



La escritura por procesos y el desarrollo del párrafo descriptivo en estudiantes de secundaria de nivel A1

Process Writing and Descriptive Paragraph Development Among A1 Secondary Learners

Mariella Zoila Garcia Coronel

<https://orcid.org/0009-0008-6050-1313>

mariella.garcia@ug.edu.ec

Universidad de Guayaquil

Ecuador - Guayaquil

Article received: (26/06/2026) - Accepted for publication: 30/07/2026

Conflicts of interest: None to declare.

*Corresponding author

Suggested citation (APA, seventh edition)

Garcia Coronel, M. (2026). Process writing and descriptive paragraph development among A1 secondary learners. *Linguattech*, 2(2), pages 32 - 47.

RESUMEN

La escritura por procesos convierte la composición en una secuencia de decisiones manejables y puede ser especialmente útil para escritores principiantes en una lengua extranjera. Este estudio de métodos mixtos, con grupos no equivalentes, evaluó una intervención de ocho semanas con 32 estudiantes de décimo grado de nivel A1 en un colegio público urbano de Ecuador. Diez estudiantes voluntarios completaron 15 sesiones adicionales de 40 minutos centradas en la lluvia de ideas, la jerarquización de ideas, las oraciones temáticas, los detalles de apoyo, los conectores, la redacción de borradores y la retroalimentación; 22 compañeros continuaron con la instrucción regular. Antes y después de la intervención, los estudiantes escribieron un párrafo descriptivo calificado de 1 a 5 en Contenido, Organización y Lenguaje. Los puntajes a nivel de participante se recalcularon y los tres criterios se sumaron en un compuesto de 3 a 15. El grupo de intervención aumentó de $M = 8.80$ ($DE = 2.44$) a $M = 11.60$ ($DE = 1.58$), mientras que el grupo de comparación aumentó de $M = 6.14$ ($DE = 2.19$) a $M = 7.91$ ($DE = 2.56$). Un modelo ajustado por línea base estimó una ventaja de 2.53 puntos en el posttest para el grupo de intervención, IC del 95% [0.64, 4.41], $p = .011$. Las diferencias ajustadas favorecieron a la intervención en Organización y Lenguaje, pero no en Contenido. Sin embargo, la comparación no ajustada de la ganancia entre grupos no fue significativa, $p = .250$, y ambos grupos mejoraron. La evidencia de cuestionarios y diarios destacó el modelado, la lluvia de ideas y la retroalimentación como útiles, mientras que la construcción de oraciones temáticas, el vocabulario, la concentración en línea y el tiempo limitado de revisión siguieron siendo desafíos. El programa es prometedor, pero la asignación no aleatoria, el desequilibrio inicial, el tiempo de instrucción desigual, las consignas repetidas y el cambio de evaluador impiden una conclusión causal definitiva.

Palabras clave: escritura por procesos, párrafos descriptivos, estudiantes de nivel A1, evaluación de la escritura, educación secundaria

ABSTRACT

Process writing converts composition into a sequence of manageable decisions and may be particularly useful for beginning foreign-language writers. This mixed-methods, non-



equivalent-group study evaluated an eight-week intervention for 32 tenth-grade A1 learners at an urban public school in Ecuador. Ten volunteers completed 15 additional 40-minute sessions focused on brainstorming, ranking ideas, topic sentences, supporting details, connectors, drafting, and feedback; 22 classmates continued regular instruction. Before and after the intervention, learners wrote a descriptive paragraph that was scored from 1 to 5 for Content, Organisation, and Language. Participant-level scores were recalculated, and the three criteria were summed into a 3-15 composite. The intervention group increased from $M = 8.80$ ($SD = 2.44$) to $M = 11.60$ ($SD = 1.58$), whereas the comparison group increased from $M = 6.14$ ($SD = 2.19$) to $M = 7.91$ ($SD = 2.56$). A baseline-adjusted model estimated a 2.53-point posttest advantage for the intervention group, 95% CI [0.64, 4.41], $p = .011$. Adjusted differences favored the intervention in Organisation and Language, but not Content. However, the unadjusted between-group gain comparison was not significant, $p = .250$, and both groups improved. Questionnaire and journal evidence highlighted modeling, brainstorming, and feedback as useful, while topic-sentence construction, vocabulary, online concentration, and limited revision time remained challenges. The program is promising, but nonrandom assignment, baseline imbalance, unequal instructional time, repeated prompts, and a change of rater prevent a definitive causal conclusion.

Keywords: process writing, descriptive paragraphs, A1 learners, writing assessment, secondary education

INTRODUCTION

Writing is a demanding form of language use because the writer must generate content, select words, organize ideas, construct sentences, monitor accuracy, and anticipate a reader without immediate conversational support. These demands are intensified for beginning users of English, whose lexical and grammatical resources are limited and whose attention may be consumed by spelling or sentence formation. A learner can know familiar vocabulary and still struggle to transform separate sentences into a coherent paragraph. Instruction must therefore address both the product that readers encounter and the sequence of decisions through which the product is created.

Cognitive accounts describe writing as recursive rather than linear. Planning, translating ideas into language, and reviewing interact throughout composition, and writers move among them as goals and problems change (Flower & Hayes, 1981; Hayes, 2012). This perspective challenges classroom routines in which students receive a



prompt, write once, and submit the first version for correction. When a task is treated only as a finished product, novice writers have little opportunity to externalize planning, test an organizational choice, or revise meaning before attention shifts to surface errors.

Process writing responds to this problem by making normally hidden actions visible and teachable. Common components include generating ideas, organizing them, drafting, receiving a response, revising, editing, and sharing. The components are not a rigid staircase. Writers may return to brainstorming after discovering that supporting details are insufficient, revise a topic sentence after drafting, or edit a sentence while reorganizing a paragraph. The instructional value lies in slowing the task down enough for learners to recognize these decisions and gradually regulate them independently.

Research generally supports explicit writing instruction for adolescents. A large meta-analysis of interventions in Grades 6-12 found positive effects for writing treatments that included strategy instruction, process-oriented practices, feedback, prewriting, and peer assistance (Graham et al., 2023). A more selective best-evidence reanalysis also concluded that systematic writing instruction improves secondary students' performance, while emphasizing the importance of reliable outcome measures and credible comparison conditions (Graham et al., 2025). Earlier syntheses similarly identified planning, revising, sentence combining, models, collaborative writing, and product goals as useful components (Graham & Perin, 2007).

The process approach is not automatically effective simply because several stages are named. Graham and Sandmel's (2011) meta-analysis found a positive average effect but also substantial variation across implementations. Beginning writers need explicit demonstration, supported practice, accessible topics, and feedback that identifies a manageable next step. If teachers ask students to revise without explaining what successful revision changes, learners may correct spelling while leaving content and organization untouched. If brainstorming produces an unstructured list, the planning stage may not guide the eventual paragraph.

Second-language writing adds further considerations. Writers must coordinate composing knowledge with an evolving linguistic system, and limitations in vocabulary or grammar can restrict the expression of otherwise available ideas (Hyland, 2019). A process orientation can reduce part of this burden by separating decisions and providing time for language support. At the same time, an exclusive focus on personal process may neglect how texts are shaped by audience, purpose, and genre. Badger and White (2000) argue for combining process work with attention to the social purposes and recognizable



patterns of texts. For a descriptive paragraph, this means teaching not only how to generate ideas but also how a topic sentence, ordered supporting details, connectors, and a closing statement help a reader construct a coherent representation.

Model texts can make these expectations concrete. Novice writers benefit from seeing how an accessible paragraph addresses a prompt, introduces its focus, connects details, and uses high-frequency language. Modeling should not become copying. Teachers can invite learners to notice the relationship between ideas and structure, compare alternatives, or reuse a pattern with new personal content. This use of examples supplies a temporary framework while preserving ownership of meaning. It also links process and genre: learners observe a communicative product and then rehearse the decisions needed to create a related one.

Brainstorming is especially relevant at the A1 level because a blank page requires both conceptual and linguistic retrieval. Generating several familiar details before drafting can reduce the pressure to create content and sentences simultaneously. Yet generation alone does not produce coherence. Ranking ideas, grouping related details, and deciding which information belongs under a topic sentence transform a list into a plan. The distinction between generating and organizing is central when students habitually write ideas in the order in which they occur.

Feedback and revision determine whether a process cycle produces more than a longer first draft. Effective feedback directs attention toward a problem the writer can understand and act on. Research on peer response indicates that explanations and specific suggestions are more likely to support revision than vague evaluation (Nelson & Schunn, 2009). In second-language settings, peer collaboration can also create opportunities to discuss language choices and jointly solve composing problems (Storch, 2005). However, beginners require preparation, modeling, and a supportive climate; otherwise, feedback may be limited to error marking or may not be used at all.

Assessment should align with the instructional target. The Cambridge A2 Key for Schools writing scale separates Content, Organisation, and Language, allowing evaluators to distinguish whether the task is addressed, ideas are connected, and vocabulary and grammar are sufficiently controlled (Cambridge Assessment English, 2020). Although the present learners were working around A1, a simplified classroom adaptation of these dimensions offered a practical analytic structure. Such use does not convert a classroom task into an official examination, and any interpretation depends on the quality and consistency of local rating.



The CEFR describes A1 users as able to produce simple isolated phrases and sentences and A2 users as able to link simple sentences with basic connectors on familiar matters (Council of Europe, 2020). The movement from isolated ideas toward a connected descriptive paragraph is therefore developmentally important. It involves more than adding words: the writer must identify a focus, order details, signal relationships, and maintain sufficient linguistic control for the message to be understood.

School-based evaluations of process writing often face constraints that complicate causal interpretation. Volunteers may differ from classmates before instruction, additional sessions increase contact time, the teacher may also be the researcher, and the same prompt may be used more than once. These limitations do not erase classroom evidence, but they require transparent analysis. Baseline differences should be reported, participant-level calculations should be checked, and conclusions should distinguish within-group improvement from a controlled treatment effect.

The present study examined an eight-week process-writing program for tenth-grade A1 learners in an Ecuadorian public-school context. The intervention combined modeled paragraphs, explicit planning, idea ranking, topic-sentence construction, supporting details, connectors, drafting, and feedback across online and face-to-face sessions. The objective was to evaluate whether participation improved descriptive-paragraph Content, Organisation, Language, and overall performance compared with regular instruction, while also describing learners' perceptions of the instructional experience.

METHODS

Design

A convergent mixed-methods, non-equivalent-group pretest-posttest design was used within a classroom action-research cycle. Quantitative data consisted of analytic writing scores before and after the intervention. Qualitative evidence consisted of an end-of-program open-ended questionnaire and a teacher journal maintained across the instructional period. The quantitative comparison was quasi-experimental because students were not randomly assigned and the intervention group received additional instructional time.

The primary outcome was the composite writing score, calculated as the sum of Content, Organisation, and Language ratings. Criterion-level scores were secondary outcomes. Qualitative evidence was used to explain perceived supports, continuing difficulties, and delivery conditions rather than to estimate treatment magnitude.



Context and participants

The study took place in an urban public secondary school in Ecuador. The accessible population was one tenth-grade cohort of 32 students aged approximately 14-15 years and working around CEFR A1. Ten learners volunteered for the additional writing sessions and had the connectivity and devices needed for online participation. The remaining 22 learners formed the comparison group and continued their regular English instruction. All 32 completed both writing assessments. Because selection depended on availability and access, the groups were not equivalent at baseline.

Table 1

Design and participant characteristics

Characteristic	Intervention group	Comparison group
Participants	10	22
Grade and age	Tenth grade; approximately 14-15 years	Tenth grade; approximately 14-15 years
Initial proficiency	Approximately CEFR A1	Approximately CEFR A1
Selection	Voluntary convenience selection with device and internet access	Remaining members of the intact cohort
Additional program	15 sessions across eight weeks	None
Assessment occasions	Pretest and posttest	Pretest and posttest

Note. The groups were not randomly assigned. All participants had complete pretest and posttest score records.

Instructional program

The intervention comprised 15 sessions of approximately 40 minutes over eight weeks, equivalent to about 10 additional instructional hours. Eleven sessions were conducted online and four were conducted face to face. Online delivery used presentations, model paragraphs, and guided exercises; the in-person meetings emphasized practice, immediate clarification, and closer review of learners' drafts.

The program simplified the writing process into an exploratory macro-stage and a developing macro-stage. During exploration, learners interpreted the prompt, brainstormed familiar content, and numbered ideas to establish an order. During development, they composed a topic sentence, expanded selected ideas into supporting sentences, connected information, and produced a draft. Feedback addressed sequence, relevance, word order, spelling, punctuation, basic grammatical forms, and connector use.



Revising and editing were introduced, but peer revision and full editing cycles were not completed consistently because of time and delivery constraints.

Topics were selected from familiar domains, including personal information, family, friends, school, routines, food, movies, and places. Materials included teacher-created and published model paragraphs, worksheets, slides, pictures, and electronic dictionaries. Each session incorporated explanation or modeling, a short guided activity, independent or collaborative practice, and feedback or recapping.

Table 2

Instructional sequence for descriptive paragraph writing

Component	Learner action	Instructional support
Interpret the task	Identify the topic, purpose, and required information	Prompt explanation and accessible model
Generate ideas	Brainstorm words, facts, experiences, and examples	Questions, visuals, and vocabulary activation
Order ideas	Number and group details into a logical sequence	Teacher modeling and guided planning sheet
Establish focus	Write a topic sentence that introduces the paragraph	Comparison of sample topic sentences
Develop a draft	Expand supporting ideas and connect sentences	Models, linkers, punctuation cues, and language support
Review and edit	Check relevance, sequence, word order, spelling, and punctuation	Focused feedback; partial peer and self-review

Note. The sequence was recursive in principle, although revision and editing received less implementation time than planning and drafting.

Writing assessment

At both measurement occasions, students had 40 minutes to write a paragraph on one of two familiar topics: family or daily routine. The classroom records indicate that the same choice of prompts and assessment structure was used at pretest and posttest. No process steps were supplied within the test prompt. Because documentation about a minimum word requirement was inconsistent, word count was not treated as an outcome.

Paragraphs were assessed with a classroom-adapted analytic rubric derived from the A2 Key for Schools writing criteria. Content represented task fulfillment and relevant information; Organisation represented connection, sequence, and basic punctuation; Language represented everyday vocabulary, spelling, and control of basic grammatical forms. Each dimension was rated from 1 to 5, producing a composite range of 3-15. The



adaptation was suitable for classroom diagnosis but was not independently validated for this sample.

The pretest was rated by the teacher who implemented the program, whereas the posttest was rated by a colleague after discussion of the rubric. The available records did not include double scoring, rater blinding, or interrater reliability. The change of evaluator across occasions was retained as a major limitation because score differences may reflect both learner development and rater severity.

Qualitative instruments

Nine of the 10 intervention participants completed a six-question open-ended questionnaire after the program. Questions addressed explanations, activities, materials, perceived ease and difficulty, online and face-to-face delivery, and intended future use of the writing process. Responses were collected in the learners' first language to reduce comprehension barriers.

A teacher journal documented session plans, participation, observed problems, adjustments, feedback, and reflections. Questionnaire responses and journal entries were grouped descriptively into recurring themes. Coding was conducted for pedagogical interpretation; no second coder or formal reliability estimate was available. Qualitative findings are therefore reported as contextual evidence rather than independently verified prevalence estimates.

Data analysis

Participant-level scores were transcribed and checked by recomputing every composite, group total, mean, standard deviation, and gain. This audit identified inconsistencies in previously aggregated posttest summaries for the comparison group; all analyses in this article therefore use the internally consistent participant-level records. Descriptive statistics include means, standard deviations, mean gains, and counts of improvement, no change, and decline.

The composite score was designated as the primary outcome. Wilcoxon signed-rank tests examined within-group change, and Mann-Whitney U tests compared baseline scores and unadjusted gains because the sample was small and criterion scores were ordinal. Rank-biserial correlations describe within-group direction and Cliff's delta describes gain-score separation between groups.

Because the groups differed at baseline, ordinary least squares models regressed each posttest outcome on group and its corresponding pretest score. HC3 heteroskedasticity-



consistent standard errors were used. The composite model was the primary adjusted analysis; criterion-level models were secondary and their p values were corrected with Holm's method. All tests were two-sided with $\alpha = .05$. Results from adjusted and unadjusted approaches are reported together because analytic conclusions were not identical.

Ethical safeguards

Institutional permission and parental consent were obtained before data collection. Participation in the additional sessions was voluntary, learners could withdraw without penalty, and results were recorded with participant codes. The present article reports only anonymized group-level findings and anonymous qualitative themes.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive changes

At baseline, the intervention group already performed above the comparison group on the composite measure: $M = 8.80$ versus $M = 6.14$. This difference was statistically detectable, $U = 168.0$, $p = .018$, and was concentrated in Organisation and Language. The initial imbalance is consistent with convenience selection: students willing and able to attend additional sessions may also have differed in prior performance, motivation, or resources.

Both groups improved over time. The intervention composite increased by 2.80 points, from $M = 8.80$ ($SD = 2.44$) to $M = 11.60$ ($SD = 1.58$). Nine of 10 learners improved and one declined. The comparison composite increased by 1.77 points, from $M = 6.14$ ($SD = 2.19$) to $M = 7.91$ ($SD = 2.56$); 16 improved, two remained unchanged, and four declined. Within-group Wilcoxon tests were significant for the intervention group, $W = 5.0$, $p = .020$, rank-biserial $r = .82$, and the comparison group, $W = 27.0$, $p = .003$, $r = .74$.

Organisation showed the largest intervention-group gain, increasing from $M = 2.60$ to $M = 4.00$. Seven learners improved and none declined on this criterion. Content and Language each increased by 0.70 points, but individual patterns were less uniform. The comparison group also improved in Content and Organisation, while Language showed a smaller mean increase of 0.23 points and included six declines.



Table 3

Pretest, posttest, and gain statistics by group

Outcome	Group	Pre M (SD)	Post M (SD)	Gain M (SD)	Improved / same / declined
Content (1-5)	Intervention	3.30 (1.06)	4.00 (0.82)	0.70 (1.25)	6 / 3 / 1
Content (1-5)	Comparison	2.50 (1.10)	3.18 (0.96)	0.68 (1.09)	14 / 5 / 3
Organisation (1-5)	Intervention	2.60 (0.70)	4.00 (0.67)	1.40 (1.17)	7 / 3 / 0
Organisation (1-5)	Comparison	1.82 (0.73)	2.68 (0.84)	0.86 (0.77)	14 / 8 / 0
Language (1-5)	Intervention	2.90 (1.10)	3.60 (0.97)	0.70 (1.25)	6 / 2 / 2
Language (1-5)	Comparison	1.82 (0.66)	2.05 (1.05)	0.23 (1.07)	8 / 8 / 6
Composite (3-15)	Intervention	8.80 (2.44)	11.60 (1.58)	2.80 (2.82)	9 / 0 / 1
Composite (3-15)	Comparison	6.14 (2.19)	7.91 (2.56)	1.77 (2.27)	16 / 2 / 4

Note. Intervention n = 10; comparison n = 22. Composite scores are sums of Content, Organisation, and Language.

Between-group analyses

The unadjusted difference in composite gains did not reach statistical significance. The intervention group gained 2.80 points and the comparison group gained 1.77 points, $U = 138.5$, $p = .250$, Cliff's delta = .26. Gain differences were also nonsignificant for Content, Organisation, and Language. This analysis asks whether the distribution of raw changes differed between groups and provides limited evidence for an intervention-specific effect.

The baseline-adjusted models produced a different result. After controlling for pretest composite score, the intervention group was estimated to score 2.53 points higher at posttest, HC3 95% CI [0.64, 4.41], $p = .011$. Secondary adjusted estimates favored the intervention for Organisation, $b = 1.08$, Holm-adjusted $p = .024$, and Language, $b = 1.19$, Holm-adjusted $p = .043$. The adjusted Content difference was 0.57 points and was not significant, $p = .110$.

The divergence between gain-score and adjusted models should not be hidden. Baseline adjustment can improve precision and partially address initial score differences,



but it cannot remove unmeasured selection bias. The intervention group had higher starting scores, volunteered for extra work, possessed the necessary technology, and received approximately 10 additional hours. The adjusted advantage is therefore compatible with a beneficial program, but it is not equivalent to a randomized treatment effect.

Table 4

Unadjusted gain comparisons and baseline-adjusted posttest estimates

Outcome	Gain U	Gain p	Cliff's delta	Adjusted group b	95% CI	Adjusted p
Content	113.0	.915	.03	0.57	[-0.14, 1.28]	.110
Organisation	139.5	.215	.27	1.08	[0.30, 1.86]	.024
Language	136.0	.281	.24	1.19	[0.19, 2.19]	.043
Composite	138.5	.250	.26	2.53	[0.64, 4.41]	.011

Note. Gain p values are from two-sided Mann-Whitney tests. Adjusted b is the intervention-group coefficient in an OLS model predicting posttest from group and pretest with HC3 standard errors. Criterion-level adjusted p values use Holm correction; the composite is the prespecified primary outcome.

Qualitative findings

Questionnaire responses and journal observations converged on five themes. First, clear explanations, repeated recapping, and model paragraphs reduced uncertainty. Learners appeared more confident when they could inspect an accessible example before creating their own text. This pattern supports a process-genre interpretation: the model made paragraph expectations visible, while the process sequence gave learners a route toward an original product (Badger & White, 2000).

Second, brainstorming and numbering ideas were perceived as useful planning supports. Several learners identified idea generation or ordering as an easier stage by the end of the program. The journal similarly recorded increasing independence as students reused the planning sequence. This theme is consistent with the strong Organisation gain and with research showing that explicit planning and strategy instruction can improve adolescent writing (Graham et al., 2023; Graham & Perin, 2007).

Third, topic-sentence construction and vocabulary remained difficult. Learners could often produce several details but struggled to summarize the focus of the paragraph in one opening sentence. Limited vocabulary also constrained sentence expansion and topic choice. These difficulties show why process support cannot replace language development. Beginning writers need recurring lexical work, sentence-level instruction, and models that connect vocabulary to a communicative purpose.



Fourth, delivery mode affected participation. Learners valued the flexibility of online meetings, but several reported easier loss of attention and preferred face-to-face sessions with more practice. The teacher journal also described more immediate checking and richer interaction during in-person work. The mixed format expanded access but did not provide equivalent conditions for feedback and peer review.

Fifth, learners expressed an intention to reuse the sequence in future writing. Their comments emphasized having a clearer order rather than beginning with whichever idea came first. Intended use is encouraging because the goal of strategy instruction is independent regulation. Nevertheless, self-reported intention is not evidence of long-term transfer; a delayed unfamiliar writing task would be needed to show that the process became durable and flexible.

Table 5

Qualitative themes and instructional implications

Theme	Evidence pattern	Instructional implication
Models and explanations	Examples, recapping, and feedback increased clarity and confidence	Use short accessible models for noticing, not copying
Planning and order	Brainstorming and numbering ideas supported paragraph sequence	Teach generation and organization as separate decisions
Persistent language demands	Topic sentences, vocabulary, spelling, and grammar remained difficult	Integrate sentence and lexical support within the process
Delivery conditions	Online concentration and limited review time reduced participation	Protect in-person or small-group time for feedback and revision
Future strategy use	Learners intended to apply the sequence in later tasks	Assess retention and transfer with delayed unfamiliar prompts

Note. Themes summarize nine questionnaires and the teacher journal. No independent qualitative coder was available.

Interpretation

The clearest quantitative change occurred in Organisation, the criterion most directly targeted by the intervention. Learners repeatedly generated, ranked, and connected ideas before drafting, and the adjusted posttest difference remained significant after correction. This alignment between instructional emphasis and outcome strengthens the plausibility of the result. It also reflects the CEFR progression from isolated statements toward simple connected text (Council of Europe, 2020).



Language also favored the intervention after baseline adjustment, although the mean gain was smaller than the Organisation gain and two intervention participants declined. Modeling, topic-specific vocabulary, connector work, and focused correction may have supported language control. At the same time, qualitative evidence identified vocabulary, spelling, and grammar as continuing needs. The result should therefore be interpreted as partial development rather than mastery.

Content did not show an intervention-specific advantage. Both groups wrote on familiar family or routine topics, and both improved by approximately 0.7 points. Familiarity may have reduced the intervention's distinct contribution to task fulfillment. Repetition of the same topic options may also have allowed students in both groups to recall or expand previous ideas. Future studies should use parallel prompts that are comparable in difficulty but require new content.

Improvement in the comparison group is educationally important. Regular instruction, maturation, repeated assessment, or growing familiarity with paragraph writing may have contributed. It also demonstrates why a pretest-posttest increase within the intervention group cannot by itself establish effectiveness. The comparison group provides a counterfactual approximation, but the groups began at different levels and experienced unequal conditions.

The adjusted composite result is promising because it summarizes coordinated change across content, organization, and language. Yet composite scores conceal different patterns. An 11-point paragraph could arise from balanced performance or from strong content and organization with weaker language. Reporting the dimensions preserves instructional meaning and avoids treating writing quality as a single undifferentiated ability.

Assessment conditions limit confidence in the magnitude of change. The pretest and posttest were scored by different people, and no common scripts were double rated. Even when both raters use the same descriptors, severity can differ. A stricter pretest rater or more lenient posttest rater would inflate apparent improvement; the reverse would suppress it. Future work should randomize anonymized scripts across occasions, use at least two trained raters, and report agreement or generalizability evidence.

The adaptation of an A2 rubric for A1 learners was pedagogically practical but psychometrically uncertain. Cambridge scales provide a coherent construct and examples for official A2 tasks (Cambridge Assessment English, 2020), but local modifications change interpretation. A classroom rating of 4 does not imply an official A2 result.



Validation should examine whether descriptors are understood consistently, whether bands distinguish performance at this level, and whether scores relate to other evidence of writing proficiency.

The intervention's additional instructional time is another confound. Ten hours of focused practice can improve performance regardless of the specific process framework. A stronger comparison would equalize time and attention by providing an alternative writing program to the second group. Cluster assignment by intact class, matched teachers, and a shared assessment protocol would further reduce bias while remaining feasible in school settings.

The partial implementation of revision also matters. Planning and drafting received repeated practice, but peer revision and full editing cycles were constrained. Process writing is most distinctive when writers use feedback to reconsider meaning and structure, not only when they plan before writing. Nelson and Schunn (2009) show that feedback becomes useful when it communicates specific information writers can apply. Longer face-to-face workshops could model revision decisions, use anonymized examples, and distinguish global revision from surface editing.

Digital delivery created both access and friction. Eleven online meetings made an after-school intervention possible, but connectivity, attention, and document exchange limited interaction. Process writing can be supported online when tools allow visible planning, shared drafts, commenting, and version comparison. In low-resource contexts, however, a hybrid design should reserve in-person time for the stages that depend most on dialogue and text review.

The program remains feasible for practice. Its core sequence requires no specialized platform: teachers can use a prompt, model paragraph, brainstorming space, ordering grid, draft area, and short revision checklist. Familiar topics reduce conceptual load, while gradual topic variation encourages transfer. Feedback can prioritize one global goal and one language goal so that A1 learners are not overwhelmed by corrections.

Overall, the convergence of a large Organisation gain, a baseline-adjusted composite advantage, and positive perceptions supports continued investigation. The evidence does not justify claiming that process writing alone caused the outcome. It does justify a more rigorous replication in which instructional time is matched, assignment is strengthened, prompts are parallel, raters are blinded, and a delayed task tests whether students can independently apply the sequence.



CONCLUSIONS

An eight-week process-writing program was associated with improved descriptive-paragraph performance among A1 tenth-grade learners. The intervention group increased from 8.80 to 11.60 on a 15-point composite, with Organisation showing the largest criterion gain. A baseline-adjusted model estimated a 2.53-point posttest advantage, and adjusted criterion analyses favored the intervention in Organisation and Language.

The evidence is encouraging but analytically mixed. The comparison group also improved, and the unadjusted between-group gain difference was not statistically significant. Nonrandom selection, higher intervention-group baseline scores, additional instructional time, repeated prompts, a change of rater, and absence of interrater reliability prevent a definitive causal conclusion. The findings should be described as promising classroom evidence rather than proof of effectiveness.

Learners and journal observations identified model paragraphs, explicit explanations, brainstorming, idea ranking, recapping, and feedback as useful. Persistent difficulties included topic-sentence construction, vocabulary, grammar, spelling, online concentration, and insufficient time for peer revision. These findings suggest that process instruction for beginners should combine visible planning with sustained sentence-level language support and protected opportunities to revise.

Future evaluations should compare groups receiving equal instructional time, use random or matched assignment when feasible, employ parallel writing prompts, blind and double-score anonymized scripts, document reliability, and include delayed transfer tasks. Under those conditions, the concise sequence used here could offer a practical framework for helping beginning secondary learners move from isolated ideas toward connected, reader-oriented paragraphs.

REFERENCES

- Badger, R., & White, G. (2000). A process genre approach to teaching writing. *ELT Journal*, 54(2), 153-160. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/54.2.153>
- Cambridge Assessment English. (2020). A2 Key for Schools handbook for teachers. <https://www.cambridgeenglish.org/images/504506-a2-key-for-schools-handbook-2020.pdf>
- Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment - Companion volume. Council of Europe



Publishing. <https://rm.coe.int/common-european-framework-of-reference-for-languages-learning-teaching/16809ea0d4>

Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 32(4), 365-387. <https://doi.org/10.2307/356600>

Graham, S., Cao, Y., Kim, Y. S. G., Lee, J., Tate, T., Collins, P., Cho, M., Moon, Y., Chung, H. Q., & Olson, C. B. (2025). Effective writing instruction for students in grades 6 to 12: A best evidence meta-analysis. *Reading and Writing*, 38, 1-46. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-024-10539-2>

Graham, S., Kim, Y. S. G., Cao, Y., Lee, J., Tate, T., Collins, P., Cho, M., Moon, Y., Chung, H. Q., & Olson, C. B. (2023). A meta-analysis of writing treatments for students in grades 6-12. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 115(7), 1004-1027. <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000819>

Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). A meta-analysis of writing instruction for adolescent students. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99(3), 445-476. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.99.3.445>

Graham, S., & Sandmel, K. (2011). The process writing approach: A meta-analysis. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 104(6), 396-407. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2010.488703>

Hayes, J. R. (2012). Modeling and remodeling writing. *Written Communication*, 29(3), 369-388. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088312451260>

Hyland, K. (2019). *Second language writing* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Nelson, M. M., & Schunn, C. D. (2009). The nature of feedback: How different types of peer feedback affect writing performance. *Instructional Science*, 37(4), 375-401. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-008-9053-x>

Storch, N. (2005). Collaborative writing: Product, process, and students' reflections. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14(3), 153-173. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2005.05.002>