Enhancing EFL Writing Skills Through The Process Writing Approach: A Case Study Of 10th Graders At Chu Van An High School

Ngo Duc Ninh, Pham Huu Duc

Lac Hong University, Dong Nai, Vietnam
International University – VNU HCMC, Vietnam

Abstract
This study explores the effectiveness of the Process Writing Approach (PWA) in improving paragraph writing skills among 10th-grade students at Chu Van An High School. Writing is an essential skill for second language learners, but students often face challenges in organizing their thoughts, producing coherent content, and applying proper language conventions. The PWA, which includes stages such as pre-writing, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing, has been proven to enhance writing skills in diverse educational settings (Murray, 1972; Flower & Hayes, 1981). The study involves 90 students who will actively participate in this approach, with their writing abilities assessed through pre-tests and post-tests to measure progress. Additionally, explicit instruction on paragraph structure and peer review processes will be incorporated to further support skill development. Interviews with educators will offer deeper insights into the challenges faced and the effectiveness of the teaching methods used. The findings are expected to contribute valuable recommendations for improving writing instruction within the Vietnamese educational system (Graham & Perin, 2007).
Keywords: *Process Writing Approach (PWA), Paragraph writing, 10th-grade students*

-- ---------

-- ---------

I.   Introduction

Writing skills in English are increasingly recognized as essential for students' academic and professional success. At Chu Van An High School, 10th-grade students face challenges in organizing their ideas, maintaining coherence, and adhering to language conventions. Despite a focus on writing in the curriculum, many students struggle with these aspects, leading to frustration and disengagement. Research has shown that traditional teaching methods, which focus primarily on the final product, fail to support the development of writing skills effectively (Smith, 2020).

The Process Writing Approach (PWA), which emphasizes stages such as brainstorming, drafting, revising, and editing, offers a more interactive and engaging method. By focusing on the writing process rather than just the finished product, PWA allows students to improve their writing progressively. However, the effectiveness of this approach in the context of Chu Van An High School has not been fully explored.

This research investigates how PWA influences the writing skills of 10th-grade students, particularly in

terms of content and organization. It also explores students' perceptions of the writing process and their motivation toward writing tasks. Through these insights, the study aims to offer recommendations for enhancing writing instruction within the Vietnamese educational context.

II.   Literature Review

This literature review addresses three key themes pertinent to the study. It begins by examining the challenges 10th-grade students face when learning to write in English, with a focus on the specific difficulties encountered in paragraph writing. It then identifies common errors in students' written work, exploring patterns and potential underlying causes. The review also discusses the Process Writing Approach (PWA) as a practical method for addressing these challenges and improving students' writing skills. Finally, it concludes by outlining the criteria used to assess students' performance in writing English paragraphs, providing a framework for effective evaluation.

Definitions of Writing and Its Components

Writing is a multifaceted process that involves more than just putting words on paper. It is a means of communication, critical thinking, and creativity, integral to both academic success and everyday interaction. Various scholars have offered definitions that underscore the complexity and significance of writing in different contexts.

Hyland (2003) defines writing as a "complex, recursive process" involving stages such as planning, drafting, revising, and editing, all of which contribute to an effective written product. This definition reflects the dynamic nature of writing, where each step interacts and builds on the others to create a coherent text. Similarly, Tribble (1996) highlights that writing is a tool for expressing ideas, emotions, and thoughts in a structured and coherent form. It requires clarity and organization to ensure that the message is effectively communicated to the reader.

In an educational context, writing goes beyond simple communication; it is a tool for learning and cognitive development. Raimes (1983) describes writing as a way to help students organize their thoughts and reflect critically on the material they are studying. By engaging in writing, students not only record information but also refine their understanding and engage in deeper intellectual processing. This idea is supported by Scribner and Cole (1981), who see writing as a cognitive activity that involves organizing thoughts and making decisions about how to communicate those thoughts clearly to an audience.

Writing is also viewed as a social activity. Flower and Hayes (1981) emphasize that writing is not only an act of individual expression but involves consideration of the audience, context, and purpose. This social dimension underscores the importance of the reader's expectations and the broader societal context in shaping the content and structure of a written piece. Vygotsky (1978) adds that writing is a social construct influenced by the writer's interaction with their environment, reinforcing the idea that writing is part of a larger conversation within a cultural and social context.

Furthermore, writing is recognized as a creative and critical activity. Elbow (1998) stresses the creative aspect of writing, particularly in the early stages, where freewriting and idea generation play a key role in the development of ideas. Writing should encourage exploration and creativity before focusing on accuracy, as this approach fosters deeper engagement. Fulwiler (1987) expands on this by presenting writing as a tool for critical thinking. It requires writers to analyze, synthesize, and evaluate information, which strengthens their ability to think critically and engage with complex material.

In terms of the components of writing skills, effective writing involves several key abilities: idea generation, organization, coherence, and language use. Idea generation refers to the ability to come up with

thoughts and concepts that can be developed into a written form. Organization involves arranging these ideas logically and clearly, ensuring that the writing has a clear structure. Coherence is the ability to connect ideas smoothly, allowing the reader to follow the writer's train of thought without confusion. Finally, language use refers to the writer's ability to apply appropriate grammar, vocabulary, and conventions to communicate ideas effectively and correctly.

Writing is also a reflective process, as Bizzell (1982) suggests, enabling individuals to clarify and articulate their thoughts, often leading to new insights. The act of writing itself becomes a means of processing complex ideas and gaining a deeper understanding of the subject matter. As such, writing is a process that not only allows for expression but also contributes to intellectual development, fostering both creative and analytical thinking.

In conclusion, writing is a dynamic and multifaceted skill that encompasses cognitive, creative, and social elements. It requires the ability to organize and communicate ideas clearly, engage critically with material, and reflect on and revise one's own thoughts. Understanding these components is essential for improving writing skills, particularly for learners who face challenges in organizing and expressing their thoughts coherently.

Challenges and Common Errors in EFL Learners' Writing

Writing in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) poses numerous challenges for learners, particularly in grammar, vocabulary, organization, and mechanics. These challenges stem from both linguistic and cognitive factors, as well as cultural and psychological influences.

One of the primary difficulties EFL learners face is their limited understanding of grammar. Learners often apply the rules of their first language (L1) to English, resulting in common errors such as incorrect verb tense usage or subject-verb agreement (Bitchener & Knoch, 2009). For example, Vietnamese learners often omit articles like "*a*" or "*the*," which do not exist in their native language. Additionally, confusion between tenses is frequent, with learners mixing present and past tenses, making their writing unclear (Darus & Subramaniam, 2009).

In addition to grammatical challenges, vocabulary errors are prevalent. EFL learners often struggle with word choice due to direct translation from their L1, leading to incorrect expressions. As noted by James (1998), learners may use phrases like "do homework" instead of "*make homework*," causing confusion. Furthermore, words with multiple meanings pose another challenge. Without adequate context, learners may misuse these words, making their writing unclear and harder to understand (Chen, 2006).

Another significant obstacle is the difficulty learners have in organizing their ideas. EFL writing requires a clear structure, including an introduction, body, and conclusion. However, many students are unfamiliar with these conventions, leading to disorganized writing. They may neglect topic sentences or fail to use linking words effectively, such as "*however*" or "*therefore*," which causes a lack of logical flow (Harmer, 2004; Khalil, 1989). As a result, the writing becomes difficult to follow and less effective in conveying ideas.

Moreover, mechanical errors in spelling, punctuation, and capitalization further detract from the overall quality of students' writing. Misplaced punctuation can completely alter the meaning of a sentence. For example, "*Let's eat grandma*" versus "*Let's eat, grandma*" (Ferris, 2002). Inconsistent capitalization, such as writing "*i*" instead of "*I*," gives the writing an unprofessional appearance.

These errors are often a result of "interlanguage," a temporary language system that learners create as they try to use English rules while still being influenced by their L1 (Selinker, 1972). Without sufficient practice or feedback, these mistakes can persist, preventing learners from improving their writing skills (Hyland, 2003).

To sum up, EFL learners face several challenges, including grammatical errors, vocabulary limitations, poor organization, and mechanical mistakes. Addressing these challenges requires focused support from teachers.

By identifying error patterns and providing corrective feedback, teachers can help learners improve their writing. Additionally, encouraging students to read good examples and practice organizing their ideas will aid in their development. With consistent practice and targeted guidance, learners can overcome these obstacles and gain confidence in their writing.

Overview and Benefits of Process Writing Approach (PWA)

Process Writing Approach (PWA) is a widely recognized methodology for teaching English writing that emphasizes the stages of writing—planning, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing—over merely producing a final polished text. It emerged as a response to the limitations of the traditional product-oriented approach, which prioritized accuracy and form while neglecting the creative and expressive dimensions of writing (Susser, 1994). By focusing on the writing process, PWA allows students to refine their work progressively, encouraging deeper engagement with their ideas and language (Onozawa, 2009).

PWA views writing as a dynamic and recursive activity in which learners produce multiple drafts, revising and improving at each stage. Unlike the traditional method, which often emphasizes error correction, PWA promotes critical thinking and creativity by encouraging students to focus on content and organization before polishing their language (Zamel, 1976). The five key stages of this approach—prewriting, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing—help students develop writing skills in a structured yet flexible manner (Harmer, 2004).

The first stage, Prewriting, involves brainstorming, outlining, and organizing ideas to provide a clear foundation for writing. This stage encourages students to define their purpose and audience, which helps them approach their tasks strategically (Zamel, 1982). Following this, Drafting focuses on freely putting ideas on paper without immediate concern for accuracy. This creative phase allows students to explore their thoughts and establish the groundwork for revisions (Flower & Hayes, 1981).

Next, the Revising stage encourages students to review and reshape their drafts, ensuring better coherence, clarity, and logical flow. This step may involve reorganizing paragraphs or refining arguments to improve the overall structure and meaning (Sommers, 1980). Once the content is refined, students move to Editing, where they address grammar, punctuation, spelling, and word choice to ensure linguistic accuracy (Strunk & White, 2000). Finally, Publishing enables students to share their completed work with others, fostering a sense of accomplishment and motivating further improvement (Kroll, 1990).

The benefits of PWA extend beyond the classroom. One key advantage is that it encourages writing as a developmental process, helping students focus on continuous improvement rather than perfection in a single draft (Sivalingam & Kaur, 2017). This approach nurtures writing fluency, as the emphasis on multiple drafts allows learners to experiment with ideas and language without fear of failure, thereby building their confidence and accuracy over time (Hassan & Zubair, 2020).

Moreover, PWA fosters collaboration and peer interaction. Activities like peer reviews and group projects create a supportive environment where students can provide feedback, learn from each other, and develop critical thinking skills (Liu & Sadler, 2009). It also promotes autonomy by encouraging students to take ownership of their writing process, track their progress, and reflect on their growth. This independence helps cultivate essential skills like self-discipline and perseverance (Chavez, 2020).

The adaptability of the Process Writing Approach (PWA) is one of its greatest strengths. It can be applied across various genres and tailored to meet the needs of diverse learners, making it suitable for different educational contexts and proficiency levels (Thorsen, 2016). In summary, PWA is an effective and versatile method for teaching writing. By emphasizing the stages of writing and fostering continuous reflection, it helps students enhance their writing skills while also promoting critical thinking, creativity, and collaboration. This

comprehensive approach equips learners with the tools they need to become confident and competent writers.

Previous Studies and Identified Gaps

Over the years, the Process Writing Approach (PWA) has garnered significant attention for its effectiveness in improving writing skills across diverse educational settings. Numerous studies, such as those by Graham and Sandmel (2011) and Faraj (2015), emphasize the benefits of PWA in fostering writing fluency, coherence, and organization through its structured stages. Additionally, its adaptability has been demonstrated across various genres and proficiency levels, ranging from secondary school students (Ngo & Trinh, 2011) to university learners (Alodwan & Ibnian, 2014). Furthermore, researchers like Durga and Rao (2018) highlight its learner-centered nature, which encourages critical thinking, motivation, and self-reflection.

However, despite these strengths, limitations and gaps persist in the current literature. Many studies, such as those by Melgarejo (2010) and Zahran & Sheir (2015), show promising short-term results but fail to examine the long-term effects of PWA on writing performance. Similarly, Graham and Sandmel (2011) report minimal improvements for struggling students, indicating a need for more targeted strategies. Moreover, contextual challenges arise in classrooms rooted in traditional grammar-focused methods, as noted by Onozawa (2010) and Gezmiş (2020), making the implementation of PWA more complex. While some researchers, such as Pham and Bui (2022), advocate for hybrid approaches that combine PWA with genre-based or collaborative strategies, empirical evidence supporting these combinations remains sparse. Additionally, studies like Ho et al. (2020) often rely heavily on quantitative data, which provides limited insight into the nuanced learner experiences and challenges associated with PWA. Specific issues related to grammar accuracy (Truong, 2017) and punctuation (Lara, 2017) also highlight the need for supplementary instruction to address these areas comprehensively.

In summary, while the Process Writing Approach (PWA) provides a proven framework for developing writing skills, certain gaps in its application and understanding persist. Key areas requiring further investigation include its long-term impact, effectiveness for struggling learners, and integration with other instructional methods. Additionally, there is a need for a deeper exploration of its role in addressing specific writing challenges, particularly within culturally and linguistically diverse contexts like Vietnam. To address these gaps, this study focuses on examining the effectiveness of PWA in enhancing paragraph writing skills among 10th-grade students at Chu Van An High School. By incorporating peer collaboration, targeted feedback, and genre-specific instruction, the research aims to offer a more comprehensive understanding of PWA's potential in improving students' writing skills and enriching their overall learning experiences.

Research Questions

To achieve the study's objectives, the following research questions were explored:
1. What challenges do tenth graders at Chu Van An High School encounter when writing paragraphs?
2. How does the Process Writing Approach (PWA) impact students' motivation and engagement in paragraph writing tasks?

III. Methods

Research Setting & Participants

This study employs a mixed-methods approach, combining both quantitative and qualitative methods to examine the challenges 10th-grade students at Chu Van An High School face in learning writing skills. The quantitative aspect includes a survey, which collects data from a large group of students on their difficulties with writing. The qualitative component involves interviews with a smaller sample of students and teachers, offering deeper insights into these challenges. This integration of methods allows for a comprehensive understanding of

the issue, as the survey highlights general trends, while interviews provide more personal, detailed accounts of the obstacles students encounter (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Morgan, 2014; Plano Clark & Creswell, 2015).

The research is conducted at Chu Van An High School in Dong Nai Province, known for its strong academic programs and diverse student population. The school was selected for its focus on academic skill development, making it an appropriate site to explore the writing challenges faced by 10th-grade students. The participants in the study include 90 10th-grade students and 5 English teachers from the school. The students represent a range of academic abilities, while the teachers are involved in teaching writing skills to these students. The research participants were selected using convenience sampling, a non-probability method that ensures easy access to participants who are willing and available to take part in the study (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Johnson & Christensen, 2017). This approach provides practical insights into the specific context of the school, though it may limit the ability to generalize findings to broader populations.

Through the use of both surveys and interviews, this study aims to gather a rich variety of data, enabling a deeper understanding of the challenges faced by both students and teachers in teaching and learning writing. The combination of qualitative and quantitative data allows for a more nuanced exploration of the issue, aligning with the objectives of the study.

Research Instruments

Questionnaire

The questionnaire is designed to gather data on the challenges faced by 10th-grade students in developing writing skills. It consists of closed-ended questions that explore students' difficulties in writing paragraphs, their understanding of the writing process, and their perceptions of teaching methods. According to Dillman, Smyth, and Christian (2014), questionnaires are an efficient tool for collecting large-scale, standardized data, ensuring that responses can be compared effectively. Fink (2017) underscores the importance of clear and relevant question design for ensuring reliable data, and this questionnaire was developed with that in mind, featuring concise questions aligned with the study's objectives to capture quantifiable insights.

Furthermore, Bradburn, Sudman, and Wansink (2004) suggest pretesting questionnaires to ensure clarity and validity. In this study, a pilot test was conducted to refine the questions, ensuring that they accurately capture the writing challenges faced by students.

Semi-structured Interview

The semi-structured interviews focus on five English teachers at Chu Van An High School to gain insights into their perspectives and experiences with the Process Writing Approach (PWA). Kvale and Brinkmann (2015) note that semi-structured interviews strike a balance between flexibility and focus, enabling researchers to delve deeper into participants' thoughts while ensuring consistency. Cohen and Crabtree (2006) also highlight the value of this method in qualitative research, as it allows for adaptation during the conversation, which is particularly useful when exploring complex teaching practices. This flexibility also facilitates the exploration of unforeseen topics that may arise during the interview, providing a more comprehensive understanding of the participants' experiences (DiCicco-Bloom & Crabtree, 2006). Moreover, semi-structured interviews are effective for capturing detailed personal experiences, allowing participants to share insights that might not be revealed through other methods, thereby enhancing the depth and richness of the data (Adams, 2015).

Materials

The primary textbook for this course is Tiếng Anh 10 Global Success, published by the Vietnam Education Publishing House. It consists of 10 units, designed to be taught over 35 weeks—18 weeks in Semester

1 and 17 weeks in Semester 2, with each week including four lessons. This research focuses on the first five units covered in Semester 1. The course provides a comprehensive approach to language learning, with each unit targeting specific learning objectives. In Semester 1, students engage in five writing lessons, addressing topics such as *family routines* (Unit 1), *ways to improve the environment* (Unit 2), *writing a blog about experiences at a music event* (Unit 3), *jobs for men and women* (Unit 4), and *the benefits of an invention* (Unit 5). These lessons are designed to enhance students' paragraph-writing skills, offering a structured approach and diverse topics that help build practical writing abilities applicable to real-world situations.

Data collection & analysis

Data for this research were collected through questionnaires and semi-structured interviews. A questionnaire was given to 90 10th-grade students at Chu Van An High School, and the responses were analyzed using a spreadsheet. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 5 teachers, either face-to-face or via phone, and recorded with consent for transcription.

The data were analyzed using both quantitative and qualitative methods. Questionnaire data were analyzed with descriptive and inferential statistics to identify common writing difficulties and significant differences between groups. Interview data were analyzed using thematic analysis to uncover recurring themes, providing deeper insight into students' writing challenges. The findings from both methods were compared for a comprehensive understanding of the issues.

IV. Results/Findings

Challenges in Writing Paragraphs

The survey data from the table below reveals several challenges faced by 10th-grade students at Chu Van An High School in paragraph writing. The most common issue is generating ideas, with 55% of students finding this difficult, which aligns with previous research (Raimes, 1983). Organizing ideas logically is also a challenge, reported by 60% of students, suggesting they struggle with structuring their thoughts clearly (Hyland, 2003). Grammar and sentence structure are difficult for 65% of students, affecting writing quality (Ferris, 2009), while 58% report limited vocabulary, which hinders expression (Nation, 2001). Time constraints, cited by 55% of students, also impact their writing (Andrade, 2011).

Despite these challenges, the survey shows positive trends. 56% of students feel confident revising their work, which enhances writing performance (Zimmerman, 2002), and 59% find that outlining before writing improves their paragraphs (Graham & Perin, 2007). Addressing these issues through strategies like revision and outlining can significantly improve students' writing skills.

Table 1

Students' Main Writing Difficulties

Item	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)	Total (%)
Generating ideas	33	22	55
Organizing ideas logically	33	27	60
Grammar and sentence structure	33	32	65
Limited vocabulary	30	28	58
Time constraints	33	22	55
Confidence in revising	34	22	56
Using outlines to improve writing	31	28	59

To gain a deeper understanding of the challenges in paragraph writing, five teachers from Chu Van An High School shared their insights. Teacher 1 emphasized that students often struggle with generating and organizing ideas, resulting in paragraphs that are either too brief or overly lengthy and unfocused. She

recommended that students practice outlining their ideas before writing to improve structure and coherence. Teacher 2, on the other hand, highlighted the prevalence of grammatical errors, such as subject-verb agreement and incorrect verb tenses, which stem from insufficient practice and foundational grammar knowledge. He suggested integrating targeted grammar exercises into lessons to address these issues. Moving beyond grammar, Teacher 3 pointed out that limited vocabulary hinders students' ability to express themselves effectively. To overcome this, she encouraged students to read more and keep a vocabulary journal. Teacher 4 focused on the importance of punctuation and sentence structure, noting that many students struggle with run-on sentences and missing punctuation, making their writing difficult to follow. She recommended providing regular feedback to help students improve their sentence boundaries. Finally, Teacher 5 identified a lack of confidence as a major obstacle to writing performance. He noted that students often hesitate to write for fear of making mistakes, which limits their creativity. To combat this, he suggested fostering a supportive environment where students feel comfortable experimenting with language. Together, these insights underscore the multifaceted nature of writing challenges and suggest that improving grammar, expanding vocabulary, enhancing organization, and building confidence are all essential to helping students succeed.

PWA's impact on students' motivation and engagement.

The survey results indicate that students at Chu Van An have a positive view of the Process Writing Approach (PWA), with notable improvements in their writing skills. Specifically, 78% of students reported feeling more motivated to write paragraphs when using PWA, which supports the idea that a structured approach helps keep students engaged (Zimmerman, 2002). Additionally, 74% of students felt more engaged in the writing process due to PWA's emphasis on revising drafts, which aligns with Hyland's (2003) suggestion that multiple revision stages increase both engagement and satisfaction. Furthermore, 77% of students enjoyed writing paragraphs more when following PWA, as the structured steps made the task feel more manageable, reducing cognitive load (Graham & Perin, 2007). Most notably, 82% of students gained more confidence in their writing, as PWA encourages iterative writing and feedback, which helps build self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997).

In addition to motivation and engagement, PWA also positively affected students' attitude towards writing tasks. 76% of students reported looking forward to writing tasks more often when using PWA, suggesting that students who feel equipped with strategies are more likely to enjoy writing (Zimmerman, 2002). Moreover, 82% noted that feedback during PWA motivated them to improve, reinforcing Ferris' (2009) findings on the importance of feedback in writing development. Finally, 82% of students agreed that outlining before writing improved their paragraphs, highlighting the value of prewriting strategies for organizing ideas (Graham & Perin, 2007). Overall, the survey underscores the significant positive impact of PWA on students' writing motivation, engagement, confidence, and quality.

Table 2
Students' Views on PWA's Effectiveness

Item	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)	Total (%)
PWA motivates students to write	39	39	78
PWA increases student engagement	37	37	74
PWA makes writing more enjoyable	37	40	77
PWA boosts students' writing confidence	36	46	82
Students are excited to write with PWA	33	23	56
Feedback in PWA motivates improvement	38	44	82
Outlining helps improve writing	36	40	76

After the implementation of PWA, five English teachers were interviewed to share their experiences with this teaching method. They provided valuable insights on both the challenges and advantages of PWA, including

its impact on students' motivation and engagement, as well as its role in helping students organize and express ideas more clearly in writing. The teachers also shared their thoughts on how PWA could be improved in future applications, offering suggestions to enhance its effectiveness in the classroom.

One challenge identified by Teacher 1 was that students often struggled with the multiple drafts required in PWA, particularly during the revision stage. Many students viewed their first drafts as final, which is a common issue for those unfamiliar with the drafting and revising process (Perl, 1980). However, Teacher 2 highlighted that PWA's focus on continuous revision helps students take ownership of their writing and significantly improves their skills. Teacher 2's view aligns with Schunk's (2003) assertion that active engagement in revision enhances students' sense of ownership and confidence. Teacher 3 noted that seeing progress step by step motivated students, fostering greater engagement in the writing process, which aligns with Ryan and Deci's (2000) research on motivation through task segmentation. Teacher 4 emphasized the benefits of prewriting activities like outlining to improve organization and clarity, supporting Hayes and Flower's (1980) finding that organizing ideas before writing enhances the coherence of students' work. Finally, Teacher 5 suggested incorporating more peer feedback during the revision stage to help students refine their work and gain different perspectives, an approach shown to enhance critical thinking and writing quality (Topping, 2009). These observations underscore the effectiveness of PWA, despite some challenges, in enhancing students' writing skills.

V. Discussion

The writing difficulties faced by tenth-grade students at Chu Van An High School are multifaceted, involving challenges in idea generation, grammar, vocabulary, mechanics, and emotional resilience. Students struggle to organize their ideas logically, often producing disorganized or overly simplistic paragraphs. Grammatical errors, such as incorrect subject-verb agreement and verb tense usage, are frequent, and vocabulary limitations hinder students from expressing their ideas effectively. Moreover, mechanical errors in punctuation and sentence boundaries compromise readability. Emotional factors, such as writing anxiety and time constraints, also play a significant role in limiting student engagement and creativity. Nevertheless, these challenges can be addressed through targeted strategies such as prewriting activities, grammar instruction, and vocabulary expansion. Creating a supportive learning environment that fosters confidence is also crucial in helping students overcome writing barriers and improve their skills (Graham & Perin, 2007; Hyland, 2003; Nation, 2001; Raimes, 1983).

In contrast, the Process Writing Approach (PWA) has proven effective in overcoming these Nation difficulties by boosting students' motivation and engagement. By breaking the writing process into manageable stages—brainstorming, drafting, revising, and editing—PWA reduces student anxiety and provides a clear framework for writing (Hyland, 2007). Furthermore, feedback, both from teachers and peers, plays a vital role in motivating students, enhancing their self-confidence, and improving their writing (Ferris, 2011). Collaborative activities further encourage student participation and idea sharing, leading to better-organized and more coherent paragraphs (Graham & Perin, 2007). Additionally, PWA's cyclical nature fosters a sense of progress and accomplishment, which enhances motivation. Prewriting activities such as outlining, emphasized in PWA, help students organize their ideas before drafting, leading to clearer and more effective writing (Raimes, 1983). Overall, PWA provides a structured, supportive approach that enables students to improve their writing skills while fostering greater engagement and confidence (Zimmerman, 2002).

VI. Conclusion

This study provides valuable insights into the effectiveness of the Process Writing Approach (PWA), demonstrating its positive impact on students' motivation, engagement, and overall writing quality. However,

there are limitations that need to be addressed. First, the sample size of 90 students, while adequate for this study, may not fully capture the diversity of the entire 10th-grade population. A larger and more diverse sample would improve the generalizability of the results and offer more comprehensive insights into the effectiveness of PWA across different student groups (Cohen et al., 2002). Second, the study was conducted over a single semester, which may not be sufficient to observe long-term changes in students' writing abilities. Writing skills often develop gradually, and a longer-term study would provide a clearer understanding of how PWA influences writing over time (Trochim, 2006).

In summary, while the findings of this study demonstrate the positive impact of PWA on students' writing skills, further research with a larger sample size and a longer study duration is needed to fully assess the long-term effects and applicability of PWA in various educational contexts.

References

[1]   Adams, W. C. (2015). Conducting Semi‑Structured Interviews. Handbook Of Practical Program Evaluation, 492–505.

[2]   Alodwan, T. A. A., & Ibnian, S. S. K. (2014). The Effect Of Using The Process Approach To Writing On Developing University Students' Essay Writing Skills In Efl. International Journal Of Linguistic And Communication, 2(2), 147-163.

[3]   Bandura, A. (1997). Self-Efficacy: The Exercise Of Control. Freeman

[4]   Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2009). The Contribution Of Written Corrective Feedback To Language Development: A Ten-Month Investigation. Applied Linguistics, 31(2), 193-214.

[5]   Bizzell, P. (1982). Functions Of The Academic Writing Process. College English, 44(2), 195-209.

[6]   Bradburn, N. M., Sudman, S., & Wansink, B. (2004). Asking Questions: The Definitive Guide To Questionnaire Design (2nd Ed.). Wiley.

[7]   Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using Thematic Analysis In Psychology. Qualitative Research In Psychology, 3(2), 77-101. Https://Doi.Org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

[8]   Chavez, M. (2020). Improving Students' Writing Through The Process Writing Approach. Journal Of English Education, 8(2), 118-126.

[9]   Chen, M. L. (2006). Self-Reported Strategy Use For Coping With Writing Difficulties Among Efl Learners In Taiwan. Asia Pacific Education Review, 7(1), 123-134.

[10]   Cohen, D., & Crabtree, B. (2006). Qualitative Research Guidelines Project. Retrieved From Http://Www.Qualres.Org

[11]   Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2002). Research Methods In Education. Routledge.

[12]   Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, And Mixed Methods Approaches (5th Ed.). Sage Publications.

[13]   Darus, S., & Subramaniam, K. (2009). Error Analysis Of The Written English Essays Of Secondary School Students In Malaysia: A Case Study. European Journal Of Social Sciences, 8(3), 483-495.

[14]   Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2018). The Sage Handbook Of Qualitative Research (5th Ed.). Sage Publications.

[15]   Dicicco-Bloom, B., & Crabtree, B. F. (2006). The Qualitative Research Interview. Medical Education, 40(4), 314-321. Https://Doi.Org/10.1111/J.1365-2929.2006.02418.X

[16]   Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2014). Internet, Phone, Mail, And Mixed-Mode Surveys: The Tailored Design Method (4th Ed.). Wiley.

[17]   Durga, S. S., & Rao, C. S. (2018). Developing Students' Writing Skills In English-A Process Approach. Journal For Research Scholars And Professionals Of English Language Teaching, 6(2), 1-5.

[18]   Elbow, P. (1998). Writing With Power: Techniques For Mastering The Writing Process. Oxford University Press.

[19]   Faraj, A. K. A. (2015). Scaffolding Efl Students' Writing Through The Writing Process Approach. Journal Of Education And Practice, 6(13), 131-141.

[20]   Ferris, D. (2002). Treatment Of Error In Second Language Student Writing. University Of Michigan Press.

[21]   Fink, A. (2017). How To Conduct Surveys: A Step-By-Step Guide (6th Ed.). Sage Publications.

[22]   Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A Cognitive Process Theory Of Writing. College Composition And Communication, 32(4), 365–387.

[23]   Fulwiler, T. (1987). Teaching Writing As A Process Not Product. In M. L. S. Mccarthy (Ed.), The Writing Teacher's Sourcebook (Pp. 45-60). Oxford University Press.

[24]   Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). Writing Next: Effective Strategies To Improve Writing Of Adolescents In Middle And High Schools. Alliance For Excellent Education.

[25]   Graham, S., & Sandmel, K. (2011). The Process Writing Approach: A Meta-Analysis. The Journal Of Educational Research, 104(6), 396-407.

[26]   Harmer, J. (2004). How To Teach Writing (2nd Ed.). Pearson Education.

[27]   Hassan, A., & Zubair, S. (2020). The Effectiveness Of Process Writing In Enhancing Efl Learners' Writing Performance. Asian Journal Of Applied Linguistics, 7(1), 45-57.

[28]   Ho, P. V. P., Thien, N. M., Oanh, T. T. T., & Trinh, D. T. P. (2020). The Effects Of The Process Approach On High School Students' Writing Performances. International Journal Of English Linguistics, 10(2), 406-413.

[29]   Hyland, K. (2003). Second Language Writing. Cambridge University Press.

[30]   Hyland, K. (2007). Genre Pedagogy: Language, Literacy And L2 Writing Instruction. Journal Of Second Language Writing, 16(3), 148-164.

[31]   James, C. (1998). Errors In Language Learning And Use: Exploring Error Analysis. Routledge.

[32]   Khalil, A. (1989). A Study Of Cohesion And Coherence In Arab Efl Students' Writing. System, 17(3), 359-371.

[33]   Kroll, B. (1990). Second Language Writing: Research Insights For The Classroom. Cambridge University Press.

[34]   Lara, H. M. A. (2017). Using The Process-Genre Approach To Improve Fourth-Grade Efl Learners' Paragraph Writing. Latin American Journal Of Content & Language Integrated Learning, 10(2).

[35]   Liu, M., & Sadler, R. (2009). The Effectiveness Of Peer Feedback In Writing. Elt Journal, 63(3), 211-221.

[36]   Melgarejo Melgarejo, D. A. (2010). Assessing Children's Perceptions Of Writing In Efl Based On The Process Approach. Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal, 12(1), 70-84.

[37]   Morgan, D. L. (2014). Integrating Qualitative And Quantitative Methods: A Pragmatic Approach (2nd Ed.). Sage Publications.

[38]   Murray, D. M. (1972). Teach Writing As A Process, Not Product. The Leaflet, 71(3), 11–14.

[39]   Nation, I. S. P. (2001). Learning Vocabulary In Another Language. Cambridge University Press.

[40]   Ngo, C. M., & Trinh, L. Q. (2011). Lagging Behind Writing Pedagogical Developments: The Impact Of Implementing Process-Based Approach On Learners' Writing In A Vietnamese Secondary Education Context. Journal On English Language Teaching, 1(3), 60-71.

[41]   Onozawa, K. (2009). The Process Writing Approach. In English Education And The Teaching Of Writing (P. 154).

[42]   Perl, S. (1980). Understanding Composing As A Process. College Composition And Communication, 31(4), 361-367. Https://Doi.Org/10.2307/358473

[43]   Pham, V. P. H., & Bui, T. K. (2022). Genre-Based Approach To Writing In Efl Contexts. Pham, Vph, & Bui, Tkl (2021). Genre-Based Approach To Writing In Efl Contexts. World Journal Of English Language, 11(2), 95-106.

[44]   Plano Clark, V. L., & Creswell, J. W. (2015). Understanding Research: A Consumer's Guide (2nd Ed.). Pearson.

[45]   Raimes, A. (1983). Techniques In Teaching Writing. Oxford University Press.

[46]   Schoonenboom, J., & Johnson, R. B. (2017). How To Construct A Mixed Methods Research Design. Kolner Zeitschrift Fur Soziologie Und Sozialpsychologie, 69(Suppl 2), 107.

[47]   Schunk, D. H. (2003). Self-Efficacy For Reading And Writing: Influence Of Modeling, Goal Setting, And Self-Evaluation. Reading &Writing Quarterly, 19(2), 159-172.

[48]   Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. International Review Of Applied Linguistics In Language Teaching, 10(1-4), 209-232.

[49]   Scribner, S., & Cole, M. (1981). The Psychology Of Literacy. Harvard University Press.

[50]   Sivalingam, R., & Kaur, S. (2017). The Impact Of Process Writing On Esl Students' Writing Skills. International Journal Of English

Language And Literature Studies, 6(2), 44-52.

[51]   Smith, R. (2020). Engaging Students In The Writing Process: A Study Of Process Writing In The Classroom. Journal Of Writing Research, 12(2), 345-367. Https://Doi.Org/10.17239/Jowr-2020.12.02.04

[52]   Sommers, N. (1980). Revision Strategies Of Student Writers And Experienced Writers. College Composition And Communication, 31(4), 378-388.

[53]   Strunk, W., & White, E. B. (2000). The Elements Of Style (4th Ed.). Longman.

[54]   Susser, B. (1994). The Process Approach To Writing Instruction. The Tesol Quarterly, 28(1), 36-38.

[55]   Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-Determination Theory And The Facilitation Of Intrinsic Motivation, Social Development, And Well-Being. American Psychologist, 55(1), 68-78. Https://Doi.Org/10.1037/0003-066x.55.1.68

[56]   Thorsen, C. (2016). Adapting The Process Writing Approach To Diverse Student Groups. Journal Of Educational Research And Practice, 6(1), 67-79.

[57]   Topping, K. J. (2009). Peer Assessment. Theory Into Practice, 48(1), 20-27. Https://Doi.Org/10.1080/00405840802577569

[58]   Tribble, C. (1996). Writing. Oxford University Press.

[59]   Trochim, W. M. (2006). Research Methods Knowledge Base. Atomic Dog.

[60]   Truong, T. N. T. (2017). Teaching Writing Using Genre-Based Approach: A Study At A Vietnamese University. Language Education In Asia, 8(2), 192-212.

[61]   Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind In Society: The Development Of Higher Psychological Processes. Harvard

[62]   Zahran, F. A. A., & Sheir, A. A. (2015). The Effectiveness Of Process Writing Approach In Developing Efl Writing Performance Of Esp College Students. Educational Sciences Journal, 23(3), 1-23.

[63]   Zamel, V. (1976). Teaching Composition In The Esl Classroom. In The Process Of Writing (Pp. 37-38).

[64]   Zamel, V. (1982). Writing: The Process Of Discovery. Tesol Quarterly, 16(2), 195-202.

[65]   Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming A Self-Regulated Learner: An Overview. Theory Into Practice, 41(2), 64-70.