

Impacts of Process-Genre Approach on EFL Sophomores' Writing Performance, Writing Self-Efficacy, Writing Autonomy

Truong Minh Hoa^{ORCID}

Ho Chi Minh City Open University

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Truong Minh Hoa, Ho Chi Minh City Open University, 96 Vo Van Tan Street, Ward 6, District 3, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam.
E-mail: tmh.camranh1991@gmail.com

Background: In literature, process-genre approach may be a favorable alternative for writing classes these days, assisting student writers in building up linguistic, cognitive, and sociocultural competency of writing. However, the contribution of this approach to fostering EFL writing learning has not been extensively probed in the context of Vietnam.

Purpose: This paper aimed at attesting the impact of the target approach on the Vietnamese EFL students' writing performance, writing self-efficacy, and writing autonomy.

Method: Thanks to convenience sampling technique, a group of 38 EFL sophomores from an intact class at a Vietnamese private university was recruited as one experimental group undergoing a nine-week writing course within process-genre approach. Grounded by quantitative design, the instruments of this study involved one writing entry test, one writing exit test, and two questionnaires. The data were analyzed by computing Paired Samples T-tests through SPSS version 26.0.

Results: The results indicated that process-genre approach enhanced the tertiary students' overall writing performance to some extent, empowered their self-efficacy of writing ideation, conventions, self-regulations, and positively reinforced their awareness and behaviors of writing autonomy.

Implication: The study contributed to a better understanding of the practicality of applying process-genre approach into EFL writing pedagogy in Vietnam, and then implications could be proposed to strengthen the quality of EFL writing instruction utilizing this eclectic approach in the Vietnamese tertiary context.

Keywords: process-genre approach, writing performance, writing self-efficacy, writing autonomy, sophomores, Vietnam

Introduction

Background of the Study

In acquiring a foreign language, learners are expected to experience four skills in a natural order of acquisition, that is, listening, speaking, reading, and writing (Truong & Pham, 2017). And the latter, writing, is viewed as the most arduous language skill for acquisition (Hyland, 2003; Mekki, 2012), demanding "the mastery of a variety of linguistic, cognitive, and sociocultural competency" (Barkaoui, 2007, p. 35). In more concrete terms, good writing performance, based on Truong and Pham (2017), requires more than linguistic knowledge and memory of sample texts (linguistic domain); it also urges learner writers to grasp how to compose their texts independently (cognitive domain), and within an

active interactivity with other writers in learning process (social domain). One of rudimental causes making writing skill difficult to acquire is that language learners have been learning about linguistic items and text forms but disregard writing steps and collaborative strategies (Mekki, 2012). It is inferred that to master writing skill, language learners not only need linguistic knowledge as "even with linguistic knowledge students often struggle to produce a cohesive piece of writing" (Uddin, 2014, p. 117), but they also grasp their social awareness of writing contexts (Hyland, 2003), and cognitive awareness of the processes they utilize to write (Khanalizadeh & Allami, 2012). Alarming, many students graduate high schools in the Vietnamese context without achieving a proficient level of writing skills (Truong & Pham, 2017). In reality, they are mostly required to imitate and memorise the sample texts provided by

teachers that might have its temporary effect on examinations. As a corollary, when becoming tertiary-level students, their writing abilities often does not meet language instructors' expectations (Ly, 2014) albeit a mess of linguistic knowledge. Undoubtedly, writing is a painstaking skill for language learners to acquire (Mekki, 2012). As mentioned earlier, writing is the art of performing linguistic, cognitive and sociocultural literacies, involving "knowledge about language, knowledge of the context in which writing happens and especially the purpose for the writing, and skills in using language" (Badger & White, 2000, pp. 157-158). Taking this into account, process-genre approach may be a favourable alternative for modern writing classrooms these days (Rusinovci, 2015).

Recent prolific studies (e.g., Agesta & Cahyono, 2017; Alabere & Shapii, 2019; Babalola, 2012; Gupitasari, 2013; Janenoppakarn, 2016) have been conducted to testify the merit of process-genre approach toward EFL students' writing performance. For instance, Babalola (2012) applied process-genre approach on 40 Nigerian students of computer science, and the results indicated that the experimental group outperformed the control group after the treatment. This finding was also sought in Gupitasari (2013)'s action research examining the impact of process-genre approach on writing ability of business letters among 28 Grade 12 students at an Indonesian vocational school. Similarly, Agesta and Cahyono (2017) investigated the effect of process-genre approach on writing ability of report texts among 28 junior high school students in Indonesia. This study also witnessed a positive contribution of process-genre approach to the students' writing ability of report texts regarding organisation, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics. To attest the luminosity of process-genre approach on students' academic writing, Alabere and Shapii (2019) conducted a six-week training course on 80 Malaysian students, including one experimental group under the treatment, and one control group under product approach. The study found out that the former completed the writing test more successfully than the latter did. Especially, Janenoppakarn (2016) compared the impact of process-genre approach on writing performance and attitudes between two groups of lower and higher proficient students (N=37) at a Thai university, using writing tests, questionnaire, and interview. The findings showed that lower proficient students outperformed higher proficient students considering generating content for writing, and exhibited more active learning attitudes than higher proficient students. It might be noted that the value of process-genre approach toward EFL students' writing performance has been constantly verified in various contexts (e.g., Nigeria, Thailand, Indonesia, Malaysia). Yet, research on this correlation seemed

scanty in the Vietnamese educational scenarios. Hence, this study aimed to explore the contribution extent of process-genre approach to EFL students' writing performance at one Vietnamese university as an initial attempt.

In any field of language pedagogy, including writing instruction, one of the eminent missions of language instructors is "promoting students' cognitive, behavioral, and motivational engagement through enhancing students' self-efficacy" (Hashemnejad, Zoghi, & Amini, 2014, p. 1045). In oft-cited definition, self-efficacy is learners' beliefs in their capability to succeed in and acquire new information, or complete a task requirement (Bandura, 1986), exerting an influence on task selection, effort, persistence and success (Schunk, 2003). It is noted that despite facing difficulties in learning process, language learners who possess their high self-efficacy might be more consistent to it than those who are skeptical of their own ability (Schunk, 2003). In the realm of writing pedagogy, writing self-efficacy is a key social cognitive factor that can influence students' writing ability (Blasco, 2016; Ho, 2016). In this respect, this factor is a significant predictor of a good writing performance (Demirel & Aydin, 2019). For this reason, Zhang (2018) recommends that language learners need to be self-efficacious and confident of their own ability so that they are able to perform writing tasks efficiently. Zhang (2018) conducted a 14-week study exploring the contribution of process-genre approach to 59 Chinese EFL freshmen' writing self-efficacy development. The questionnaire and interview results revealed that process-genre approach raised their confidence and reduced their anxiety while writing. As additional part of research, Abdullah (2019) compared the impact of process-genre approach on writing anxiety reduction between one experimental group (N=31) and one control group (N=31). The questionnaire findings documented that process-genre approach helped the experimental group control their anxiety and foster their confidence of writing ability more effectively. Given a key role of writing self-efficacy to writing performance, studies to investigate the change of students' writing self-efficacy in process-genre approach writing lessons appeared to be scarce, especially in Vietnam. Thus, this cognitive change would be explored in this study to check if process-genre writing approach could develop the students' strong confidence and positive belief in their personal writing ability or not.

As depicted above, the vast majority of Vietnamese students (both high school and university students) are struggling to make a written text effectively, which is rooted in their memorisation and imitation of the sample texts without independent writing strategies.

Consequently, learning to write autonomously has now become a necessity, especially for university students (Taghizadeh, 2014). Success of a foreign language acquisition (e.g., good writing performance), as a corollary, relies to a greater extent on learner autonomy – “an ability to take charge of one’s own learning” (Holec, 1981, p. 193) – both to take initiative in the classroom and persist in their learning path outside classroom (Brown, 2007). In this regard, autonomous learners need to self-plan, self-control, self-regulate, and self-evaluate their own learning process (Little, 2007) both inside and outside the class (Brown, 2007) “without being reminded by their teachers or waiting for the teachers’ instruction” (Truong, Nguyen, & Luu, 2019, p. 120). In the field of foreign language writing pedagogy, autonomous learner writers are those who “shape their essays without the abstaining pressure from any parties where they have the power to determine the content and rhetoric of their writing” (Abdel-Haq, Atta, & Ali, 2020, p. 31). Writing autonomy, accordingly, is viewed as an important construct to develop students’ writing performance (Taghizadeh, 2014; Yeung, 2016). In academia, process-genre approach is deemed to create a non-threatening environment for writing autonomy (e.g., Kim & Kim, 2005; Salim, Walker, & Rosenblatt, 2016), which “helps teachers shift responsibility gradually to their students once they get familiar with the different processes to produce a text meeting the requirements of a particular genre” (Abdel-Haq, *et al.*, 2020, p. 32). Arteaga-Lara (2017) conducted a qualitative research using journals and group interviews to see how process-genre approach assisted 13 Grade 4 students in writing narrative paragraphs in Colombia. The results indicated that process-genre approach built the students’ better awareness of writing stages such as prewriting, drafting, revising and publishing. Moreover, this eclectic approach provided the students with a stronger sense of direction and purpose for paragraph writing. Abdel-Haq, *et al.* (2020) investigated the effect of a web-mediated process-genre approach on developing writing autonomy among 46 Egyptian EFL third-year students. The results disclosed that this instruction fostered autonomy abilities in EFL writing among the students in reflecting, decision making and revising of their essays. Notwithstanding the recognised buttress of writing autonomy to writing performance, the contribution of process-genre approach to fostering writing autonomy has not been fully probed, especially in Vietnam. Purposely, the paper was additionally targeted to explore the students’ transformation of writing autonomy levels before and after the writing course driven by process-genre approach.

Research Questions

To achieve the aforementioned objectives, three research questions were formulated as follows:

RQ-1: To what extent does process-genre approach enhance EFL sophomores’ writing performance?

RQ-2: How does process-genre approach impact EFL sophomores’ writing self-efficacy?

RQ-3: How does process-genre approach impact EFL sophomores’ writing autonomy?

Research Hypotheses

This quasi-experimental study consisted of three research hypotheses:

H1: *Process-genre approach has a positive effect on the students’ writing performance.*

H2: *Process-genre approach has a positive effect on the students’ writing self-efficacy.*

H3: *Process-genre approach has a positive effect on the students’ writing autonomy.*

Literature Review

Process-Genre Approach

Process-genre approach, as the term suggests, is a combination of two well-known approaches in writing instruction, namely the process approach and the genre approach (Badger & White, 2000). This eclectic approach is formed with the integration of the strengths of both the process and the genre approaches in developing learners’ writing ability (Rusinovci, 2015). Under this approach, writing requires linguistic knowledge, schematic knowledge within specific socio-cultural context, and strategic skills concurrently for writing act (Badger & White, 2000). In other words, to produce a good written text, learner writers need to take three writing aspects into consideration, that is, relational, strategic, and textual aspects (Schmitt, 2010). In specific, Schmitt (2010) depicts that writing must be purposeful and contextual (in relational aspect), including the effective use of linguistic features of vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics to construct the text’s clear meaning (in textual aspect); for that, learner writers must handle writing strategies to produce the good text (in strategic aspect). Overall, based on Deng,

Chen and Zhang (2014), this potential writing approach allows students to undergo the recursive process of writing (e.g., planning, drafting, revising, and editing) and accumulate the certain repertoire of text genres—“socially recognised ways of using language” (Spycher, 2007, pp. 240-241), which may be narrative, report, explanation, or argumentation (Derewianka, 1990).

Process-genre approach, according to Yan (2005), is commonly implemented within a six-stage cycle, including preparation, modelling, planning, joint construction, independent construction, and revision. Yan (2005) claims that under this eclectic approach, teachers’ role becomes less authoritative, but more facilitative, especially in promoting students’ responsibility for their own writing or scaffolding them with timely feedback. In this model, the teacher initially establishes a situational context for a written text, which allows students predict structural feature of the text genre. Secondly, the teacher provides a model of the specific genre and lets them analyse it in terms of field (i.e. purpose of the writing), tenor (i.e. audience of the writing), and mode (i.e. textual structure of the writing). Thirdly, the teacher presents the writing topic to the students, arousing their interest by asking them to discuss the topic and brainstorm ideas related to their experience. Fourthly, the teacher works collaboratively with the students to construct the text together, in which they generate the text within experiencing different writing processes (e.g., outlining, drafting, and revising). Fifthly, the teacher assigns another topic of this particular genre, and asks the students to produce their own text. Lastly, the teacher requires the students to revise, edit, and assess their written work by themselves or with their fellow students. In this paper, the researcher designed the writing lessons based on Yan (2005)’s model due to two reasons. Firstly, this model has been widely applied in several foregoing studies, thus it was proven highly reliable and valid. Secondly, this model’s specifications were consistent with the time allotment for English writing classes in numerous Vietnamese colleges and universities, it might be highly practical.

Writing Performance

In definition, writing performance is the student writers’ ability to write a piece of text effectively and transform ideas into written words (Sharadgah, 2013). In specific, it refers to “the production of a writer’s ideas on a certain topic in a written form with clear organisation of ideas, adequate and relevant content taking the audience into consideration” (Mohammed, 2010, p. 2). Based on this definition, it is indicated

that writing performance on a given topic is assessed on content, language forms (e.g., vocabulary and grammar), and organisation. In this paper, the researcher focused on the four criteria to design scoring rubrics for writing performance.

Writing Self-Efficacy

Writing self-efficacy is viewed as students’ beliefs in ability to perform in writing tasks, and specifically in the context of this study, students’ beliefs in ability to write essays in English. On the whole, “writing self-efficacy is defined as one’s belief in his/her writing ability” (Demirel & Aydin, 2019, p. 107). Indeed, to succeed in such a cognitively challenging task as writing, student writers must strongly believe in their writing ability. Writing self-efficacy is linked with writing processes emphasising writing performance (Hayes, 2012). This construct, thus, is measured under three basic dimensions below (Bruning, Dempsey, Kauffman, McKim, & Zumbrunn, 2013), via which the researcher estimated the enhancement of the students’ self-efficacy after the course.

Dimension 1 (Self-Efficacy of Writing Ideation) is bound with the idea generation process, covering schematic knowledge or idea organisation (Hayes, 2012). That is, students’ ideation self-efficacy focuses on their appraisal of the idea quality and sequencing (Bruning, *et al.*, 2013).

Dimension 2 (Self-Efficacy of Writing Conventions) pertains to writing conventions, which refer to a set of generally accepted standards for conveying ideas in writing (Bruning, *et al.*, 2013). The conventions may be grammar, vocabulary and mechanics (Fayol, Alamargot, & Berninger, 2012).

Dimension 3 (Self-Efficacy of Self-Regulation) is reflected in writers’ confidence (Zimmerman & Kitsantas, 2007) and their anxiety or frustration management (Bruning, *et al.*, 2013) that they can direct themselves successfully through writing stages.

Writing Autonomy

Writing autonomy pertains to self-management involving decision-making abilities that a learner writer needs to possess during their writing learning process (Duong, 2015). In more concrete terms, writing autonomy reflects learners’ awareness and behaviors of setting writing goals, creating writing learning plan, selecting materials for writing practice, self-assessing writing performance, and reflecting upon the whole learning process (Duong, 2015). Similarly, Yeung (2019) describes that an autonomous

learner of writing is able to utilise such learning strategies as “goal setting, planning for writing, making decisions on what and how to learn, self-monitoring and self-assessment” (p. 43). In the current paper, the researcher chiefly adapted Duong (2015)’s detailed taxonomy with the aim of testifying the students’ change of learner autonomy levels on writing learning before and after the treatment.

Method

Research Context and Participants

This study was carried out in the first semester of the school year 2020-2021 at one private university of Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. This setting aimed to provide an active and practical learning environment for students, and to encourage self-learning and an entrepreneurial spirit, contributing to both Ho Chi Minh City’s and Vietnam’s economy, social stability, and sustainable development. To the *Academic Writing* subject of the four-year English language program, English majors (i.e. English-majored students) were required to accomplish total seven modules labelled *Academic Writing 1-7* (10 four-hour sessions per module) during the first seven semesters of each intake. These modules enabled them to develop writing ability to produce English texts in different levels like sentences, paragraphs, essays under various text genres.

The research sample was recruited to this study thanks to the use of the convenience sampling technique. It was chosen as “participants are willing and available to be studied” (Creswell, 2012, p. 67) and other criteria were met such as “easy accessibility, geographical proximity” (Etikan, Musa, & Alkassim, 2016, p. 2). The participants were 38 second-year English majors (i.e. EFL sophomores) from an intact English writing class managed by the researcher; and all of them (9 males and 29 females) were treated as an experimental group. In the Vietnamese tertiary context, rearranging an already-formed group or an intact class for research purpose is an arduous task due to restricted temporal and administrative conditions; thus, using an intact class was more accessible in this study. A control group was not formed in this experiment owing two salient reasons. It was unfair that the treatment group received special training, whereas the control group received a conventional way (Gall, Walter, & Joyce, 2007). Besides, the existence of a control group in this study was irrelevant since the main aim of this research was to estimate the writing progress of the experimental group before and after being exposed to process-genre approach. Similar writing proficiency

background, age range, and prior experience with process-genre writing approach among these students were convenient conditions for the researcher to employ this target sample.

Research Design

By purpose, a quasi-experimental design, without random choice of the representative sample (Creswell, 2012), was purposely deployed to testify the cause-effect correlation between process-genre approach (i.e. the independent variable) and the students’ writing performance, writing self-efficacy, and writing autonomy (i.e. the dependent variables). By manner, the study was grounded by a quantitative design with the presence of different numerical instruments such as writing entry and exit tests, and questionnaires.

Training Procedures

Time

The study lasted eight four-hour-weeks, from early October to early December of 2020. In Week 1, the researcher sent the writing entry test, and the pre-questionnaires of writing self-efficacy and writing autonomy. The six next weeks; from Week 2 to Week 7, were used to implement the treatment of process-genre approach on the target sample, which is depicted in the following section. In Week 8, the students were required to complete the writing exit test first, and afterwards the post-questionnaires of writing self-efficacy and writing autonomy.

Material

The quasi-experiment was conducted on the textbook called *Skillful Reading & Writing Level 4* written by Bixby and Scanlon in 2016. This publication included ten units in total, overarching different topics such as social relationships (Unit 1), sports events (Unit 2), family (Unit 3), risks in life (Unit 4), urban development (Unit 5), existence of languages (Unit 6), overpopulation (Unit 7), company changes (Unit 8), geographical effects (Unit 9), and conflicts (Unit 10). However, due to constrained temporal condition and research purposes, the researcher decided to work on six units (i.e. Units 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9). The target text genres included report and argumentation (see Table 1), equivalent to Task 1 and Task 2 in IELTS Writing section, respectively.

Description of the Treatment

The actual treatment consisted of seven successive four-hour-sessions from Week 2 to Week 8, equivalent to the six chosen units. In Week 1, the researcher spent half hour noticing the students of functions

and stages of process-genre approach in writing. In addition, the researcher divided the whole class into separate pairs and groups consistently during the entire experiment. Each four-hour lesson under process-genre approach encompassed six stages (see Table 2), which was adopted from Yan (2005).

Scoring Rubric and Inter-Rating

The predominant aim of the study was to measure the change of the EFL sophomores' writing performance before and after their exposure to process-genre approach, so evaluating students' essay writing was vital and relevant to the content of the training course. Scoring rubric was totally adopted from the

Table 1

Description of the Treated Material Content

<i>Unit</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Genre</i>	<i>Main Writing Task (Text 3)</i>
2	Games	17-26	Report Text	Write a report comparing the effect the FIFA World Cup or the Olympics had on two previous host countries. Suggest if your country should host the event.
8	Change	77-86	Report Text	Imagine you work for TWC Management Consultancy. Write a report giving practical suggestions on how Buckson's supermarket can ensure that all staff are prepared and support company changes.
5	Sprawl	47-56	Argumentative Text	Write an essay assessing benefits and disadvantages of slum tourism.
6	Legacy	57-66	Argumentative Text	Read the data about two endangered languages. Which language do you think is in greater danger? Write an essay on the question, giving reasons and supporting your answer with the information.
7	Expanse	67-76	Argumentative Text	Write an essay on behalf of an international charity giving reasons why education for all children is necessary in the fight against overpopulation.
9	Flow	87-96	Argumentative Text	Write about how a place's geography influenced its agriculture, economics, history, and culture.

Table 2

Stages of Four-Hour Lessons Driven by Process-Genre Approach

<i>Stage</i>	<i>Specifications</i>
Preparation (10')	Teacher asked the students relevant questions about the socio-cultural context and communicative purposes of the model text (Text 1).
Modelling (45')	Teacher provided the students with Text 1 of the specific genre. Teacher analysed Text 1 about field (purpose of Text 1), tenor (audience of Text 1), mode (linguistic features, schematic structures of Text 1) of the target genre. Teacher let the students do 2 or 3 controlled practice tasks on these target linguistic features (e.g., formulaic expressions, key grammar). Teacher reinforced the schematic structures of the target genre in the next stages.
Planning (20')	Teacher introduced the writing topic of Text 2 to the students, which was then built by both teacher and the students collaboratively. Teacher asked the students to discuss the topic, brainstorm ideas on it. Teacher participated in constructing the content for Text 2 by eliciting relevant questions from the students and providing further prompts.
Joint construction (75')	Teacher and the students outlined Text 2, using the textual moves from Stage 2. Teacher divided the whole class into separate groups, and then had each of the groups complete one particular textual move of Text 2. Teacher asked the students to show their writing onto the board one by one, based on the sequence of textual moves of Text 2. Teacher, along with the students, suggested feedback and correction on each part so that the best version of Text 2 was produced.
Independent construction (60')	Teacher assigned the writing task of Text 3 of the genre to the students, asked them to complete it individually. Teacher told the students to follow the writing steps as in Stages 3 and 4: i) Planning ideas, lexical items, or sentence patterns, ii) Outlining Text 3 with the learnt rhetorical moves, iii) First drafting.
Revision (30')	Teacher asked the students to do peer feedback with classmates on the first draft. (If the class time was available, the students were expected to revise and edit their first paper to produce the final version of Text 3). Teacher reinforced the students' understandings of the target writing genre from three main dimensions of field, tenor, and mode.

IELTS Writing Band Descriptors owing to two reasons. The first reason, the IELTS was internationally standardised test accepted by many countries around the world, so the inclusive writing rubric had its high reliability. The second reason, the scoring rubric of the IELTS writing part was to assess the test takers' analytical writing ability of Task Achievement (content), Coherence and Cohesion (organisation), Lexical Resource (vocabulary), Grammatical Range and Accuracy (grammar), so it had its high validity—the extent to which the instrument measures what it is intended to measure (Mackey & Gass, 2005). The writing scoring rubric involved nine band scores from 1 to 9 for each of the four criteria above and for overall. The total score was the average value of all the four rated criteria.

As rating involves subjectivity (Mackey & Gass, 2005), it is postulated that more than one rater be used, to make the final results more reliable. This rating procedure ensured inter-rater reliability of the test results, considering the question of if a second observer interpreted the data in the same way as the first (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011). In this study, the researcher invited one more reliable Vietnamese EFL lecturer at this setting to participate in the rating process. This 32-year-old second rater had a seven-year experience of English academic writing instruction, and she regularly attended training workshops in EFL/ESL writing pedagogy. Both the researcher and this rater were responsible for judging the students' writing performance of the entry test and the exit test. Initially, the researcher and this rater discussed the usage of the IELTS Writing Band Descriptors for the assessment consistently. The students' writing products were independently scored by the two raters when these papers had been duplicated beforehand. If the scores were not much balanced, meetings were organised to reach the final agreement on the final ratings. The Pearson Correlation coefficient results, testifying the correlation of the scores rated by the researcher and the inter-rater, proved the writing scores had high correlation coefficient reliability, that is, $r = .712$, $p = .000$ (to the entry test scores), and $r = .779$, $p = .000$ (to the exit test scores).

Research Instruments

Writing Entry and Exit Tests

To measure the change in the participants' writing performance, the researcher deliberately utilised the entry test in the initial week, and the exit test in the last week. The former “[was] taken for all cases prior to the introduction of the independent variable in the experimental group” (Frankfort-Nachmias &

Nachmias, 2004, p. 101), whilst the latter “[was] taken for all cases after the experimental group has been exposed to the independent variable” (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, 2004, p. 101).

Both the tests, basically, shared the same format, time duration, scoring rubric, and administration procedure. As for the format, the students were asked to write a 250-word argumentative essay about the benefits and disadvantages of competition in education (as in the entry test), and about the benefits and disadvantages of urban sprawl in Vietnam (as in the exit test). The writing topics and format in these tests were familiar to the students before and after the experimental course (in *Skillful Reading & Writing Level 3-4*, respectively); as a result, the tests were proven reliable. To the time duration, the students were allocated 40 minutes for completing each test, equivalent to the time allotment of an actual IELTS writing test. To the scoring rubric, based on the IELTS Writing Band Descriptors, the students' writing performance of both the tests was assessed on four individual criteria and on overall, each of which was scored from 1.0 to 9.0. Finally, before the tests, the researcher explained to the students the test rules carefully; during the tests, the researcher observed the class strictly so that the test scores were reliable.

Questionnaires of Writing Self-Efficacy and Writing Autonomy

With the purpose of investigating the change of the students' writing self-efficacy and writing autonomy, respectively, after their exposure to process-genre approach, the researcher decided to use the questionnaires. This numerical data collection technique (Creswell, 2012) was in use due to two salient reasons. It, firstly, was one of the most useful tools to exploit subjects' attitudes, beliefs and perceptions (Koshy, 2005). Secondly, it helped the researcher to gain large amount of information from a number of students with the same questions in short time with less effort (Alnasser, 2013). Both the pre-questionnaire and the post-questionnaire constituted two parts, including *Part 1: Writing Self-Efficacy*, and *Part 2: Writing Autonomy* (see Table 3).

According to Bryman (2012), reliability and validity are the most salient evaluative criteria of an effective social research. The five-point Likert scaled questionnaires were found highly reliable as their Cronbach's Alpha values were greater than .700 as depicted in Table 3 (Pallant, 2011). High reliability of the questionnaires was partly derived from the fact that the students were carefully pre-trained how to complete the questionnaires. Similarly, these questionnaires had a high degree of validity as their

content was equally relevant to all the respondents (e.g., all of them experienced the same training course, the same material) and to the research aims (i.e. content validity). Such high validity was also attested through the items being structurally classified under pre-determined sub-themes (i.e.

construct validity), along with the content, scales, layout, and accuracy of both English and L1 versions being double-checked by two other experienced lecturers in the research arena including one 39-year-old male and one 42-year-old female (i.e. face validity).

Table 3

The Overarching Description of the Questionnaires

	<i>Pre- and Post-questionnaire (Part 1)</i>	<i>Pre- and Post-questionnaire (Part 2)</i>
Sub-Themes	Writing self-efficacy of (12 items) A. Writing ideation (4 items) B. Writing conventions (5 items) C. Writing self-regulation (3 items)	Writing autonomy (10 items) A. Awareness (5 items) B. Behaviors (5 items)
Sources	Items 1-5-7-8-10-11: Adapted from Villagrasa, Iglesias, Prado, Blázquez, Peña & Lizaga (2018) Items 2-3-4-6-9-12: Self-designed	Items 13-14-15-16-17-18-19-20-21-22: Adapted from Duong (2015)
Scale	A five-point Likert scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Uncertain, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree	
Cronbach's Alpha	Pre-Questionnaire I (12 items) = .725 > .700 Post-Questionnaire I (12 items) = .782 > .700	Pre-Questionnaire II (10 items) = .771 > .700 Post-Questionnaire II (10 items) = .812 > .700

Data Analysis

To examine the effects of process-genre approach on the EFL sophomores' writing performance (RQ-1), the researcher employed SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) version 26.0, and textual evidence. Based on this software, the researcher ran Paired Samples T-tests which compared the mean scores between the writing entry test and the writing exit test with reference to content, organisation, vocabulary, grammar, and overall. Similarly, to attest

the positive change of the students' writing self-efficacy (RQ-2), and writing autonomy (RQ-3) after their exposure to process-genre approach, the researcher continued to run other Paired Samples T-tests, comparing the mean scores between the pre-questionnaire and the post-questionnaire on each individual items of Part 1 and Part 2. If the two-tailed significance value (*p* value) is greater than alpha level (0.05), there is not a significant difference in variances between the two sets of scores (Pallant, 2011).

Results

Table 4

Paired Samples T-tests on the Writing Entry Test's and Exit Test's Scores

<i>Pair</i>	<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Entry Test (N=38)</i>	<i>Exit Test (N=38)</i>	<i>M.D.</i>	<i>p</i>
		<i>M (S.D.)</i>	<i>M (S.D.)</i>		
P1	Content: Task Achievement	4.03 (1.44)	4.24 (1.38)	-0.21	0.073
P2	Organisation: Coherence & Cohesion	5.47 (1.45)	6.34 (1.28)	-0.87	0.000
P3	Vocabulary: Lexical Resource	4.53 (1.50)	4.68 (1.63)	-0.15	0.136
P4	Grammar: Grammatical Range & Accuracy	4.66 (1.07)	5.29 (1.16)	-0.63	0.000
P5	Overall	4.74 (1.25)	5.20 (1.25)	-0.46	0.000

As Table 4 displays, the intervention of process-genre approach made a considerable contribution to the test takers' effectively structuring their texts (P2, $M_{\text{entry test}} = 5.47$, $M_{\text{exit test}} = 6.34$, $M.D. = -0.87$) and correctly using various grammar points (P4, $M_{\text{entry test}} = 4.66$, $M_{\text{exit test}} = 5.29$, $M.D. = -0.63$). In addition, based on the results of Pair 5 and Pair 6, statistically significant differences in the sophomores' performance of textual

organisation and grammar before and after the treatment were found ($p = 0.000 < 0.050$), respectively. It is inferred that this approach made many students outperform the "Coherence and Cohesion" and "Grammatical Range and Accuracy" criteria.

Albeit process-genre approach positively enhanced the sophomores' gathering and developing content

IMPACTS OF PROCESS-GENRE APPROACH ON EFL SOPHOMORES' WRITING

for writing ($P1, M_{\text{entry test}} = 4.03, M_{\text{exit test}} = 4.24$), this change appeared to be not statistically significant ($M.D. = -0.21, p = 0.073 > 0.050$). Similarly, the students' better performance of the lexical criterion thanks to process-genre approach was witnessed ($P3, M_{\text{entry test}} = 4.53, M_{\text{exit test}} = 4.68$); yet, this positive change was also not statistically significant ($M.D. = -0.15, p = 0.136 > 0.050$). Inferentially, despite the presence of process-genre approach, many students still had low ongoing performance of the "Task Achievement" and "Lexical Resource" criteria.

Generally speaking, prior to the treatment, most of the sophomores failed to compose their good essays ($M = 4.74 < 5.00$; $S.D. = 1.25$), but after the treatment, many participants outperformed ($M = 5.20 > 5.00$; $S.D. = 1.25$). The results of P5 indicate a statistically significant change in the sophomores' overall writing performance after the treatment ($M.D. = -0.46, p = 0.000 < 0.050$). It means that this eclectic approach improved the EFL sophomores' writing ability in general.

The textual evidence in Table 5 was used to elucidate

Table 5

Textual Analysis of the Writing Entry Test and Exit Test

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Evaluated Aspects of Argumentative Text (N=38)</i>	<i>Entry Test</i>	<i>Exit Test</i>
Content	The text included at least 250 words.	10.5%	21.1%
	The text included enough 2 main ideas to fully respond to the writing task.	31.6%	47.4%
	The first main idea was clear.	23.7%	39.5%
	The supporting ideas to the first main idea was relevant and convincing.	18.4%	31.6%
	The second main idea was clear.	10.5%	23.7%
	The supporting ideas to the second main idea was relevant and convincing.	7.9%	15.8%
Organisation	The text included an introductory paragraph.	100.0%	100.0%
	The introductory paragraph presented the clear thesis statement.	50.0%	68.4%
	The text included two enough body paragraphs.	39.5%	84.2%
	The first body paragraph presented a clear topic sentence.	31.6%	60.5%
	The first body paragraph included at least 4 supporting sentences*.	15.8%	42.1%
	The second body paragraph presented a clear topic sentence.	26.3%	52.6%
	The second body paragraph included at least 4 supporting sentences*.	13.2%	28.9%
	The text included a concluding paragraph.	28.9%	71.1%
	The concluding paragraph restated the thesis statement.	15.8%	63.2%
The concluding paragraph included an extensive part (e.g. warning, suggestion).	7.9%	52.6%	
<i>(*) 4 sentences = one explanation + one elaboration + one example + one elaboration</i>			
Grammar	The average quantity of grammar items used in the whole text was ...	$\bar{X} = 6.4$	$\bar{X} = 8.1$
	The text fully included three sentence patterns: simple, complex, and compound.	13.2%	55.3%
	The average quantity of grammar errors in the introductory paragraph was ...	$\bar{X} = 4.3$	$\bar{X} = 2.9$
	The average quantity of grammar errors in the first body paragraph was ...	$\bar{X} = 7.2$	$\bar{X} = 5.8$
	The average quantity of grammar errors in the second body paragraph was ...	$\bar{X} = 6.6$	$\bar{X} = 5.2$
	The average quantity of grammar errors in the concluding paragraph was ...	$\bar{X} = 3.2$	$\bar{X} = 2.5$
Vocabulary	The text included at least two idioms or idiomatic expressions.	10.5%	18.4%
	The average quantity of advanced lexical items** in the introductory paragraph was ...	$\bar{X} = 21.3$	$\bar{X} = 22.0$
	The average quantity of advanced lexical items** in the first body paragraph was ...	$\bar{X} = 22.9$	$\bar{X} = 23.7$
	The average quantity of advanced lexical items** in the second body paragraph was ...	$\bar{X} = 22.2$	$\bar{X} = 22.8$
	The average quantity of advanced lexical items** in the concluding paragraph was ...	$\bar{X} = 21.4$	$\bar{X} = 22.3$
	<i>(**) advanced lexical items: C1 and C2 words (based on Online Cambridge Dictionary)</i>	$\bar{X} = 27.6$	$\bar{X} = 26.1$
	The average quantity of spelling mistakes in the introductory paragraph was ...	$\bar{X} = 211.9$	$\bar{X} = 29.0$
	The average quantity of spelling mistakes in the first body paragraph was ...	$\bar{X} = 211.5$	$\bar{X} = 29.2$
	The average quantity of spelling mistakes in the second body paragraph was ...	$\bar{X} = 27.2$	$\bar{X} = 25.5$
The average quantity of spelling mistakes items in the concluding paragraph was ...			

the test results presented in Table 4. To begin with the content criterion, still a tiny part of the students composed their writing texts at least 250 words as required regardless of the intervention. Positively, nearly half of them wrote enough two main ideas to fully respond to the writing task after the treatment; however, these ideas were mostly unclear or ambiguous. Though the students made progress in adding the relevant and convincing supporting ideas to the main ideas, this seemed insignificant. As for the organisation criterion, the intervention facilitated the students' textual structure to some extent. For instance, many students formulated their texts with enough four paragraphs as demanded (i.e. an introductory, two body, and a concluding paragraphs). Some students succeeded in providing the clear thesis statement, two clear topic sentences, and the clear idea restatement. Especially, more than half of writers were able to add an extensive part to the concluding paragraph. Nevertheless, only small proportion of the students composed enough four supporting sentences to each topic sentence. To the grammar criterion, the students' production of more varied grammar items through the texts was witnessed thanks to the

treatment although this change was small. Strikingly, beyond half of the students focused on different sentence patterns while writing, consisting of at least three common ones—simple, complex, and compound. In addition, the students’ incurring grammar items also reduced, but this change was inconsiderable. About the vocabulary criterion, it seemed that the intervention only assisted the students’ avoidance of making spelling mistakes to a certain extent. Nonetheless, this treatment failed to aid the students yielding advanced lexical items and idiomatic expressions.

As Table 6 depicts, the students’ self-efficacy of writing ideation increased after their exposure to process-genre approach. In specific, they were confident of the abilities to collect many original ideas (I1, M.D.= -0.16), to arrange and develop ideas coherently for writing (I2, M.D.= -0.76), to identify the textual moves of writing (I3, M.D.= -1.02), and to recognise different writing genres (I4, M.D.= -1.03). However, while the sophomores’ writing self-efficacy of the last three abilities existed a statistically significant change (P7, $p= 0.001$; P8, $p= 0.000$; P9, $p= 0.000$), that of the first ability was inconsiderable (P6, $p= 0.563 > 0.050$).

Similarly, the sophomores’ self-efficacy of writing

conventions was stronger after the training course in general. More specifically, the majority of students believed in the abilities to recollect many words and phrases (I5, M.D.= -0.29), to use synonyms, antonyms, collocations (I6, M.D.= -0.14), to spell words correctly (I7, M.D.= -0.60), to use a variety of grammatical items (I8, M.D.= -0.65), and to use a range of sentence structures for writing (I9, M.D.= -0.47). The change in the students’ writing self-efficacy of the first two abilities was not statistically significant (P10, $p= 0.110 > 0.050$; P11, $p= 0.625 > 0.050$); by contrast, that of the three last abilities was considerable (P12, $p= 0.027 < 0.050$; P13, $p= 0.004 < 0.050$; P14, $p= 0.040 < 0.050$).

Furthermore, process-genre approach positively enhanced the sophomores’ self-efficacy of writing self-regulations. For example, they were confident of the abilities to control frustration or anxiety when writing (I10, M.D.= -0.16), to start writing quickly (I11, M.D.= -0.24), and to administrate the allotted writing time (I12, M.D.= -0.97). As Table 6 documents, the difference in the students’ self-efficacy of the last ability before and after the treatment was statistically significant (P17, $p= 0.000$), but that of the first two abilities was found insignificant (P15, $p= 0.547 > 0.050$; P16, $p= 0.413 > 0.050$).

Table 6
Paired Samples T-tests on the Students’ Writing Self-Efficacy

Pair	Statements	Before (N=38)	After (N=38)	M.D.	p
		M (S.D.)	M (S.D.)		
<i>Writing Self-Efficacy of Writing Ideation</i>					
P6	I1: brainstorming and collecting original ideas	3.08 (1.26)	3.24 (1.20)	-0.16	0.563
P7	I2: arranging and developing ideas coherently	3.42 (1.27)	4.18 (1.31)	-0.76	0.001
P8	I3: identifying the textual moves of writing	3.32 (1.47)	4.34 (0.88)	-1.02	0.000
P9	I4: recognising different writing genres	3.26 (1.01)	4.29 (0.93)	-1.03	0.000
<i>Writing Self-Efficacy of Writing Conventions</i>					
P10	I5: thinking of many lexical items for writing	2.97 (1.22)	3.26 (1.52)	-0.29	0.110
P11	I6: using synonyms, antonyms, collocations for writing	2.89 (1.52)	3.03 (1.40)	-0.14	0.625
P12	I7: spelling vocabulary items correctly	3.45 (1.29)	4.05 (0.77)	-0.60	0.027
P13	I8: writing with a variety of grammar items	3.53 (1.13)	4.18 (0.93)	-0.65	0.004
P14	I9: writing with a range of sentence structures	3.74 (1.29)	4.21 (0.74)	-0.47	0.040
<i>Writing Self-Efficacy of Writing Self-Regulations</i>					
P15	I10: controlling frustration and anxiety while writing	3.16 (1.13)	3.32 (1.09)	-0.16	0.547
P16	I11: starting writing quickly	3.55 (1.16)	3.79 (1.26)	-0.24	0.413
P17	I12: administrating the allotted time	3.11 (1.27)	4.08 (0.67)	-0.97	0.000

Table 7
Paired Samples T-tests on the Students' of Writing Autonomy

Pair	Statements	Before (N=38)	After (N=38)	M.D.	p
		M (S.D.)	M (S.D.)		
<i>Awareness of Writing Autonomy</i>					
P18	I13: setting clear goals before starting writing	4.00 (0.96)	4.05 (1.19)	-0.05	0.843
P19	I14: following steps for writing completion	3.66 (1.19)	4.03 (0.80)	-0.63	0.015
P20	I15: reading various materials for writing revision	4.11 (1.06)	4.42 (0.64)	-0.31	0.110
P21	I16: self-assessing writing papers	4.39 (0.63)	4.55 (1.05)	-0.16	0.310
P22	I17: self-assessing writing learning process	4.34 (0.82)	4.61 (0.72)	-0.27	0.016
<i>Behaviors of Writing Autonomy</i>					
P23	I18: setting clear goals before starting writing	3.16 (1.46)	4.39 (0.76)	-1.23	0.000
P24	I19: following steps for writing completion	3.21 (1.34)	4.00 (1.27)	-0.79	0.008
P25	I20: reading various materials for writing revision	3.00 (1.27)	4.24 (1.28)	-1.24	0.000
P26	I21: self-assessing writing papers	2.95 (1.23)	3.26 (1.25)	-0.31	0.291
P27	I22: self-assessing writing learning process	2.55 (1.16)	3.00 (1.49)	-0.45	0.114

As Table 7 indicates, prior to the treatment, the majority of students held awareness of writing autonomy to a certain extent; for instance, they recognised the importance of setting writing goals (I13, $M=4.00$), following writing steps (I14, $M=3.66$), reading writing materials (I15, $M=4.11$), writing self-assessment (I16, $M=4.39$), and self-evaluating the learning process (I17, $M=4.34$). After the treatment, their awareness of this field remained positive, and was slightly enhanced (P18, $M.D.= -0.05$, $p=0.843$; P20, $M.D.= -0.31$, $p=0.110$; P21, $M.D.= -0.16$, $p=0.310$). Strikingly, the course raised the sophomores' awareness of writing steps and self-assessing the learning process considerably (P19, $p=0.015<0.050$; P22, $p=0.016<0.050$).

Besides, process-genre approach made a great contribution to the students' autonomous behaviors of writing. In specific, thanks to this experience, a large number of students set goals before writing (P23, $M.D.= -1.23$, $p=0.000$), accorded basic writing steps (P24, $M.D.= -0.79$, $p=0.008$), and consulted writing materials like classmates' essays (P25, $M.D.= -1.24$, $p=0.000$). However, many students still disregarded writing self-assessment for their writing (I21, $M_{\text{before}}=2.95$, $M_{\text{after}}=3.26$; P26, $p=0.291>0.050$) and for the learning process (I22, $M_{\text{before}}=2.55$, $M_{\text{after}}=3.30$; P27, $p=0.114>0.050$).

Discussion

The first research question was formed to confirm the effectiveness of process-genre approach on the EFL university students' writing performance of content, textual organisation, vocabulary, and grammar.

Overall, the sample performed the writing exit test better than the entry test to a certain degree, especially about organisation and grammar. Thus, **H1** was met. This result was partly aligned with previous studies (e.g. Agesta & Cahyono, 2017; Alabere & Shapii, 2019; Janenoppakarn, 2016). While these previous studies witnessed a substantial progress in content, textual organisation, vocabulary, and grammar of the students' writing via process-genre approach, the study documented the contribution of this approach to textual organisation and grammar only. During the writing sessions driven by the target approach, the sophomores were exposed to two text genres, including report and argumentative, repetitively, the former with two sessions and the latter with four sessions. Pertaining to argumentative text, the approach enabled many students to devise their four-paragraph essays through modelling and planning stages. In addition, they had chances to discuss, send to, and receive feedback from their fellow writers about the coherence and cohesion of writing in joint constructing, independent constructing, and revising stages. Especially, at the end of the lessons, the teacher reinforced the students' understandings of the target genre and key formulaic expressions. It might attest the students' better performance of the organisation criterion. Besides, the modelling and joint constructing stages of the lessons informed the students of various sentence patterns and grammar units; plus, the independent constructing and revising stages allowed them to apply these linguistic features to their writing. Consequently, the test takers' a bit better performance of the grammar criterion was explicable; for example, more grammar items and enough three typical sentence patterns (i.e. simple, complex, and

compound) sought in the exit test. Yet, this approach did not make significant improvement in both content and vocabulary. To the former, the students severely lacked topical or social knowledge for writing despite the similarity of the exit test topic to the training course, whilst foreign language writing always embraces diversifying themes and topics. Coupled with the limited duration (merely 40 minutes), this scarcity impeded many students fulfilling the demand for word count (at least 250 words), and garnering adequate and clear information for their task response. Yet, it is undeniable that this approach helped some students manage the writing task more strategically by supplying it within at least two main ideas, which was greatly contributed by modelling, planning, joint constructing stages of the previous sessions. To the latter, many students merely recollected basic and common words while writing, but good writing ability also required them to yield advanced words, and accurate collocations and idioms. Though the lessons driven by the target approach, especially in modelling and planning stages, furnished the students with necessary topic-based linguistic input, they failed to recollect it for the essay due to the temporal pressure and their severe lexical dearth. Positively, joint constructing and revising stages of the previous lessons improved the students' word spelling a little bit. Hence, preparation and expansion of lexical and topic inputs for writing, and extensive practice should be focused on a regular basis. Briefly, process-genre approach benefited the students' overall writing performance to a certain extent.

The second research question was used to testify the effectiveness of process-genre approach on the EFL university students' writing self-efficacy. On the whole, the sample displayed stronger beliefs in their writing ability considering writing ideation (e.g., content, organisation), convention (e.g., grammar, vocabulary), and self-regulation (e.g., affection or time management) thanks to the treatment. This finding validated the positive correlation between process-genre approach and writing self-efficacy in literature, and was aligned with foregoing studies such as Zhang (2018), and Abdullah (2019). Accordingly, **H2** was met. It is worth noting that those who possess stronger writing self-efficacy might gain better writing performance (Blasco, 2016; Demirel & Aydin, 2019). Yet, like the test results of "Task Achievement", albeit the aid of process-genre approach, the students' beliefs in topical knowledge for writing remained low. Besides, similar to the test results of "Lexical Resource", many students remained a low confidence level of their lexical knowledge for writing regardless of the treatment. Evidently, some

sophomores were still skeptical of the ability to control their anxiety when writing. It means that the students were presumed to recognise their current deficiencies in topical and lexical inputs; hence, it is imperative that they accumulate both topical and lexical knowledge for writing regularly. By anyway, process-genre approach reinforced the students' self-efficacy to some extent.

To seek the impact of process-genre approach on the sophomores' writing autonomy, **the third research question** was added. In general, process-genre approach made a positive contribution to the students' awareness and behaviors of autonomous writing learning, which had been recognised by foregoing studies such as Arteaga-Lara (2017), and Abdel-Haq, *et al.* (2020). That is to say, **H3** was met. In essence, during the training course, the students had chances to work actively with their classmates, and themselves; concurrently, they were instructed to plan, control, and regulate their own writing act. Clearly, the target approach created a convenient environment to foster the students' writing autonomy, as noted by Salim, *et al.* (2016). Behaviourally, many participants still dismissed the self-assessment of both writing paper and learning process despite the presence of process-genre approach. The students are expected to enact this autonomous action strictly so that they can define what strengths to promote and what weaknesses to minimise (Truong, *et al.*, 2019) for higher writing performance. This approach, hopefully, may empower the sophomores' writing autonomy significantly, which inhibits them from their passive fossilised habit of memorising and imitating the sample texts without independent writing strategies, as mentioned earlier.

Conclusion

The results of the study shed light on the practicality of process-genre approach towards EFL sophomores' writing learning in the Vietnamese context. Firstly, the results showed that the target approach made the students' overall writing performance better to a certain degree, especially for "Coherence and Cohesion" and "Grammatical Range and Accuracy" criteria. Secondly, the study revealed that it made the students' general writing self-efficacy of writing ideation, conventions, and self-regulations stronger. Lastly, from the results, this eclectic approach enhanced the students' both awareness and behaviors of writing autonomy, especially pertinent to autonomous writing steps and techniques. Thus, process-genre approach should be conducted in further writing classes.

To pedagogical implications, despite the treatment of process-genre approach, many students still failed to perform "Task Achievement" and "Lexical Resource" criteria well, which strongly correlated to their low confidence of topical and lexical knowledge and quite high writing anxiety after the intervention. Thus, the students should spend time broadening these indispensable inputs, and practicing this productive skill more frequently. For example, the teachers should ask their students to prepare ideas, vocabulary, and relevant idiomatic expressions prior to each process-genre lesson via mind-mapping technique. Besides, the lecturers can provide their students with a course of topic-based writing assignments and key prompts for their self-study after each lesson. Besides, the lecturers should ask the students to store their papers in a portfolio, and afterward give them both formative and summative assessment, and even self-assessment. Notably, the target approach might be not powerful enough for the students to spend time on writing self-assessment. It is suggested that the students do it heedfully to self-regulate their writing learning path, whilst the lecturers highlight its obligation, and facilitate their self-assessing practice with instructed self-evaluation checklists during the Independent Construction and Revision stages of further lessons driven by process-genre approach.

Though the researcher endeavored to gain the success of the study, there still remained drawbacks. First, owing to time shortage, the researcher merely testified the students' writing improvement of argumentative text (IELTS Task 2), but excluded that of report text (IELTS Task 1) which was also taught in this study. Thus, for further studies, researchers should measure the students' writing performance of all text genres taught in the studies. Second, use of a single tool like questionnaires to measure the students' writing self-efficacy and writing autonomy appeared to be inadequate, under the temporal restriction. Thus, for further studies, researchers should diversify instruments to gain credible data in depth and breadth; for instance, interviews, observations, or diaries. Third, due to the incomplete convenience, the researcher merely recruited one small sample into the experiment, making it hard to generalize the findings to other pedagogical settings and subjects. Hence, the effectiveness of process-genre approach should be attested among larger population in further research. Lastly, under temporal restriction and particular research aims, the correlation among three variables, i.e. writing performance, writing self-efficacy, and writing autonomy, was not addressed. Thus, this correlation should be verified in further studies.

Declaration of Competing Interest

None declared.

References

- Abdel-Haq, E. M., Atta, H. T., & Ali, A. A. H. (2020). A suggested web-mediated process genre-based program for developing writing autonomy of EFL prospective teachers. *Sohag University International Journal of Educational Research*, 2(2), 30-50. <https://dx.doi.org/10.21608/suijer.2020.97630>
- Abdullah, H. M. A. (2019). The effect of process-genre approach for developing English writing skills of secondary school students and reducing their writing anxiety. *CDELTA Occasional Papers*, 68(1), 513-528. <https://doi.org/10.21608/opde.2019.132690>
- Agesta, S., & Cahyono, B. Y. (2017). Effect of process-genre approach on the Indonesian EFL writing achievement across personality. *International Journal of English Language and Linguistics Research*, 5(3), 39-48.
- Alabere, R. A., & Shapii, A. (2019). The effects of process-genre approach on academic writing. *Journal of English Educators Society*, 4(2), 89-98. <https://doi.org/10.21070/jees.v4i2.2598>
- Alnasser, S. M. N. (2013). *A new form of peer feedback technique: An investigation into the impact of focusing Saudi ESL learners on macro level writing features* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Newcastle University.
- Arteaga-Lara, H. M. (2017). Using the process-genre approach to improve fourth-grade EFL learners' paragraph writing. *Latin American Journal of Content and Language Integrated Learning*, 10(2), 217-244. <https://doi.org/10.5294/laclil.2017.10.2.3>
- Babalola, L. H. A. (2012). Effects of process-genre based approach on the written English performance of computer science students in a Nigerian polytechnic. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 3(6), 1-7.
- Badger, R., & White, G. (2000). A process genre approach to teaching writing. *ELT Journal*, 54(2), 153-160. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/elt/54.2.153>
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive view*. Prentice Hall.
- Barkaoui, K. (2007). Teaching writing to second language learners: Insights from theory and research. *TESL REPORTER*, 40(1), 35-48.
- Blasco, J. A. (2016). The relationship between writing anxiety, writing self-efficacy, and Spanish EFL students' use of metacognitive writing strategies: A case study. *Journal of English Studies*, 14, 7-45. <https://doi.org/10.18172/jes.3069>

- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. Pearson Education.
- Bruning, R., Dempsey, M., Kauffman, D. F., McKim, C., & Zumbunn, S. (2013). Examining dimensions of self-efficacy for writing. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 105*(1), 25-38. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029692>
- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research methods*. Oxford University Press.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research methods in education*. Routledge.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative*. Pearson Education.
- Demirel, M. V., & Aydin, I. S. (2019). Examining high school students' writing self-efficacy perceptions. *International Journal of Education & Literacy Studies, 7*(4), 106-113. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.7n.4p.106>
- Derewianka, B. (1990). *Exploring how text works*. Primary ELT Association.
- Deng, L., Chen, Q., & Zhang, Y. (2014). *Developing Chinese EFL learners' generic competence: A genre-based and process-genre approach*. Springer.
- Duong, M. T. (2015). *A portfolio-based learner autonomy development model in an EFL writing course* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Suranaree University of Technology.
- Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, N. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics, 5*(1), 1-4. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11>
- Fayol, M., Alamargot, D., & Berninger, V. W. (Eds.). (2012). *Translation of thought to written text while composing*. Psychology Press.
- Frankfort-Nachmias, C. & Nachmias, D. (2004). *Research methods in the social sciences*. Edward Arnold Publishers.
- Gall, M. D., Walter, R. B., & Joyce, P. G. (2007). *Educational research: An introduction*. Allyn and Bacon.
- Gupitasari, H. (2013). The implementation of process-genre approach to teaching writing business letter. *Journal of English & Education, 1*(2), 23-30.
- Hashemnejad, F., Zoghi, M., & Amini, D. (2015). The relationship between self-efficacy and writing performance across genders. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 4*(5), 1045-1052. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.4.5.1045-1052>
- Hayes, J. R. (2012). Evidence from language bursts, revision, and transcription for translation and its relation to other writing processes. In M. Fayol, D. Alamargot, & V. W. Berninger (Eds.), *Translation of thought to written text while composing: Advancing theory, knowledge, research methods, tools, and applications* (pp. 15–25). Psychology Press.
- Ho, M. (2016). Exploring writing anxiety and self-efficacy among EFL graduate students in Taiwan. *Higher Education Studies, 6*(1), 24-39. <https://doi.org/10.5539/hes.v6n1p24>
- Holec, H. (1981). *Autonomy and foreign language learning*. Pergamon Press.
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge University Press.
- Janenoppakarn, C. (2016). *Effects of using process-genre approach on the teaching of writing: A case study of higher and lower proficient EFL students* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Thammasat University.
- Khanalizadeh, B., & Allami, H. (2012). The impact of teachers' belief on EFL writing instruction. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 2*(2), 334-342. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.2.2.334-342>
- Kim, Y., & Kim, J. (2005). Teaching Korean university writing class: Balancing the process and the genre approach. *Asian EFL Journal, 7*(2), 1-15. <http://doi.org/10.12691/education-3-7-3>
- Koshy, V. (2005). *Action research for Improving practice: A practical guide*. Sage.
- Ly, H. T. D. H. (2014). *Peer feedback implementation and the effects of trained peer feedback on students' writing quality at Ho Chi Minh City Open University* [Unpublished master's dissertation]. Ho Chi Minh City Open University.
- Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2005). *Second language research: Methodology and design*. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Mekki, C. (2012). *The student awareness of writing skill: The case study third year students at Biskra University* [Unpublished master's dissertation]. Biskra University.
- Mohammed, M. (2010). *Using Wikis to develop writing performance among prospective English as a foreign language teacher*. Retrieved from <http://www.nauss.edu.sa/acit/PDFs/f1766.pdf>
- Pallant, J. (2011). *SPSS survival guide: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS for windows*. Open University Press.
- Rusinovci, X. (2015). Teaching writing through process-genre based approach. *US-China Education Review A, 5*(10), 699-705. <https://doi.org/10.17265/2161-623X/2015.10.006>
- Salim, N. A., Walker, S. M., & Rosenblatt, K. (2016). Teachers' perceptions on the effectiveness of a process-genre approach on the writing skills of students with dyslexia. *Asia Pacific Journal of Developmental Differences, 3*(1), 35-61. <https://doi.org/10.3850/S2345734114000217>
- Schmitt, N. (2010). *An introduction to applied linguistics*. Hodder Education.

- Schunk, H. D. (2003). Self-efficacy for reading and writing: Influence of modelling, goal setting, and self-evaluation. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 19(2), 159-172. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10573560308219>
- Sharadgah, T. A. (2013). Writing in an Internet-based environment: Improving EFL students' writing performance through text-based chat. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3(14), 258-266.
- Spycher, P. (2007). Academic writing of adolescent English learners: learning to use "although". *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16, 238-254. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.07.001>
- Taghizadeh, M. (2014). Contribution of writing autonomy to the writing performance of EFL learners based on CEFR. *English Language Teaching*, 1(3), 58-85.
- Truong, M. H., & Pham, V. P. H. (2017). High school teachers' pedagogical beliefs in English as a foreign language writing instruction. *Journal of Science: Ho Chi Minh City Open University*, 7(4), 21-33.
- Truong, M. H., Nguyen, T. T. T., & Luu, T. H. T. (2019). The English-majored sophomores' self-perception of autonomous language learning. *English Language Teaching*, 12(12), 119-131. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v12n12p119>
- Uddin, M. E. (2014). Teachers' pedagogical belief and its reflection on the practice in teaching writing in EFL tertiary context in Bangladesh. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 5(29), 116-129.
- Villagrasa, P. J. R., Iglesias, I. S., Prado, M. G., Blázquez, B. O., Peña, J. M., & Lizaga, P. C. (2018). Spanish version of "Self-Efficacy for Writing Scale". *Anales De Psicología*, 34(1), 86-91. <https://doi.org/10.6018/analesps.34.1.264931>
- Yan, G. (2005). A process genre model for teaching writing. *English Teaching Forum*, 43(3), 18-26.
- Yeung, M. (2016). Exploring the construct of learner autonomy in writing: The roles of motivation and the teacher. *English Language Teaching*, 9(8), 122-139. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n8p122>
- 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), 42-54. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v12n9p42>
- Zhang, Y. (2018). Exploring EFL learners' self-efficacy in academic writing based on process-genre approach. *English Language Teaching*, 11(6), 115-124. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v11n6p115>
- Zimmerman, B., & Kitsantas, A. (2007). Reliability and validity of Self-Efficacy for Learning Form (SELF) scores of college students. *Journal of Psychology*, 215(3), 157-163. <https://doi.org/10.1027/0044-3409.215.3.157>