsistencies. Additionally, the paired-sample t-test compared pretest and posttest results within each group to identify any significant changes which are short-term improvements. Effect-sizes were calculated using Cohen's d formula to quantify the magnitude of the PBI's effects and to evaluate its practical significance. Teachers' questionnaire data were analyzed through both descriptive and inferential statistics, while interview data were examined thematically.

RESULTS

Paragraph Test Data Analysis

Paragraph test scores were analysed through independent-sample t-test and paired-sample t-test to draw conclusion. The impact of PBI was evaluated using effect sizes to determine the magnitude of its feasibility and significance.

Table 1. Pre-test scores between control and experimental groups

Group	Independent Sample Test					
	Mean	N	SD	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Control Group	46.25	38	10.914	1.606	76	.113
Experimental Group	41.79	40	13.429			

As presented in Table 1, before the introduction of PBI, students' mean(M) pre-test score for the control group was 46.25 with a standard deviation (SD) of 10.914, while the mean score for experimental group was 41.79 with an SD of 13.429. The sample size consisted of 38 participants for control group and 40 participants for experimental group. Statistical analysis of the pre-test scores for writing paragraph ($t = 1.606$, $df = 76$, $p = .113$) indicated a mean difference of 4.463, between the two groups. However, this difference was not statistically significant, as the effect-size was modest (0.37).

Table 2: Post-test results between control and experimental groups

Group	Independent Sample Test					
	Mean	N	SD	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Control Group	46.51	38	10.867	-3.750	76	.000
Experimental Group	55.81	40	11.020			

An independent sample t-test was conducted to examine whether a significant difference existed between the post-test scores of experimental and control groups. The results indicated that the mean post-test score for control group was 46.51 (SD = 10.867), while the mean score for experimental group was 55.81 (11.020). The mean difference between the two groups was 9.3. Statistical analysis revealed that this difference was significant ($t = -3.750$, $p = .001$), with the magnitude of the difference considered moderate, with a strong effect size of .84.

Table 3. Pre- test and post-test results of the Experimental group

Test	Paired Sample Statistics					
	Mean	N	SD	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pre-Test	41.79	40	13.429	-23.213	39	.000
Post-Test	55.81	40	11.020			

Table 3 presents the students' writing performance test scores before and after the treatment. The mean pre-test score was 41.79 (SD = 13.429), which increased to 55.81 (SD = 11.020) in the post-test. A paired sample t-test revealed a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores ($t = -23.213$, $p = .000$), indicating a statistically significant improvement. The effect size was notably strong, with Cohen's $d = 1.17$, thereby confirming the substantial impact of PBI on students' writing performance.

Table 4. Pre-test and post-test results of the control group

Test	Paired Sample Statistics					
	Mean	N	SD	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pre-Test	46.25	38	10.914	.960	37	.452
Post-Test	46.51	38	10.867			

The table illustrates the pre-test and post-test scores of control group, analysed using a paired samples t-test. The mean pre-test score was 46.25 (SD = 10.914), while the mean post-test score was 46.51 (SD = 10.867). this was supported by a t-value of 0.960 with a p-value of 0.452, indicating that the observed difference was not statistically

significant. The effect size was minimal (Cohen’s $d = 0.02$), further confirming the absence of a meaningful improvement in writing performance between the two test periods.

Questionnaire Data Analysis

The fourteen questionnaire items are organized into four tables, each corresponding to a distinct thematic category, and subsequently analysed in relation to these themes.

Table 5. Improves writing performance

No.	Statements	SA	A	N	D	SD
1	PBI has supported students to organize their writing effectively.	3 30%	6 60%	1 10%		
2	PBI has improved students’ ability to demonstrate better coherence and cohesion in their writing	2 20%	8 80%			
3	PBI enhances students’ grammatical accuracy in writing.	3 30%	6 60%	1 10%		
4	Students’ vocabulary usage has significantly expanded through PBI.	3 30%	6 60%	1 10%		

Note: SA=Strongly Agree; A=Agree; N=Neutral; D=Disagree; SD=Strongly Disagree

According to the Table 5, 60% of respondents agreed and 30% strongly agreed that PBI improved students’ writing skills in terms of idea organization, while one participant remained neutral. With respect to item 2, the majority of respondents (80% agreed; 20% strongly agreed) reported that students write coherent paragraphs and use cohesive devices appropriately as a result of PBI. Furthermore, 60% of respondents agreed and 30% strongly agreed that PBI improves students’ grammatical accuracy in writing, although one respondent expressed uncertainty regarding its impact. Similarly, 30% of participants strongly agreed and 60% agreed that PBI contributed to the enhancement of students’ vocabulary usage.

Table 6. Collaborative learning and feedback

No.	Statements	SA	A	N	D	SD
1	PBI allows teachers to provide constructive feedback effectively.	3 30%	6 60%	1 10%		
2	PBI has the ability to create an interactive and a collaborative learning environment.	5 50%	5 50%			
3	Teachers find it easier to identify students' strengths and weaknesses with PBI	5 50%	5 50%			

As shown in Table 6, 60% of participants agreed and 30% strongly agreed that they provided constructive feedback while applying PBI in writing classes, with one participant remaining neutral. In relation to interactive and collaborative learning, all respondents (100%; 50% strongly agreed and 50% agreed) reported that PBI played a significant role. Furthermore, half of the participants strongly agreed and the other half agreed that PBI assisted them in identifying students’ strengths and weaknesses.

Table 7. Enhances motivation and reduces anxiety

No.	Statements	SA	A	N	D	SD
1	PBI enhances students' motivation to write.	3 30%	6 60%	1 10%		
2	Students become more proficient in structuring paragraphs effectively.	2 20%	8 80%			
3	PBI reduces students' anxiety about writing.	1 10%	8 80%			1 10%
4	PBI improves students' ability to revise and refine their writing drafts.	5 50%	4 40%	1 10%		

As presented in Table 7, item 8, 60% of participants agreed and 30% strongly agreed that PBI enhanced students' motivation to write, while one participant expressed uncertainty regarding its effect. In relation to paragraph structuring, all participants (80% agreed; 20% strongly agreed) indicated that students demonstrated positive proficiency as a result of PBI. Furthermore, the majority of respondents (80% agreed; 10% strongly agreed) reported that PBI reduced students' anxiety about writing, although one respondent strongly disagreed. In addition, 50% of participants strongly agreed and 40% agreed that students improved their ability to revise and refine their draft through PBI, whereas 10% remained uncertain about its role.

Table 8: Challenges of applying PBI in writing classes

No.	Statements	SA	A	N	D	SD
1	Teachers find PBI challenging due to time constraints.	2 20%	5 50%	3 30%		
2	PBI is difficult to apply due to large class sizes.	3 30%	5 50%	2 20%		
3	Implementing PBI requires additional workload for teachers.	4 40%	2 20%	1 10%	3 30%	

As presented in Table 8, item 12, 50% of respondents agreed and 20% strongly agreed that they experienced a scarcity of time during classroom activities, while 30% remained neutral on this issue. According to item 2, the overcrowded class posed a challenge for applying PBI, with 80% of respondents (50% agreed; 30% strongly agreed) reporting that large class size hindered its implementation, although 20% expressed neutrality. Furthermore, more than half of the participants (40% strongly agreed; 20% agreed) indicated that applying PBI in language class was a burden for teachers. In contrast, 30% disagreed, and one participant reported neutrality regarding this concern.

Interview Data Analysis

Five interview questions were administered to teachers, and the responses were organized into six thematic categories. The data were subsequently examined through thematic analysis, with the discussions and conclusions presented in the sections that follow.

The main purpose of teachers' interview was to find out their attitude towards the effectiveness of PBI on students' writing performance. When the study was being

conducted, there were ten English teachers who were teaching English at Bishaw W/Yohannes high school. Among them, the researchers interviewed four of them. The researchers categorized the interview results into themes. And then the results were interpreted and discussed. This interview was conducted in order to triangulate the statistical findings and teachers' questionnaire.

Theme 1: Improves Writing skills

The teachers were asked how they implement PBI in their writing classes and what type of strategies they find most effective. In this regard, almost all of them reported that they used the writing stages: planning, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing to facilitate students writing. For instance, teacher 1 said: *I use process writing stages, like selecting topic, generating ideas, drafting, editing and producing a final draft in writing class.*

Teachers also reported that the instruction helps students internalise the importance of teaching writing through process stages which facilitate language skills development. They have positive attitudes towards process writing instruction and are happy to implement each stage while teaching writing. For instance, teacher 3 said:

"I like this instruction because, without starting from planning, we cannot make readable texts. Therefore, students should begin by planning and generating ideas; then drafting and revising. After taking revision, they need to edit based on the given feedback. Final, they produce final texts and present them to the class. Students can produce effective and efficient texts or paragraphs by using these teaching strategies in the teaching and learning process. That is why I support it and advise others to practice it."

Theme 2: The role of Feedback

Teachers reported that students can gain confidence to develop their writing skills if teachers support their students through different types of strategies. These teachers mention the strategies that may be used in the process of writing teaching. One of the strategies is feedback. Students can enhance their participation when they receive comments from their teachers and peers. Feedback is very important to improve students' engagement in writing activities and their writing proficiency if it is timely and constructive. Teachers reflected that they guide their students to exchange their exercise books and check each other's work. The students give and receive comments and share their experiences, and then they rewrite by using their friend's suggestions. Teachers go around and facilitate students' activities as well as support them when necessary. Teachers often use this kind of method to help students who struggle with writing based on this instruction. For example, teacher-2 reported that:

"I often give feedback because feedback is very important, and it should start from the outlining stage. When students develop paragraphs after generating ideas, I move around the classroom while they work in a group and I provide timely comments. I try to give feedback to every group on everything from the introduction to the final draft. I always focus on helping students, so I provide constructive feedback."

Theme 3: The Role of Collaborative Writing

Another strategy is collaborative learning. Teachers can support their students by guiding students to practice activities in groups. Students can improve their writing by exchanging opinions and working together, which facilitates helping one another. Teachers reported that they usually encourage students to work together and exchange comments. Students receive and give comments on their writing and rewrite it to make free from grammar errors, spelling mistakes, and punctuation issues. After editing, they write the final texts. After they finish their texts, teachers give learners an opportunity to share their work with their partners. The more pupils work together, the more they participate actively in the writing activity and improve their writing skills. For instance, one teacher reflected that:

“Students bring changes and progress after they practice writing activities through collaborative writing. They work together with their classmates, starting from generating ideas to producing a final draft; they show improvements in their writing. These improvements can be observed from the first stage to the final stage.”

Theme 4: Enhances Motivation and Confidence

Teachers reported that they support students use the writing process stages to practice writing activities. They encourage students to participate in each stage and facilitate their activity in each stage of writing. The more students participate in each stage, the better they improve their writing proficiency, which motivates and develops confidence. For instance, teacher-1 said:

“I usually encourage students to practice and give them a chance for continuous practice. I use various techniques to help them apply this instruction properly. I motivate them to write, and I use motivating words or phrases, and also, I give good marks to those who follow the writing process.”

Similarly, other teachers use the same techniques to help motivate students in writing. They said that they often use very simple and familiar topics to encourage students to participate in the writing classes. Then they gradually guide students to practice a little bit more difficult. Teacher-3 said:

‘In order to enhance students’ motivation, I teach them to start from the topic that they know, and I gradually move forward a little more complex topic. If you give them familiar writing activities which they understand, they will become interested. If they have interest in a certain activity, they will do it without hesitation.’

Theme 5: Applying Assessment

They reported that they assess their students’ learning progress by observing their activity at every stage of writing: from planning to publishing texts. Teacher-4 said;

“I try to assess students’ changes from selecting a topic to producing texts. I observe their plan, how they organise their ideas, how they make their first draft, how they use comments they receive from their classmates, how they refine their arguments, and how they produce their final texts. I observe each stage carefully, and give marks for each stage.”

The teachers also reported that they assess their students during their writing process. Teachers evaluate students' learning progress starting from idea generation to publishing. They observe how the students generate ideas, the way they write their first draft, their participation in receiving and giving comments, how they incorporate feedback into their texts and how they produce final texts and share with the class. They notice that their students improved after writing process.

Theme 6: Evaluating Criteria

Teachers use different types of criteria to evaluate their students' learning progress. They often use mark through marking key that may include categories like content, organisation, language use, and mechanics. They give 10% for those marking keys in general, and hence, they may give 4% out of 10% for the content, 3% for the organisation, 2% for the language use, and 1% for the mechanics. For instance, teacher-2 said:

"I use a set of criteria. I have a marking key that includes categories such as idea organisation, language use, and mechanics. I also assess the outline separately. For example, I may give 3% out of 10% for the outline, which is submitted on a separate sheet, and 7% for the entire written work."

Theme 7: Challenges

With respect to facing challenges while presenting writing through PBI, almost all of the interviewees reported that PBI needed a lot of time to apply the writing process stages. The teachers reported that the instruction needed a lot of time and there was a shortage of time to apply it within the given time. When students are assigned to write on a certain topic using this instruction, they need to plan and generate ideas, then write a first draft, give their drafts to their classmates for correction, edit based on the comments, and finally produce a final draft. To practice this process, it requires a lot of time. This means that it is not possible for them to finish within a period. This is one of the challenges that usually affects our teaching writing through this instruction.

Students' poor language proficiency was another problem that prevents students' engagement. Students fear to write a single sentence due to their poor grammar and vocabulary. The other problem was anxiety. This problem can be related to the students' language proficiency. If students have a problem with grammar and vocabulary, they feel that they cannot compete with their friend and develop anxiety which discourage them doing writing activities. With respect to this, teacher-1 said:

"Students faced challenges during organising ideas. They usually refused to make single sentences because they felt anxious. If their ideas are not well organised, coherence becomes a problem. They also have difficulty using vocabulary appropriately and arranging ideas meaningfully. The teacher should give attention to this problem and provide a solution to help students produce quality texts."

DISCUSSIONS

This section presents the analysis of data obtained from the paragraph test scores. The purpose of this analysis is to examine whether PBI contributes to enhancing grade ten students' writing performance in high schools. In addition, the discussion

incorporates findings from both the questionnaire and interview data, with particular attention to teachers' attitudes towards PBI.

Based on the paragraph tests conducted before and after the introduction of PBI at Bonga Bishaw W/Yohannes high school, the researchers presented the major findings. As noted, a pre-test on paragraph writing was undertaken to assess whether the two groups demonstrated comparable performance and the analysis indicated no significance difference observed ($p > .113$) between experimental and control groups at that stage. However, post-test results revealed that experimental group outperformed control group, with the mean difference of 9.3, which was statistically significant at $p = 0.000$. These findings are supported by Huang et al. (2025), who emphasized the impact of production-oriented approach on improving EFL learners' writing skills. Similarly, Ninh & Duc (2024), in their study, highlighted that Process Writing Approach assists students in organizing ideas, developing content, and producing well-organized texts. The improvement observed in the experimental group aligns with Sucharitrak's (2021) study, which also documented enhanced learning outcomes. PBI plays a pivotal role in teaching writing, as it approaches writing as a cyclical process that involves planning, drafting, revising, and editing. Yeung (2019) further noted that PBI benefits students by fostering engagement, encouraging feedback, and promoting collaborative writing, while Abeje et al. (2025) demonstrated that students using PBI exhibited more convincing writing skills compared to those applying conventional instructions.

Teachers reported that PBI contributed to students' improvement in writing, particularly in flow of ideas and word choice. Survey results indicated that 90% of participants believed PBI enhanced students' grammatical accuracy and vocabulary usage. This outcome aligns with previous research findings. For example, Moussaoui (2024) observed that learners were able to produce coherent and linguistically cohesive texts through process-based writing tasks. Similarly, Feng (2025) highlighted that PBI allowed students to engage in continuous writing practice, which facilitated the production of well-organized characterized by greater clarity and fewer grammatical mistakes. Furthermore, Sánchez & Lopez-Pinzon (2019) emphasized that students improved vocabulary and employed cohesive devices more effectively through processes of continuous revision, editing, and constructive feedback.

All participants (100%) believed that collaborative writing enhanced students' social interaction and critical thinking (Nguyen & Phuong, 2021). Furthermore, 90% of participants acknowledged the importance of exchanging constructive feedback in this process (Feng, 2025; Moussaoui, 2024). In addition, 80% emphasized that PBI increased both students and teachers' interest in writing. Overall, the data demonstrated that PBI had a significant impact on students' engagement and motivation. In line with this, Huang et al. (2025) and Habtamu (2018) noted that PBI played a crucial role in reducing anxiety and promoting active participation. Similarly, Sánchez & Lopez-Pinzon (2019) found that when teachers applied PBI appropriately, students became more interested and less anxious about writing. As Flower & Hayes (1981) explained, writing is not a simple skill but rather a cognitive process that require planning, organizing ideas, and revising. Moreover, 90% of the respondents indicated that students developed greater motivation and independence after using PBI, consistent with the findings of Ninh & Duc (2024) and Moussaoui (2024).

Teachers emphasized that continuous assessment at every stage is essential for monitoring students' learning progress. In this regard, Arochman et al. (2024) and Liunokas (2020) argued that formative assessment enhances learning by identifying and bridging existing gaps. To improve the quality of students' writing, teachers highlighted the importance of providing checklists that facilitate the exchange of comments. Consistent with this, Voinea (2018) and Hyland (2003) maintained that formative assessment through checklists strengthens students' peer evaluations while simultaneously reducing teachers' workload. Moreover, structured rubrics were noted to play a critical role in improving students reviewing skills and accountability. The use of checklists was further recognized as a practical approach for managing large classes and addressing resource-related problems (Tegegne, 2020; Zeleke, 2022).

Although teachers reported that PBI supported students in developing their writing performance, some expressed a preference for traditional instruction, citing greater flexibility in preparing students for final examinations. This perspective is consistent with Habtamu's (2018) findings, which indicated that teachers favoured traditional instruction over PBI when preparing students for national examinations. While teachers acknowledged PBI's role in enhancing students' writing skills, they also emphasized its limitations, including the considerable time and providing insufficient attention to grammar, paragraph structure, and accuracy (Hailemariam & Abie Gebeyehu, 2020). Furthermore, teachers demonstrated limited interest in assessing students' progress through feedback at each stage of writing choosing instead to evaluate only the final product (Anh, 2019; Rachawong & Phusawisot, 2025).

CONCLUSION

The study concludes that the students who received PBI demonstrated significant improvements in their writing skills compared to those who continued using traditional instruction. Prior to the intervention of PBI, students' overall performance was poor with the mean score of 41.79, reflecting difficulties in producing clear and meaningful outputs and indicating a lack of writing performance. Following its implementation, however, students' writing skills showed marked improvement, with mean score increasing to 55.81. This enhancement can be attributed to the structured practice facilitated by the stages of PBI. Moreover, PBI created opportunities for students to exchange constructive feedback, enabling them to refine their work. This peer criticism enhanced students understanding of the structure of paragraph writing and supported the production of quality tests with fewer grammatical errors.

According to insights from teachers' questionnaire and interview responses, the introduction of PBI has proven to be engaging for both learners and teachers. Students actively participated in writing activities, all of which contributed to enhancements in writing proficiency and strengthened social interaction. PBI further encouraged students to monitor their activity, assume risks with accountability, build self-confidence, and alleviate writing-related anxiety. It is appropriate application in EFL classes therefore offers significant notable advantages for the advancement of students' writing performance. Nevertheless, teachers reported several challenges in providing writing instruction, including shortage of time, large class sizes, poor proficiency level, which collectively hinder effective application. Addressing these challenges requires sustained commitment and considerable effort from teachers to identify and apply suitable writing

techniques that maximize the effectiveness of PBI. Overall, this study advances the understanding of the impact of PBI on students' writing performance and teachers' perceptions of its effectiveness. It offers important empirical evidence regarding the instructional value of PBI and contributes to the broader body of knowledge on high school curricula. In addition, the findings highlight both the barriers and opportunities encountered by teachers in the implementation of PBI, thereby providing valuable insights for policy makers and practical approaches in language education.

The evaluation revealed that the effectiveness of PBI, as measured by students' writing performance, increased by 14.3 within a thirteen-week period. Data collected through questionnaires and interviews indicated that teachers expressed positive attitudes toward PBI and acknowledged its role in enhancing students' writing skills. These findings suggest that integrating PBI into language curriculum and implementing it consistently throughout the year could lead to sustained improvements in students' writing performance. To support this process, stakeholders are advised to provide professional development training for teachers, enabling them to design practical strategies that encourage students to engage in recurring writing stages. Moreover, teachers' implementation of PBI in writing tasks is expected to improve students' participation, foster creativity, strengthen problem-solving abilities, collaborative learning and promote autonomy, thereby contributing to the overall advancement of writing performance. The study faced several limitations that constrained its generalizability and effectiveness. It was conducted in a single high school with only two sections of grade ten, making the sample size too small to represent the broader Ethiopian context. The intervention period was limited to thirteen weeks across 40-minute sessions, which proved insufficient for meaningful application of PBI. Additional challenges included students' poor language proficiency, restricted participation, and large class size, all of which hindered implementation. Future research should therefore extend to multiple high school and educational levels, with long-term studies to better assess PBI's impact on students' writing performance.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researchers would like to thank Bonga Bishaw W/Yohannes high school directors and English language teachers for their support and collaboration. Special thanks are extended to Bonga College of Education instructors and department secretaries for their technical and material support, as well as the Research and Community Service Coordinator for facilitating and providing room for seminar in the college.

REFERENCES

- Abeje, Y., Orkojo, Dr. Wondwosen Tesfamichael, & Dr. Hailu Wubeshet. (2025). Effects of Process Writing Approach on the Students' Paragraph Writing Skills. <https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.17237694>
- Akpan, D. V. I., Igwe, D. U. A., Blessing, I., Mpamah, I., & Okoro, C. O. (2020). SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIVISM: IMPLICATIONS ON TEACHING AND LEARNING. 8.
- Anh, D. T. N. (2019). EFL Student's Writing Skills: Challenges and Remedies.

- Arochman, T., Margana, M., Ashadi, A., Achmad, S., Nugrahaeni, D. A., & Baihaqi, I. (2024). The effect of project-based learning on English writing skill for EFL learners. *Journal of Pedagogical Research*, 2. <https://doi.org/10.33902/JPR.202423961>
- Atanaw & Gaur. (2021). The Practice of English Language Teaching Through Literature at Secondary Schools in Ethiopia Focusing on Attitudes of Teacher's and Student's. *Journal of Literature, Languages and Linguistics*. <https://doi.org/10.7176/JLLL/82-01>
- Bada, D., & Olusegun, S. (2015). *Constructivism Learning Theory: A Paradigm for Teaching and Learning*.
- Belete, D., Elias. (2021). The Practice of Teaching Writing Skills Using the Process Approach: The Case of Three Selected Secondary Schools in Wolaita Zone, Ofa Woreda. *International Journal of Secondary Education*, 9(4), 91. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijsedu.20210904.11>
- Daniel. (2021). Foreign Languages in Ethiopia: A heyday of French. *Journal of Culture, Society and Development*. <https://doi.org/10.7176/JCSD/64-01>
- Degaga, D. E. G. (2018). Investigating the Effects of Process-genre Approach on EFL Students Writing Ability.
- Din, W. A., Swanto, S., Abd Latip, N. A., & Ismail, I. H. (2021). THE PROCESS APPROACH TO THE TEACHING OF WRITING: FOCUS ON PROCESS RATHER THAN PRODUCT. *Journal of Information System and Technology Management*, 6(23), 63–71. <https://doi.org/10.35631/JISTM.623005>
- Dunn, M. (2021). The Challenges of Struggling Writers: Strategies That Can Help. *Education Sciences*, 11(12), 795. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11120795>
- Feng. (2025). A Review of The Effectiveness of Process-Oriented English Writing Strategies in Higher Education. <https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.14958987>
- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). *A Cognitive Process Theory of Writing*. College Composition and Communication.
- Gerencheal, B., & Mishra, I. D. (2018). Foreign Languages in Ethiopia: History and current status. 6(1).
- Giday, W. G. (2020). *History of Education and English Language Teaching in Ethiopia: A Brief Survey*.
- Graham, S., & Harris, K. R. (2017). Evidence-Based Writing Practices: A Meta-Analysis of Existing Meta-Analyses. In R. Fidalgo Redondo, K. Harris, & M. Braaksma (Eds.), *Design Principles for Teaching Effective Writing* (pp. 13–37). BRILL. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004270480_003
- Habtamu, S. A. (2018). The practice of process approach in writing classes: Grade eleven learners of Jimma preparatory and Jimma University community preparatory school in focus. *International Journal of English and Literature*, 9(5), 39–49. <https://doi.org/10.5897/IJEL2018.1158>

- Hailemariam, T., & Abie Gebeyehu, T. (2020). Assessment on the Implementation of Process Approach in Teaching Writing Skill: The Case of Preparatory Schools in Hadiya Zone. *Science Journal of Education*, 8(3), 87. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.sjedu.20200803.14>
- Huang, T., Wu, C., Zhang, W., & Chen, Y. (2025). The Effect of Production-Oriented Approach on Chinese University Students' Foreign Language Writing Anxiety and English Writing Performance: Evidence From a Longitudinal Study. *SAGE Open*, 15(2), 21582440251344016. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440251344016>
- Hyland K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ishiyama, H. (2022). *EFL COLLEGE STUDENTS' PERCEPTION OF ENGLISH WRITING*.
- Kadmiry, M. (2021). The Comparison between the Process-oriented Approach and the Product-oriented Approach in Teaching Writing The Case of Moroccan EFL Students in Preparatory Classes for the Grandes Ecoles. *Arab World English Journal*, 12(1), 198–214. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol12no1.14>
- Liunokas, Y. (2020). Assessing Students' Ability in Writing Argumentative Essay at SMAN 1 Soe Kab. Timur Tengah Selatan NTT. *IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas.v8i1.1344>
- Moussaoui, S. (2024). Enhancing Writing Quality and Self-Efficacy Beliefs through Process-oriented Task-based Instruction and Multiple Feedback Forms. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Studies*, 18(1), 96–116. <https://doi.org/10.53543/jeps.vol18iss1pp96-116>
- Habtamu Mulugeta (2018) *STUDENTS' BELIEFS ABOUT WRITING, THEIR WRITING STRATEGY USE AND WRITING PERFORMANCE: Unpublished Ph. D. Thesis*
- Nam Chi, N. T., Thi Thuy, T., & Nhan Ai, N. (2024). Exploring Factors Influencing Students' Challenges in Academic Writing: A Qualitative Analysis Based on Student Perspectives. *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies*, 4(3), 32–37. <https://doi.org/10.62225/2583049X.2024.4.3.2737>
- Nguyen, T. T. T., & Phuong, H. Y. (2021). The Impacts of Collaborative Writing on EFL Students' Paragraph Writing Performance. *International Journal of Science and Management Studies (IJSMS)*, 177–190. <https://doi.org/10.51386/25815946/ijms-v4i4p117>
- Ninh, N. D., & Duc, P. H. (2024). Enhancing EFL Writing Skills Through The Process Writing Approach: A Case Study Of 10th Graders At Chu Van An High School. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 29(12), 27–38. <https://doi.org/10.9790/0837-2912062738>
- Peter, J., & Singaravelu, G. (2020). Problems in Writing in English among High School Learners. 8(9).
- Peungcharoenkun, T., & Waluyo, B. (2023). Implementing process-genre approach, feedback, and technology in L2 writing in higher education. *Asian-Pacific Journal of*

Second and Foreign Language Education, 8(1), 34.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-023-00211-7>

- Rachawong, M., & Phusawisot, P. (2025). The Effects of Process-Genre Approach on Writing Performance and Writing Anxiety of Thai EFL University Students. *World Journal of English Language*, 15(5), 113. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v15n5p113>
- Sánchez, L. F., & Lopez-Pinzon, M. (2019). The Effect of the Process-Based Approach on the Writing Skills of Bilingual Elementary Students. *Latin American Journal of Content & Language Integrated Learning*, 12(1), 72–98. <https://doi.org/10.5294/lacil.2019.12.1.4>
- Sucharitrak, S. (2021). Utilizing Dictation Techniques in Process Writing Instruction: Improving Undergraduate Students' English Writing Performance.
- Tegegne. (2020). EFL Students' and Teachers' Perceptions and Practices of the Writing Tasks in Grades 11 and 12: The Case of Liyew Asres Zewudie General Secondary and Preparatory School, East Gojjam Zone, Ethiopia. *Journal of Literature, Languages and Linguistics*. <https://doi.org/10.7176/JLLL/72-02>
- Voinea, L. (2018). FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT AS ASSESSMENT FOR LEARNING DEVELOPMENT. *Revista de Pedagogie - Journal of Pedagogy*, LXVI(1), 7–23. <https://doi.org/10.26755/RevPed/2018.1/7>
- White & Arndt. (1991). 3. White, R., & Arndt, V. (1991). *Process Writing*. Longman.
- Yeung, M. (2019). Exploring the Strength of the Process Writing Approach as a Pedagogy for Fostering Learner Autonomy in Writing Among Young Learners. *English Language Teaching*, 12(9), 42. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v12n9p42>
- Zelege, Y. D. (2022). Investigating the Implementation of Process Approach to the Teaching and Learning of Writing Skills: The Case of Ethiopian University. *Journal of English Teaching and Learning Issues*, 5(1), 63. <https://doi.org/10.21043/jetli.v5i1.13649>
- Zhang, C. (2024). Teach Writing by Process Writing Approach. *Frontiers in Humanities and Social Sciences*, 4(6), 224–230. <https://doi.org/10.54691/6apkvj38>