The Impact of the Process Approach on Timed Writing Performance of EFL University Students in Japan

Yasunori Matsuzono

Abstract

This study investigates whether the process approach to teaching writing can enhance Japanese EFL university students' performance on a timed essay task—a format commonly used in academic and high-stakes testing. Nineteen first-year students participated in a 15-week writing course that included structured instruction, peer review, and teacher feedback. Quantitative analyses comparing pre- and post-essays revealed improvements in paragraph organization and gains in sentence and word counts, reflecting a stronger ability to organize ideas under time constraints. Move analysis of the essays further demonstrated increased awareness of rhetorical structure, as shown by more consistent use of expected moves and improved sequencing across paragraphs. Despite these achievements, some challenges remained, particularly in content scope and the elaboration of supporting details. Overall, the findings support the effectiveness of the process approach in EFL writing instruction for timed tasks and suggest directions for future research on broader aspects of writing development.

keywords: process approach, time writing, EFL university students, move analysis, peer and teacher feedback

1. Introduction

Writing has long been regarded as an essential component of language education in academic settings worldwide. Over time, numerous efforts have been made to establish different approaches to teaching writing and to explore their benefits and potential challenges. One widely used approach is the *process approach*, which has been advocated for nearly 50 years, following a major shift in the 1970s and 1980s as a reaction against the traditional *product approach* (Applebee, 1986). Although some researchers and practitioners have proposed alternative methods, such as the *genre approach* (Hyland, 2003) and the *process-genre approach* (Badger & White, 2000), the process approach is still regarded as a dominant framework in many classrooms. Implementing this approach in university settings re-

mains essential, as it helps learners develop critical thinking skills, gain confidence, and refine their writing through continuous revision and feedback. Particularly in academic contexts where independent writing is highly valued, the process approach provides a solid pedagogical foundation for student success.

Despite these advantages, one area of concern is its effectiveness in preparing students for timed writing tasks. Timed writing assessments are commonly used in academic and high-stakes testing contexts to evaluate students' ability to produce structured and coherent essays under time constraints. However, prior research has suggested that students trained under the process approach may struggle to adapt their writing strategies to such constrained conditions, as they are accustomed to having extended periods for revision and editing (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2013; Hyland, 2021). This raises an important pedagogical question: Can the process approach be effectively integrated into instruction to enhance timed writing performance without compromising its pedagogical benefits?

To address this issue, the present study investigates the impact of the process approach on EFL university students in Japan, specifically examining whether this instructional method improves students' ability to compose well-structured and coherent essays within a limited time frame. By analyzing students' performance and identifying potential challenges they encounter in timed writing, this research aims to contribute to the ongoing discussion on the applicability of process-based instruction in EFL writing classrooms, particularly in the context of Japanese university learners.

Two research questions guide this inquiry:

1. Does the process approach to teaching writing improve students' performance on a timed essay?

2. What issues can be identified from timed essays written by students exposed to this instructional method?

2. Literature Review

Process Approach

The process approach to teaching writing has been promoted as an alternative to the traditional product approach, and it has been widely accepted and implemented in English writing instruction. Hedge (2000) indicates that the principal purpose of the process approach is to support learners so they can more effectively manage the cognitive strategies involved in writing. In a similar vein, Jaladdin (2019) points out that the process approach aims to create a supportive learning environment in which students become active participants in composing their own texts.

To successfully achieve these objectives, it is important to clarify which writing activities

should ideally be integrated into the process approach. Tribble (1996) introduces four major activities commonly reported: prewriting, composing, revising, and editing. Prewriting includes specifying the task, planning and outlining, collecting data, and making notes. Revising involves reorganizing, changing emphasis, and adjusting information and style for a specific readership. Editing focuses on checking grammar, vocabulary, and other linguistic features such as punctuation and spelling.

While the initial diagram presented by Tribble (1996) appears to follow a linear model, many researchers argue that the process of writing is not linear. Rather, writing is better understood as a recursive activity, where writers move back and forth between different stages (Alodwan & Ibnian, 2014; Hedge, 2005; Rusinovci, 2015). While it is true that writing is inherently recursive, it is my firm belief that classroom instruction should emphasize the pedagogical value of clearly structured stages in the writing process. In particular, providing students with a suggestive sequence—such as prewriting, initial drafting, redrafting, and finalizing—helps them engage more confidently and systematically with academic writing tasks. Especially for EFL learners, who may face additional linguistic and cognitive challenges, such a structured approach offers essential guidance and promotes greater writing fluency.

When discussing the effectiveness of the process approach to teaching writing, one issue that arises is the validity of implementing teacher and peer feedback. With regard to teacher feedback, studies have shown that learners typically expect and appreciate receiving comments on their writing (Muncie, 2000). Zou et al. (2022) argue that teacher feedback supported by technology is considerably more effective than self-generated feedback in facilitating collaborative writing and promoting cognitive engagement in the learning process. Cui et al. (2021) further highlight that teacher feedback yields similarly positive outcomes in enhancing students' writing competence and their sense of writing self-efficacy. On the other hand, from a theoretical perspective, teacher feedback is often viewed as more critical, in contrast to other forms of feedback that tend to offer less harsh input (Cui et al., 2021). In addition, the heavy workload involved in providing feedback beyond mere grammar correction, combined with large class sizes in university settings, often hinders instructors from delivering sufficient feedback to every student, resulting in limited benefits for learners (Zou et al., 2022).

To address these challenges, research studies have explored the effectiveness of implementing peer feedback and have reported substantial benefits. Jones and Dicicco (2019) point out that the primary value of peer review lies not in the feedback received but in the cognitive and reflective processes involved in giving feedback to others, which positively influence students' critical thinking skills and revision practices. Another advantage of peer review is its potential to encourage and motivate L2 writers, as feedback from peers—who share similar writing experiences—is often perceived as more supportive and less authoritative than that provided by teachers (Rollinson, 2005). On the other hand, some studies have cautioned against potential drawbacks. A major concern is the lack of

clear guidance on how to evaluate peers' writing, which can result in vague or unconstructive feedback and leave writers uncertain about the meaning or usefulness of the comments provided (Otsu, 2014). Another concern pertains to students' unwillingness to engage in peer review, stemming from either insufficient grammatical knowledge or fear of giving inappropriate comments (Hatakeyama, 2020; Srichanyachon, 2011).

The discussions regarding teacher and peer feedback highlight the complementary nature of the two approaches. While teacher feedback provides authoritative and structured input that supports writing development, peer feedback offers cognitive and affective benefits, such as increased engagement and reflective thinking. A balanced integration of both types of feedback may help maximize learning outcomes while addressing the challenges inherent in each.

Move Analysis

This study adopts the concept of move analysis to investigate students' timed essays, making it necessary to clarify the definition of a *move* as it relates to genre structure (Bhatia, 1993; Henry & Roseberry, 2001; Mirador, 2000; Swales, 1990). According to Mirador (2000) and Henry and Roseberry (2001), a move is defined as a functional unit—typically a sentence or a group of sentences—that performs a specific rhetorical function and contributes to the overall communicative purpose of a particular genre. Moves are typically classified into two categories: (1) obligatory moves, which occur consistently across texts within a given corpus, and (2) optional moves, which appear less frequently but are still recognizable and functionally relevant (Mirador, 2000). The sequence in which these moves occur—referred to as the allowable move order—includes both obligatory and optional moves and represents the typical rhetorical structure found within the genre (Henry & Roseberry, 1997, 2001).

The concept of move analysis has been widely applied to the study of written texts, primarily in professional contexts (e.g., Park et al., 2021; Thumnong & Tongpoon-Patanasorn, 2017), but it has also been adopted in academic settings. Scholars have applied move analysis to a wide range of academic texts, including student essays from various contexts (Henry & Roseberry, 1997), tutors' written feedback (Mirador, 2000), research article abstracts in ELT (Kaya & Yagiz, 2020), and undergraduate argumentative essays from the Philippines (Escandallo, 2021). Among them, Henry and Roseberry (1997) made a significant contribution by outlining a framework that distinguishes between obligatory and optional moves and specifies permissible move sequences, offering valuable insights into text organization. However, their analysis was limited to introductions and conclusions, leaving body paragraphs unexamined.

The work of Escandallo (2021) also aligns with this study's focus on analyzing timed essays written by Japanese undergraduate students. A key contribution is the identification of structural elements within specific paragraphs—such as the hook, generalization, and thesis statement in intro-

ductions—which serves as a useful reference for this analysis. One limitation, however, is the treatment of the introduction, body, and conclusion as distinct moves defined by paragraph boundaries. This contrasts with the view of moves—as rhetorical units determined by the purpose of a sentence or group of sentences—advanced by Mirador (2000) and Henry and Roseberry (2001). This requires adapting Escandallo's approach to better suit the context of the present study.

3. Methodology

Participants

The study involved 19 first-year students enrolled in the Department of International Business in 2022. All participants were CEFR B1-level English learners prior to taking the target class and were scheduled to study abroad in their second year, as required by their department. During their first year, students took two English Communication (EC) classes: EC A, which focused on academic reading, discussions, and presentations, and EC B, which emphasized academic writing through multiple-draft essays supported by logical arguments and textual integration. Each course included 90 hours of instruction over 15 weeks. Table 1 presents students' prior writing experiences.

Table 1

Participants' Previous Experiences with Writing Activities (n=19)

Experiences	Yes / n (%)	No / n (%)
Learning how to write an English essay	9 (47.4%)	10 (52.6%)
Creating English essays as writing assignments	9 (47.4%)	10 (52.6%)
Performing the peer review task	6 (31.6%)	13 (68.4%)
Receiving teacher's feedback for their essays	11 (57.9%)	8 (42.1%)

As shown, nearly half had prior experience writing essays and receiving teacher feedback, while most (68.4%) had not engaged in peer review, suggesting that collaborative revision was relatively unfamiliar.

Writing Instruction

As previously noted, while writing itself is recursive, writing instruction in classroom settings should emphasize the pedagogical value of clearly structured stages in the writing process. This is particularly important given the proficiency levels and prior writing experience of the students targeted in this study. In addition, the positive aspects of teacher and peer feedback examined earlier have prompted the integration of these feedback methods into the writing instruction, while also considering their potential drawbacks. With this in mind, and incorporating the basic framework advo-

cated by Tribble (1996), this study implemented a four-stage process approach:

・Stage 1: Prewriting

Students brainstormed ideas in response to a given question, analyzed a model essay, and created outlines aligned with the expected structure.

・Stage 2: Draft 1 Composition

Students wrote their first drafts using their outlines and participated in peer review, guided by carefully prepared instructions due to their limited prior experience. The feedback mainly focused on organization, language use, and grammar.

・Stage 3: Draft 2 Composition

Students revised their drafts using peer feedback. While some made substantial content changes, most focused on surface-level edits. After submission, teacher feedback addressed content, logic, and clarity, and also included references to the positive aspects of their second drafts, along with encouraging comments to support the development of the final draft.

・Stage 4: Final Draft Composition

Students refined their drafts based on teacher feedback, focusing on content and structure before addressing grammar and formatting. Final drafts were submitted via the university's e-learning system.

Under this instructional model, students completed two major essay assignments during the semester. Their key features are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2

Key Features of the Essay Assignments in EC B (Spring 2022)

Title	Assignment 1: Essay	Assignment 2: Essay
Topic	Study abroad	Journalism
Text type	Expository	Argumentative
In-text citation	Not required	One in each body paragraph

Topics were selected to connect students' writing with their upcoming study abroad experiences and the content of the EC A textbook, while essay types were based on the EC B textbook developed by Chin et al. (2012). Assignment 1 did not require in-text citations, as students were still adjusting to university-level writing. In contrast, Assignment 2 required at least one in-text citation per body paragraph to encourage objective support for their arguments.

Data Collection and Analysis

This study compared (1) pre-essays, written at the beginning of the semester, and (2) post-essays, written during the final class after 15 weeks in the spring semester. Both essays were based on

the same prompt: *University students study abroad for many different reasons. Why do you think university students study abroad? Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.* Students had 30 minutes to complete each task. The writing format reflected the TOEFL iBT Independent Writing Task, which had been used for more than 35 years until July 2023 (ETS, 2025, 2020).

It was anticipated that, in the post-essays, students would express their ideas more effectively, having brainstormed and organized their thoughts through Assignment 1 completed during the course. Notably, the post-essay prompt was not provided in advance, helping to ensure fairness by minimizing preparation advantages and maintaining the same spontaneous writing conditions as the pre-essays.

Essays were first analyzed for structure, categorized into introductory, body, and concluding paragraphs. Metrics such as paragraph, sentence, and word count were collected. Where needed, separate-line sentences were grouped semantically into paragraphs.

The study then proceeded with the implementation of a move analysis. The first step was to develop an original move framework based on Henry and Roseberry (1997), Escandallo (2021), and Chin et al. (2012). Nine initial moves were tested in a pilot study, resulting in a revised set of seven. These were finalized following a second pilot study to better reflect the specific characteristics of the pre- and post-essays.

After establishing the moves, the frequency of each move was calculated, and the order of moves was recorded. Essays were then categorized into introductory, body, and concluding paragraphs to identify common patterns in move order within each paragraph type. At this stage, careful observation was conducted to clarify improvements from pre-essays to post-essays and to identify potential issues that emerged in the post-essays.

4. Findings and Discussions

Paragraph, Sentence, and Word Counts

The study quantitatively analyzed the paragraph, sentence, and word counts in the pre-essay and post-essay. In the pre-essay, the average paragraph count was 2.6, distributed as follows: 1 paragraph in 8 essays, 2 paragraphs in 1 essay, 3 paragraphs in 2 essays, 4 paragraphs in 7 essays, and 5 paragraphs in 1 essay. In contrast, in the post-essay, the average paragraph count increased to 4.1, with only two distribution patterns: 4 paragraphs in 15 essays and 5 paragraphs in 4 essays. The average sentence count per essay also exhibited a significant increase. In the pre-essay, students wrote an average of 9.1 sentences, with totals ranging from 4 to 15. In the post-essay, however, the count nearly doubled to 18.3, extending from 14 to 26. A notable change was observed in the word count. The pre-essay had an average of 120.2 words, with a range of 66 to 248. By contrast, the post-essay

showed a substantial increase, averaging 266.7 words, with individual essays ranging from 200 to 415 words. Notably, 13 of the post-essays exceeded 250 words. (See Tables A and B in the Appendix for a detailed breakdown.)

These findings provide valuable insights into the students' writing development over the 15-week course. The relatively uniform paragraph patterns in the post-essay suggest that students adopted a more structured approach to essay organization, possibly influenced by instructional guidance during the course. The growth in sentence count indicates an expansion of content, with students demonstrating an ability to elaborate on their ideas more extensively. Moreover, the substantial rise in word count throughout the essay highlights an improvement in idea development, suggesting that students became more fluent in expressing their thoughts in writing.

Moves Identification

In this study, seven distinct moves were recognized for examining the pre- and post-essays, each assigned a specific code (see Table 3).

Table 3

Description of the Moves and Codes for This Study

Move	Code	Examples from Post-Essays
Making a General Statement	MGS	*Education plays an important role in modern society and more and more students choose to study abroad in order to pursue higher education. Some people think going to an unfamiliar country requires too much effort and money to go to.*
Making a Thesis Statement	MTS	*However, the advantages of studying abroad were obvious: new life experience and language skills.*
Giving a Reason	GR	*First, study-abroad experience provides students a totally different life experience.*
Giving Details	GD	*It is undeniable that the students who study abroad can widen their horizons because of a brand-new life experience with a different world view. What is more, students will have a lot of opportunities to meet people from various backgrounds. Because of that, students will become more open-minded and gain a precious and unforgettable experience in their lives.*
Making a Closing Sentence	MCS	*If the students eager to learn languages and also new learnings as well, the students will think that the joining to the study abroad program would be the best choice to learn things.*
Restating a Thesis Statement	RTS	*In conclusion, there are multiple benefits for students to join study-abroad program. For many of them, the reason is to gain new life experience. Others want to acquire a foreign language.*
Expressing a Final Thought	EFT	*Although going to a new country and start a new life can be very challenging, the advantages are obvious. Therefore, I strongly believe overseas study will bring great influence on students' lives.*

The moves serve distinct rhetorical purposes, ranging from Making a General Statement (MGS) to Expressing a Final Thought (EFT). The MGS move introduces the main topic identified in

the writing prompt, often presenting a general perspective with possible interpretations, without including the writer's personal stance. The Making a Thesis Statement (MTS) move clearly expresses the writer's own opinion in direct response to the prompt. Both the MGS and MTS moves typically appear in the introductory paragraph.

In the body paragraphs, three moves were identified: Giving a Reason (GR), Giving Details (GD), and Making a Closing Sentence (MCS). The GR move presents a core reason that directly and logically supports the MTS move, which is generally regarded as the topic sentence in academic writing. The GD move reinforces the GR move by providing specific examples, explanations, or elaborations that illustrate or clarify the stated reason. These details enhance the persuasiveness and clarity of the argument, contributing to the overall coherence of the paragraph. The MCS move typically appears as the final sentence of the body paragraph, restating the GR move and briefly referencing the points introduced in the GD move. These three moves reflect the conventional structure of academic essays, serving as the topic sentence, supporting sentences, and concluding sentence, respectively (Chin et al., 2012).

The concluding paragraphs included two distinct rhetorical moves: Restating the Thesis Statement (RTS) and Expressing a Final Thought (EFT). The RTS move reinforces the writer's position by rephrasing the thesis originally presented in the introductory paragraph. The EFT move signals the end of the essay by offering an additional comment that further supports the writer's stance.

Moves in the introductory paragraph

In the introductory paragraph, two moves were observed in both the pre-essays and post-essays, but their frequencies and move orders showed different patterns, as indicated in Table 4.

Table 4

Move and Move Order in the Introductory Paragraph

		Pre-essay (n=11)	Post-essay (n=19)
Move	Making a General Statement (MGS)	2	19
	Making a Thesis Statement (MTS)	11	19
Move order	MGS → MTS	2	19
	MTS	11	0

Although only 2 of the 19 pre-essays included the MGS move and 11 featured the MTS move, all 19 post-essays contained both moves in the introductory paragraph. Interestingly, while the pre-essays showed two distinct move orders, the post-essays consistently followed the same sequence: MGS ^ MTS (where ^ indicates "precedes"). This uniformity suggests that, by the end of the 15-

week course, all students had successfully learned how to structure their introductory paragraphs in a timed essay. This change may indicate a growing awareness of effective organizational patterns.

On the other hand, a close examination of the content within each move revealed three main issues. First, in two post-essays, the writers misunderstood the prompt, leading to a core stance in the MTS move that deviated from the given topic. Second, three post-essays demonstrated vagueness in the writer's position by presenting overly broad ideas in the MTS move. Third, in two cases, the writers relied too heavily on general statements or included both the general statements and the thesis statement with excessive wordiness. Notably, one student was unable to complete the post-essay, and this unfinished work included an excessive amount of information in both the MGS and MTS moves. These patterns suggest that some students may have struggled with managing content scope within the introductory paragraph. This finding highlights the need for more targeted instruction on interpreting prompts accurately, narrowing ideas effectively, and avoiding the inclusion of too much content in the introductory paragraph during timed writing tasks.

Moves in the body paragraph

The study revealed that three moves were present in both the pre-essays and post-essays within the body paragraphs, and their frequencies and move orders showed similar patterns in body paragraphs 1 and 2 of the post-essays. Table 5 summarizes these aspects for both body paragraphs.

Table 5

Move and Move Order in Body Paragraphs 1 and 2

Body Paragraph 1		Pre-essay (n=10)	Post-essay (n=19)
Move	Giving a Reason 1 (GR1)	9	19
	Giving Details 1 (GD1)	10	19
	Making a Closing Sentence 1 (MCS1)	0	6
Move order	GR1 → GD1 → MCS1	0	6
	GR1 → GD1	8	12
	GD1	1	0
	GD1 → GR1	1	1
Body Paragraph 2		Pre-essay (n=8)	Post-essay (n=19)
Move	Giving a Reason 2 (GR2)	8	19
	Giving Details 2 (GD2)	4	19
	Making a Closing Sentence 1 (MCS2)	0	7
Move order	GR2 → GD2 → MCS2	0	7
	GR2 → GD2	3	12
	GR2	4	0
	GD2	1	0

Notably, although the frequencies of the GR1–GD1 and GR2–GD2 move combinations varied in the pre-essays (i.e., 9 essays included GR1, 10 included GD1, 8 included GR2, and 4 included GD2), all 19 post-essays demonstrated the use of both the GR1–GD1 and GR2–GD2 combinations. In addition, while the MCS move was absent from all pre-essays, it appeared in several post-essays, with six essays including MCS1 and seven including MCS2. Regarding move order, whereas the pre-essays exhibited several inconsistent patterns, the post-essays revealed two predominant tendencies, with one essay as an exception: GR1 ^ GD1 and GR2 ^ GD2 as the major sequences, and GR1 ^ GD1 ^ MCS1 and GR2 ^ GD2 ^ MCS2 as the secondary patterns. These findings suggest that students became more consistent in structuring their body paragraphs by the end of the course. This improvement may indicate an increased awareness of logical flow and idea development in their essays, particularly under timed conditions.

In contrast, one critical issue emerged from a detailed analysis of each move in the body paragraphs of the post-essays. Specifically, many students still appeared to lack proficiency in fully elaborating on their ideas within the GD move to effectively support the preceding GR move. This issue is evident in the word count distribution of the GD move: five essays contained fewer than 40 words, three contained fewer than 50 words, and seven contained fewer than 60 words. In total, only four post-essays featured body paragraphs 1 and 2 in which the GD moves exceeded 60 words (see Table C in the Appendix for a detailed breakdown). This tendency may indicate that students were able to present reasons but struggled to sufficiently elaborate on them with concrete details or examples. Additional instruction on developing supporting content in argumentation may help students strengthen the depth and persuasiveness of their body paragraphs, particularly in time-constrained writing tasks.

Moves in the concluding paragraph

A comparative analysis of the concluding paragraphs revealed notable changes in move use and sequencing, as illustrated in Table 6.

Table 6

Move and Move Order in the Concluding Paragraph

		Pre-essay (n=11)	Post-essay (n=18)
Move	Restating a Thesis Statement (RTS)	11	18
	Expressing a Final Thought (EFT)	0	12
Move order	RTS → EFT	0	12
	RTS	11	6

Whereas 11 pre-essays included the RTS move without incorporating the EFT move, 18 post-essays featured the RTS move, and among them, 12 also demonstrated the inclusion of the EFT move. In terms of move order, the pre-essays exhibited only a single pattern, whereas the post-essays displayed two dominant structures: RTS ^ EFT as the primary sequence and RTS alone as the secondary pattern. These results suggest that more students became capable of extending their final remarks beyond merely restating their thesis, showing greater rhetorical awareness. The increased use of the EFT move may reflect an enhanced understanding of the rhetorical function of conclusions—namely, to leave a broader impact or insight on the reader and to bring a sense of closure to the essay.

Despite these achievements, two issues were identified through an examination of the content within each move, although their frequency was relatively low. First, in two post-essays, the writers presented ideas in the RTS and EFT moves that appeared to be unrelated to the main instruction provided in the writing prompt. Second, in two instances, the writers relied excessively on the final thought or included both the restatement of the thesis and the final thought in an overly wordy manner. In one case, this tendency was attributed to unnecessary expansion within the EFT move, while in the other, redundancy was observed in the RTS move due to the repetition of closely related points. These findings indicate that while most students demonstrated structural control, a few continued to face difficulties with coherence and rhetorical precision in their conclusions. Providing additional guidance on how to maintain relevance and avoid redundancy in the concluding paragraph may further support students' development in this area.

5. Conclusions

This study examined whether the process approach to teaching writing could enhance Japanese EFL university students' performance on a timed essay task.

The findings reveal that after just a 15-week course, delivered through instruction grounded in the process approach, students made substantial improvements in their writing. Quantitative analyses showed increased consistency in paragraph organization and notable gains in sentence and word counts, reflecting a stronger ability to organize ideas within time constraints. Move analysis further demonstrated students' growing awareness of rhetorical structure, particularly in the consistent application of expected moves and improved sequencing across paragraphs.

Despite these overall improvements, a number of challenges persisted. In the introductory and concluding paragraphs, a few students struggled with content scope, clarity of stance, and relevance to the prompt. Notably, in the body paragraphs, underdeveloped supporting details observed in the majority of post-essays suggest a need for further instruction on how to elaborate and reinforce core arguments.

One limitation of this study is that it did not examine linguistic aspects such as lexical range or sentence complexity. Including these factors in future analyses would provide a more comprehensive understanding of students' writing development.

Overall, this study supports the integration of the process approach into academic writing instruction aimed at timed writing tasks, particularly when tailored to the needs of EFL learners. The incorporation of both teacher and peer feedback, along with a staged instructional design, appears to offer a productive framework. Future research might expand on this work by examining the long-term retention of these writing strategies over a full academic year, including the fall semester.

References

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. *Review of Arts and Humanities. 3*(2), 139‒155.

Applebee, A. N. (1986). Writing trends across the curriculum: The influence of formal testing. *English Journal, 75*(5), 30‒36.

Badger, R., & White, G. (2000). A process genre approach to teaching writing. *ELT Journal, 54*(2), 153‒160.

Bhatia, V.K. (1993). *Analysing genre: Language use in professional settings*. Longman.

Chin, P., Koizumi, Y., Reid, S., Wray, S., & Yamazaki, Y. (2012). *Academic writing skills 1*. Cambridge University Press.

Cui, Y., Shunn, C. D., Gai, X., Jiang, Y., & Wang, Z. (2021). Effects of trained peer vs. teacher feedback on EFL students' writing performance, self-efficacy, and internalization of motivation. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12*, 788474. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.788474

Escandallo, J. C. (2021). Move analysis of the argumentative essays written by the undergraduate students: A genre-based approach. *International Journal of Innovative science and Research Technology, 6*(5), 1001‒1068.

ETS (2020). *TOEFL® program history volume 6*. https://www.ets.org/pdfs/toefl/toefl-ibt-insight-s1v6.pdf

ETS (2025). *TOEFL iBT® enhancements debuting July 2023*. https://www.ets.org/toefl/itp/scoring.html#accordion-d5f026058d-item-bca03d239f

Ferris, D. R., & Hedgcock, J. S. (2013). *Teaching L2 composition: Purpose, process, and practice (3rd ed.)*. Routledge.

Hatakeyama, Y. (2020). Peer feedback comments and revision strategies of L2 writers: Insights from the analyses of their reflection texts. *Journal of the Ochanomizu University English Society, 10*, 5‒22.

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

Hedge, T. (2005). *Writing*. Oxford University Press.

Henry, A. and R. L. Roseberry. (1997). An investigation of the functions, strategies, and linguistic features of the introductions and conclusions of essays. *Systems, 25*(4), 479‒495.

Henry, A. and R. L. Roseberry. (2001). A narrow-angled corpus analysis of moves and strategies of the genre: 'Letter of application'. *English for Specific Purposes, 20*(2), 153‒168.

Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, K. (2021). *Teaching and researching writing (4th ed.)*. Routledge.

Jaladdin, I. (2019). Process approach in teaching of ESL writing: Teacher's assistance and its practicality in a real classroom. *Journal of Research, Policy & Practice of Teachers & Teacher Education, 9*(2), 66‒78.

Jones, K., & Dicicco, N. (2019). Student and teacher perspectives on peer review of student writing. *Kwansei Gakuin University Humanities Review, 24*, 119‒124. https://kwansei.repo.nii.ac.jp/records/28519

Kaya, F., & Yagiz, O. (2020). Move analysis of research article abstracts in the field of ELT: A comparative study. *Journal of Language and Linguistics Studies, 16*(1), 390‒404.

Mirador, J. F. (2000). A move analysis of written feedback in higher education. *RELC Journal, 3*(1). 45‒60.

Muncie, J. (2000). Using written teacher feedback in EFL composition classes. *ELT Journal, 54*(1), 47–53.

Otsu, R. (2014). Effective incorporation of peer response in English writing class. *Tokiwa International Studies Review, 18*, 91–100.

Park, S., Jeon, J., & Shim, E. (2021). Exploring request emails in English for business purposes: A move analysis. *English for Specific Purposes, 63*, 137–150.

Rollinson, P. (2005). Using peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *ELT Journal, 59*(1), 23–30.

Rusinovci, X. (2015). Teaching writing through process-genre based approach. *US-China Education Review. 5*(10), 699–705.

Srichanyachon, N. (2011). A comparative study of three revision methods in EFL writing. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning, 8*(9), 1–8.

Sun, C., & Feng, G. (2009). Process approach to teaching writing applied in different teaching models. *English Language Teaching, 2*(1), 150–155.

Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge University Press.

Thumnong, P., & Tongpoon-Patanasorn, A. (2017). A genre analysis of job application letters written by ASEAN applicants. Proceedings of the Asian Conference on Educatino & International Development 2017. http://papers.iafor.org/wp-content/uploads/papers/aceid2017/ACEID2017_34975.pdf

Tribble, C. (1996). *Writing*. Oxford University Press.

Zou, D., Xie, D., & Wang, F. L. (2022). Effects of technology enhanced peer, teacher, and self-feedback on students' collaborative writing, critical thinking tendency and engagement in learning. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education, 35*, 166–185.

Appendix

Table A

Paragraph, Sentence, and Word Counts in Student Pre-essays

Student	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
Paragraph	4	1	1	1	1	4	4	1	4	4
Sentence	7	5	10	4	15	10	7	13	6	8
Word*	121	76	96	66	148	142	81	121	123	114
Word**	17.3	15.2	9.6	16.5	9.9	14.2	11.6	9.3	20.5	14.3
Student	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	
Para.	2	3	1	4	3	1	5	4	1	
Sent.	11	9	9	13	8	5	10	15	7	
Word*	150	105	113	139	157	94	123	248	81	
Word**	13.6	11.7	12.6	10.7	19.6	18.8	12.3	16.5	11.6	

Note. Word* = Word count per essay; Word** = Word count per sentence.

Table B

Paragraph, Sentence, and Word Counts in Student Post-essays

Student	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
Paragraph	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	5
Sentence	16	17	18	16	21	21	14	20	13	20
Word*	261	258	212	214	261	244	220	282	246	264
Word**	16.3	15.2	11.8	13.4	12.4	11.6	15.7	14.1	18.9	13.2

Student	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	
Para.	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	
Sent.	20	15	21	18	14	20	22	26	15	
Word*	263	200	361	311	250	309	274	415	223	
Word**	13.2	13.3	17.2	17.3	17.9	15.5	12.5	16.0	14.9	

Note. Word* = Word count per essay; Word** = Word count per sentence.

Table C

Word Counts for Each Move Identified in Post-essays

Student		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
IP	MGS	40	18	32	38	25	35	60	29	24	19
	MTS	10	13	18	8	14	17	15	31	9	18
BP 1	GR1	10	18	12	18	15	13	34	13	20	13
	GD1	58	60	74	59	50	43	27	80	37	33
	MCS1	0	0	0	0	21	8	0	0	0	0
BP 2	GR2	13	15	10	9	12	8	8	11	12	11
	GD2	63	49	44	64	80	64	34	74	53	60
	MCS2	0	0	0	0	10	8	20	0	0	0
BP 3	GR3	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	10
	GD3	0	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	66
	MCS3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CP	RTS	31	10	15	18	5	23	22	34	23	23
	MFT	32	33	7	0	29	25	0	10	0	11

Student		K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	
IP	MGS	62	30	51	57	38	93	43	38	18	
	MTS	40	20	6	26	24	16	14	27	18	
BP 1	GR1	12	14	12	29	13	16	20	11	17	
	GD1	76	46	128	53	59	51	101	85	50	
	MCS1	0	10	0	14	0	12	0	33	0	
BP 2	GR2	10	11	11	20	17	14	10	11	10	
	GD2	63	30	77	72	60	41	50	86	57	
	MCS2	0	8	0	0	14	0	0	18	20	
BP 3	GR3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	
	GD3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	0	
	MCS3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	
CP	RTS	0	10	61	12	25	18	25	23	33	
	EFT	0	21	15	28	0	48	11	0	0	

Note. IP = Introductory Paragraph; BP = Body Paragraph; CP = Concluding Paragraph; MGS = Making a General Statement; MTS = Making a Thesis Statement; GR = Giving a Reason; GD = Giving Details; MCS = Making a Closing Sentence; RTS = Restating a Thesis Statement; EFT = Expressing a Final Thought.