

Genre-Based Instruction in Language Teaching for Enhancing College Students' Writing Skills

Ronnie B. Rubi

*College of Science, Bicol State College of Applied Sciences and Technology,
Naga City, Philippines
Contact: 09388657651, E-mail: rbrubi@astean.biscast.edu.ph*

KEYWORDS Academic. Assessment. Coherence. Literacy. Pedagogy. SFL (Systemic Functional Linguistics)

ABSTRACT This study aimed to investigate the effectiveness of Genre-Based Instruction (GBI) in enhancing paragraph writing skills among college students. The research employed a mixed-methods approach using a pre-test and post-test design with 120 students over one academic semester, focusing on explicit instruction in academic genres and effective paragraph features. The principal observation revealed a significant quantitative improvement in student performance, confirmed by a paired-samples t-test showing a substantial mean score increase from pre-test ($M=16.77$) to post-test ($M=24.82$), with high statistical significance ($p < 0.001$). Additionally, qualitative analysis indicated enhanced student engagement, genre awareness, and writing confidence. The findings underscore the pedagogical value of Genre-Based Instruction in improving academic writing skills. The study recommended the integration of GBI into writing curricula, the provision of sustained teacher training in genre pedagogy, and further research into its effectiveness across diverse student populations and disciplinary contexts.

INTRODUCTION

In today's rapidly evolving educational landscape, there is a growing emphasis on pedagogical approaches that cultivate active learning, critical thinking, and meaningful engagement with texts. Genre-Based Instruction (GBI), rooted in Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), has emerged as a powerful framework for enhancing writing skills by explicitly teaching the social purpose, structure, and language features of various text types or genres (Rose and Martin 2012). This study explored the application of GBI in developing college students' academic writing skills, particularly focusing on how genre-based pedagogies support the planning, organisation, and linguistic realisation of coherent texts across disciplines.

Writing remains a crucial academic competency, with direct implications for students' performance in higher education and their success in professional environments. However, many college students struggle to produce well-structured and purposeful texts. These challenges are often rooted in traditional approaches that emphasise mechanical correctness over meaning-making, or that fail to provide sufficient scaffolding for learners to understand how texts function in real-world contexts (Hyland 2007). In the Philippines and other contexts, studies have shown that students often lack awareness of how language choices vary ac-

cording to genre, audience, and communicative intent (Pablo and Lasaten 2018).

Genre-Based Instruction (GBI) systematically guides students through the writing process of deconstruction, joint construction, and independent writing, while emphasising the rhetorical and linguistics features specific to various genres, such as expositions and arguments. This pedagogical strategy directly aligned with the PISA 2022 writing literacy framework, which stressed students' ability to organise and express ideas clearly and appropriately for their purpose, audience, and context (OECD 2023). By integrating GBI, educators fostered not only language proficiency but also the development of global competencies, including critical thinking and communication, simultaneously supporting the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), specifically Goal 4: Quality Education, and Goal 10: Reduced Inequalities.

Recent studies underscored the efficacy of genre-based pedagogy in enhancing student performance. For instance, Yasuda (2011) demonstrated that EFL learners receiving GBI-based writing instruction exhibited marked improvement in managing both genre-specific features and rhetorical structure. Similarly, Thongchalerms and Jarunthachai (2020) found that GBI enhanced students' ability to successfully adapt their writing to different academic and disciplinary contexts, which re-

sulted in an increase in both writing fluency and coherence. These findings supported GBI as a principled, evidence-based approach to developing college students' writing skills by focusing on the functional use of language within structured, purposeful texts, rather than solely on discrete grammar and vocabulary.

Despite GBI's growing international recognition, its application in language teaching, particularly for writing instruction other than English, remained underexplored. While extensive research examined GBI within English for Academic Purposes (EAP), studies addressing its role in developing students' writing skills in diverse multilingual contexts or across tertiary-level disciplines were still limited (Liu et al. 2023). This study sought to address this gap by exploring how GBI could be implemented to support college students in producing well-structured, purposeful written texts across genres, and by analysing how students perceive this approach to writing instruction.

One pressing issue in language education is that many students struggle not just with grammar or vocabulary, but with organising their ideas in ways that suit the purpose and audience of the text, that is, key competencies emphasised in the PISA 2022 writing framework (OECD 2023). GBI offers an explicit, scaffolded way of addressing this by teaching the staged structure and linguistic features of genres, thus helping students write with greater clarity, cohesion, and communicative effectiveness. However, without sufficient research into learners' experiences with this model, its practical implementation may fall short of achieving its intended outcomes.

This study extended beyond analysing the impact of GBI on writing performance by crucially investigating the role of learner perception in instructional effectiveness. Recognising how students view a teaching method significantly influences their motivation, self-efficacy, and willingness to engage (Azar and Nasiri 2014; Hyland and Hyland 2019), and understanding these perspectives is essential for refining pedagogy and promoting inclusive, learner-centred education aligned with SDG 4: Quality Education.

The research specifically centred on characterising college students' experience with GBI. Its aims are twofold, with first, to establish students' attitudes and perceptions toward GBI and how they evaluate its effectiveness concerning genre

clarity, relevance to academic writing, and personal engagement. Second, the study sought to generate actionable insights on how GBI can be further refined to effectively meet the diverse linguistic and educational needs of college-level learners within increasingly multilingual and multicultural academic contexts.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study utilised a quasi-experimental mixed-methods design to assess the effectiveness of Genre-Based Instruction (GBI) in enhancing the academic writing skills of college students. Following the mixed-methods framework established by Creswell and Creswell (2017), this approach allowed for a comprehensive analysis of both quantitative improvements in writing performance and qualitative insights into students' attitudes, engagement, and perceptions of the instruction. The quasi-experimental nature of the study involved a non-randomised control group and an experimental group, which received the GBI intervention.

Participants

The participants in the study were first year college students enrolled in a language and communication course at a state university in Naga City and Camarines Sur, Philippines. A total of 120 students were involved, divided into two intact classes with 60 students in the experimental group (receiving genre-based instruction) and 60 in the comparison group (receiving conventional form-focused instruction). The participants were selected based on convenience sampling, given the existing class assignments. Informed consent was obtained from all students.

Application Process and Data Collection Tools

Instrument

The study employed a mixed-methods approach with three primary instruments for data collection. First, a Writing Performance Test (pre-test and post-test) required students to compose a paragraph or short essay within a specified genre (for example, argumentative). Performance was as-

sessed using genre-based rubric measuring four dimensions of structure, coherence and cohesion, lexical and grammatical accuracy, and genre-specific language features. Second, a Student Perception Survey (Likert-scale questionnaire) measured students' attitudes toward GBI across dimensions like task clarity, relevance, and confidence. Finally, a Semi-Structured Interview Guide was used with a subset of eight participants ($n=8$) from the experimental group to gather rich, in-depth qualitative insights into their personal experiences, focusing on strategies, challenges, motivation, and the perceived usefulness of the GBI scaffolding.

Procedure

The study employed a three-phase procedure. During the Pre-intervention Phase, a writing pre-test established baseline proficiency for both the experimental and comparison groups, and the experimental group completed an initial perception survey. The Intervention Phase lasted six to eight weeks wherein the experimental group received GBI focused on academic genres, following the genre pedagogy cycle (Modelling, Joint Construction, and Independent Construction), as shown in Table 1.

In contrast, the comparison group received traditional instruction focused on grammar rules and isolated writing exercises. Finally, the Post-intervention Phase concluded the study with both groups completing a post-test and the experimen-

tal group completing a final survey and participating in semi-structured interviews.

Data Analysis

The data were subjected to a rigorous mixed-methods analysis. Quantitative data (pre/post-test scores) were analysed using paired and independent samples t-tests in IBM SPSS Statistics (Version 21), with significance set at $p < 0.01$. Survey responses were summarised using descriptive statistics. Qualitative data (interview transcripts) were analysed thematically using the Braun and Clarke (2006) method. Emerging themes were triangulated with survey responses to ensure validity and consistency. Ethically, the study maintained voluntary participation, anonymity, and confidentiality of subjects, having secured ethical clearance beforehand.

RESULTS

Presented in Table 2 is the mean scores on pre-test of college students' writing skills.

The pre-test established a baseline for college students' academic writing skills, revealing significant difficulties across all dimensions, with an overall mean score of 16.77 categorised as "Needs Improvement". All parameters were notably low. Students struggled most with Research and Citation ($M = 2.03$), indicating serious gaps in source integration. Other low scores included Clarity and

Table 1: The GBI pedagogy cycle

<i>GBI cycle</i>	<i>Focus area</i>
<i>Contextualising The Genre</i>	♦ Audience Awareness ♦ Research and Citation
<i>Deconstructing Mentor Texts</i>	♦ Content Development and Evidence ♦ Vocabulary and Word Choice ♦ Grammar and Syntax ♦ Clarity and Coherence
<i>Joint Construction</i>	♦ Critical Thinking and Argumentation ♦ Audience Awareness
<i>Independent Construction</i>	♦ Clarity and Coherence ♦ Grammar and Syntax ♦ Vocabulary and Word Choice ♦ Content Development and Evidence ♦ Research and Citation
<i>Revising And Editing</i>	♦ Audience Awareness ♦ Revising and Editing Skills ♦ Clarity and Coherence ♦ Grammar and Syntax ♦ Vocabulary and Word Choice

Table 2: Mean scores on pre-test of college students' writing skills

<i>Parameters</i>	<i>Mean score</i>	<i>Description</i>
Clarity and coherence	2.08	Needs improvement
Grammar and syntax	2.14	Needs improvement
Vocabulary and word choice	2.13	Needs improvement
Content development and evidence	2.10	Needs improvement
Research and citation	2.03	Needs improvement
Audience awareness	2.10	Needs improvement
Revising and editing skills	2.05	Needs improvement
Critical thinking and argumentation	2.14	Needs improvement
Mean Total Score	2.10	Needs improvement

Legend: 1.0 - 1.49 Poor; 1.50 - 2.49 Needs Improvement; 2.50 - 3.49 Satisfactory; 3.50 - 4.49 Proficient; 4.50 - 5.00 Excellent

Coherence (M = 2.08), Revising and Editing Skills (M = 2.05), Content Development and Evidence (M = 2.10), and Audience Awareness (M = 2.10). Grammar and Syntax (M = 2.14), Vocabulary and Word Choice (M = 2.13), and Critical Thinking and Argumentation (M = 2.14) also confirmed pervasive challenges in producing well-structured, accurate, and reasoned academic writing.

Based on the pre-test results, which revealed substantial challenges in academic writing, the researcher designed a systematic instructional intervention using Genre-Based Instruction (GBI) to enhance students' ability to produce structured, purposeful, and coherent texts (shown in Table 3). This intervention spanned eight weeks and strictly followed the core phases of the GBI cycle:

1. Building Knowledge of the Field (BKOF)
2. Modelling the Genre (MG)
3. Joint Construction of Text (JCOT)
4. Independent Construction of Text (ICOT)
5. Feedback and Revision (FR)

Each week targeted a distinct genre commonly required in academic and professional contexts, emphasising both linguistic resources and rhetorical structure. The intervention also included peer collaboration and teacher scaffolding to foster genre awareness and writing competence.

The researcher also implemented task-based language teaching activities in Filipino over a month, followed by a post-test assessment.

Presented in Table 4 are the mean scores on post-test of college students' paragraph writing skills.

Following the 6-week GBI intervention, college students' writing performance demonstrated a significant improvement, reaching the "Satisfactory" range with an overall mean score of 24.82.

The highest scores were in Clarity and Coherence (M = 3.145) and Revising and Editing Skills (M = 3.13), indicating strong gains organisation and drafting refinement. Other parameters like Vocabulary and Word Choice (M = 3.12), Content Development (M = 3.11), and Critical Thinking (M = 3.10) also showed substantial improvement. Only Research Citation (M = 2.99) remained slightly below the satisfactory threshold.

A paired-samples t-test confirmed that the observed improvement was statistically significant ($p < 0.01$). The substantial increase in the mean score from the pre-test (M = 16.77) to the post-test (M = 24.82) strongly underscored the effectiveness of the genre-based pedagogy in enhancing learners' writing performance across multiple dimensions.

The statistical results from the pre-test and post-test assessment of students' paragraph writing skills demonstrate a significant improvement following the GBI intervention. As summarised in Table 5, the pre-test mean score was 16.777 (SD $\approx$ 2.07), while the post-test mean rose to 24.82 (SD 3.14), indicating a marked increase in writing performance.

A paired-samples t-test confirmed that the improvement in students' writing performance following the GBI intervention was highly statistically significant. The computed t-statistics of -33.36 exceeded both the one-tailed (1.66) and two-tailed (1.98) critical values, with the corresponding p-value ($p < 0.001$) confirming that the positive difference was not due to chance. Additionally, the Pearson's correlation coefficient of 0.55 indicated a moderate positive relationship between the pre-test and post-test scores. This suggested that while the GBI intervention benefited all participants, stu-

Table 3: Designed genre-based instruction activities for enhancing students' writing skills

<i>Task</i>	<i>Focus in writing component/skill</i>	<i>Genre-based instruction cycle activities</i>
<i>Writing Personal Narratives</i>	Organisation and Structure, Descriptive Language, Past Tense Usage, Personal Voice	BKOF: Discuss narrative purposes and contexts MG: Analyse model personal essays JCOT: Class collaboratively writes a sample paragraph ICOT: Students write their own 500 to 700-word personal narrative FR: Peer review and teacher feedback on use of description, structure, and verb forms
<i>Writing an Opinion Piece</i>	Argumentation, Use of Evidence, Logical Flow, Modality and Hedging Language	BKOF: Examine current issues and common positions MG: Deconstruct sample opinion texts JCOT: Write an argument collaboratively using sentence starters ICOT: Students write 300 to 500-word opinion pieces FR: Focus on evaluating claims, cohesion, and lexical choices
<i>Writing a Formal Letter or Email</i>	Formal Tone, Politeness Conventions, Salutation and Formatting, Conciseness	BKOF: Introduce real-world scenarios for formal correspondence MG: Review and annotate sample formal letters/emails JCOT: Compose a request letter together ICOT: Students independently write a 200 to 300-word formal letter/email FR: Feedback on tone, structure, and clarity
<i>Collaborative Writing Project</i>	Creativity, Coherence in Group Writing, Revision Practices, Sentence Structure	BKOF: Explore blogs or story formats through examples MG: Examine structure and tone of blogs or anthologies JCOT: Plan content as a class ICOT: Groups collaboratively write blog entries or stories FR: Peer editing rounds and whole-class sharing for critique
<i>Writing a Report</i>	Report Writing Structure, Clarity and Objectivity, Use of Formal Vocabulary, Coherence and Cohesion	BKOF: Discuss real-world issues and report purposes MG: Break down sample reports (e.g. incident reports, feasibility studies) JCOT: Draft outline or introductory paragraph as a class ICOT: Students write 500 to 700-word reports FR: Revision based on clarity, structure, and data presentation

dents' initial writing proficiency levels were moderately predictive of their final performance.

Presented in Table 6 is the students' attitudes and perceptions towards GBI in learning writing in Filipino.

The results from the student perception survey showed overwhelmingly positive student attitudes toward GBI in writing development. The highest-rated item was the perceived usefulness and relevance of the writing tasks to real-life academic/professional contexts, scoring $M = 4.65$. Stu-

dents also strongly agreed that GBI improved their writing skills ($M = 4.40$) and enhanced their motivation to write ($M = 4.35$). Collaborative writing tasks received a positive response ($M = 4.10$) still fell within the "Agree" category, indicating a moderate to strong positive effect on students' self-efficacy.

The qualitative findings from student reflections showed that GBI significantly fostered positive attitudes toward paragraph writing. As shown

Table 4: Mean scores on post-test of college students' writing skills

Parameters	Mean score	Description
Clarity and coherence	3.14	Satisfactory
Grammar and syntax	3.09	Satisfactory
Vocabulary and word choice	3.12	Satisfactory
Content development and evidence	3.11	Satisfactory
Research and citation	2.99	Satisfactory
Audience awareness	3.09	Satisfactory
Revising and editing skills	3.13	Satisfactory
Critical thinking and argumentation	3.10	Satisfactory
Mean Total Score	3.10	Satisfactory

Legend: 1.0 - 1.49 Poor; 1.50 - 2.49 Needs Improvement; 2.50 - 3.49 Satisfactory; 3.50 - 4.49 Proficient; 4.50 - 5.00 Excellent

Table 5: t-Test results of the pre-test and post-test scores of the writing skills assessment of college students in Filipino

	Pre-test	Post-test
Mean	16.76666667	24.81666667
Variance	4.281232493	9.848459384
Observations	120	120
Pearson Correlation	0.549841028	
Hypothesized	0	
Mean Difference		
df	119	
t Stat	-33.35620493	
P(T<=t) one-tail	1.56762E-62	
t Critical one-tail	1.657759285	
P(T<=t) two-tail	3.13524E-62	
t Critical two-tail	1.980099876	

in Table 7, the most salient theme identified was enhanced engagement and motivation, with students expressing greater interest when tasks were meaningful and mirrored real-world genres. Another notable finding was the growth in writing confidence, which students attributed to GBI's structured stages (modeling, joint construction, and independent practice). Students also perceived the writing tasks as highly relevant to real-life academic and professional contexts, and they specifically appreciated the collaborative aspect of GBI during the joint construction phase. Finally, students reported finding the tasks appropriately challenging yet enjoyable, which, they noted, supported their ability to think more critically, particularly

Table 6: Students' attitudes and perceptions towards GBI in learning writing in Filipino

Indicator	Mean score	Description
1. "Mas interesado akong magsulat sa Filipino dahil sa mga gawain na ibinigay sa GBI." (Students actively participate in writing tasks and show enthusiasm in completing them.)	4.35	Agree
2. "Ang mga gawain sa GBI ay nakatulong upang mas mapabuti ang aking kakayahan sa pagsusulat ng mga talata sa Filipino." (Students believe that GBI activities helped improve their writing skills.)	4.40	Agree
3. "Ang mga gawain sa GBI ay nakatutulong sa akin na gamitin ang aking kasanayan sa pagsulat sa mga tunay na sitwasyon." (Students find the tasks relevant to real-life situations or useful for their personal and academic growth.)	4.65	Strongly agree
4. "Dahil sa GBI, mas kumpiyansa akong magsulat ng mga talata sa Filipino." (Students feel more confident in their ability to write effectively in Filipino after participating in GBI tasks.)	4.10	Agree
5. "Ang pakikipagtulungan sa mga kaklase sa mga gawain sa GBI ay nakatulong sa akin na mapabuti ang aking pagsusulat." (Students perceive that working with peers in GBI activities enhances their writing skills and learning experience.)	4.25	Agree

Legend: 4.51 – 5.00: Strongly Agree; 3.51 – 4.50: Agree; 2.51 – 3.50: Neutral; 1.51 – 2.50: Disagree; 1.00 – 1.50: Strongly Disagree

Table 7: Thematic analysis of students' attitudes and perceptions towards GBI in learning paragraph writing in Filipino

<i>Theme</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Feedback</i>
1. Enhanced Engagement and Motivation	Students reported increased interest and willingness to write due to the relevance and structure of genre-based activities.	<i>"Mas interesado akong magsulat sa Filipino dahil sa mga aktwal na gawain."</i>
2. Improved Confidence in Writing	Structured genre-based guidance gave students a stronger sense of competence in paragraph writing.	<i>"Mas naging kumpiyansa ako sa pagsusulat ng talata dahil sa gabay at struktura ng mga gawain."</i>
3. Perceived Relevance of Tasks	Students find the tasks relevant to real-life writing situations, helping them apply their learning beyond the classroom.	<i>"Makabuluhan ang mga gawain at magagamit ko sa pang-araw-araw na buhay."</i>
4. Collaboration and Peer Learning	Genre instruction fostered collaboration through joint construction and peer review.	<i>"Mas natututo ako kapag nagtutulungan kami sa mga gawain."</i>
5. Positive Perception of Task Difficulty	Tasks were seen as appropriately challenging, promoting effort without frustration.	<i>"Sakto lang ang hirap ng mga gawain, hindi masyadong madali, hindi rin sobrang hirap."</i>
6. Enjoyment and Satisfaction with GBI	Students enjoyed writing more through structured genre-based tasks.	<i>"Masaya at kapaki-pakinabang ang mga gawain sa GBI."</i>
7. Development of Critical Thinking	Students engaged in reasoning, logical structure, and argument development.	<i>"Natutulungan ako ng mga problem-solution tasks na maging mas lohikal sa pagsusulat."</i>
8. Practical Application of Grammar and Vocabulary	Students perceive that GBI helps them apply grammar rules and improve their vocabulary in a practical and contextualised manner.	<i>"Mas natututo akong gamitin ang tamang"</i>

when structuring arguments and applying grammar and vocabulary contextually.

DISCUSSION

The pre-intervention results, shown in Table 2, revealed that students exhibited significant difficulties across multiple dimensions of writing, which could impede their success in academic communication. Their low mean score in Clarity and Coherence (mean = 2.08) aligns with studies highlighting that students often struggle with macro-organisation of texts when the expected stages and moves of a genre are not explicitly taught (Bogaerds-Hazenberg et al. 2021). The low score in Grammar and Syntax (mean = 2.14) further indicate that while traditional approaches might focus on isolated rules, scholars have emphasised the need to teach grammar in context as part of larger genre-based writing tasks to improve both accuracy and fluency

(Jones and Derewianka 2012). The observed deficiency in Vocabulary and Word Choice (mean = 2.13) suggested a need for instruction that ties vocabulary closely to register and field-specific language, aligning with genre-based pedagogy's focus on explicit instruction of lexical bundles common to particular genres (Schleppegrell 2020). Students' limited ability in Context Development and Evidence (mean = 2.10) is a key area addressed by GBI, which emphasised content-bulging through joint construction and modelling of texts that demonstrate logical reasoning and substantiated claims (Rose and Martin 2012). Furthermore, the critical gaps identified in Research and Citation (mean = 2.03) necessitate integrated instruction on intertextuality and source synthesis, a rhetorical expectation in academic genres (Fu and Liu 2022). The low score for Audience Awareness (mean = 2.10) reflects a limited ability to tailor tone and content, an issue GBI addressed by highlighting tenor as a

crucial dimension of genre learning (Seiter and Gass 2007). Similarly, low scores in Revising and Editing (mean = 2.05) suggests students do not yet view revision as an integral process. GBI can address this by encouraging reflective practices like peer editing based on genre expectations, strengthening students' ability to self-monitor. Finally, challenges in Critical Thinking and Argumentation (mean = 2.14) underscore the need for purpose-driven writing instruction, which GBI provided by encouraging the construction of texts that are not only linguistically correct but also rhetorically effective in argumentative contexts (Schleppegrell 2020).

The consistent "Needs Improvement" scores suggested that students enter higher education with underdeveloped academic writing skills, likely stemming from traditional form-focused instruction that prioritises isolated grammar drills over real-world writing applications. To address this, the implementation of GBI is essential, as its functional and scaffolded framework aligns writing pedagogy with actual academic and professional demands. Adopting this explicit approach not only remedies observed deficiencies but also fosters the 21st century communication competencies highlighted by PISA (OECD 2023) and advances Sustainable Development Goal 4 (Quality Education) by promoting inclusive, equitable literacy instruction.

Post-test mean of 24.82 (Satisfactory), shown in Table 4, signifies a major improvement, confirming the efficacy of GBI's explicit instruction in genre features and purposeful writing (Rakrak 2024; Jones and Derewianka 2012). The rise in Clarity and Coherence (M = 3.14) validates genre theory's emphasis on structural moves (Capan Tekin and Iseri 2022; Charney and Carlson 1995), while Grammar and Syntax scores (M = 3.09) support durability of contextualised instruction over isolated drills (Vold 2020). Correspondingly, gains in Vocabulary (M = 3.12) and Content Development (M = 3.11) reflect improved lexical awareness (Birhan 2021) and the benefits of guided construction (Rakrak 2024). While Research and Citation (M = 2.99) remained a relative challenge necessitating specific focus on intertextuality (Harman 2013), improvements in Audience Awareness (M = 3.09), Revising (M = 3.13) and Critical Thinking (M = 3.10) affirm the value of teaching tenor (Hyland 2007), integrated revision cycles (Tran 2025), and guided modelling (Cakmak 2013).

The results in Table 5 provide strong statistical evidence that GBI intervention significantly and positively impacted students' writing skills. These findings strongly support GBI's effectiveness in fostering academic writing development by guiding students through explicit genre modelling, joint construction, and scaffolded practice, thereby helping learners internalise the structural, linguistic, and rhetorical demands of academic genres (Jones and Derewianka 2012; Hyland 2007). The statistically significant gains confirm recent literature arguing that explicit genre instruction not only improves surface features of writing but also deepens learners' ability to organise, argue, and write for purpose and audience (de Oliveira and Smith 2021). Furthermore, the moderate correlation underscores the value of differentiated scaffolding inherent in GBI, as it allows both advanced and struggling students to benefit from the approach (Tran 2025).

Table 6 reflects overwhelmingly positive student attitudes, demonstrating GBI's success in empowering learners by connecting instruction to authentic communicative demands (Liu et al. 2023; Tran 2025). The high perception of improved writing skills (M = 4.40) supports evidence that explicit genre instruction enhances coherence and organization (Hyland 2007; Jones and Derewianka 2012), while the strong motivation score (M = 4.35) indicates that purpose-driven contexts foster interest (de Oliveira and Smith 2021) and reduce anxiety through structured progression (Yasuda 2011). This scaffolding notably bolstered writing confidence (M = 4.10), allowing learners to gradually master complex tasks and improve self-efficacy (Nguyen and Truong 2024). Finally, the positive reception of collaborative writing (M = 4.25) confirms that GBI effectively fosters metalinguistic awareness and critical reflection through peer interaction (Harman 2013; Schleppegrell 2020).

Student" perceptions underscore the value of Genre-Based Instruction in fostering engagement, skill development, confidence, and collaboration in writing. The consistently high ratings across indicators affirm that GBI not only supports writing proficiency but also creates a learner-centred environment where writing is seen as meaningful, purposeful, and achievable.

The high engagement and motivation reported by students, Table 7, align with the work of Morgan and To (2023), who found that genre-based

pedagogy enhances learner agency by emphasizing the communicative purpose and social context of texts. The growth in writing confidence confirms de Oliveira and Smith (2021), who observed that GBI's explicit instruction and structured scaffolding help learners build competence and confidence in tackling complex academic tasks. Furthermore, the perceived relevance of the tasks mirrors recent studies confirming that genre-based instruction promotes the transfer of writing skills beyond the classroom (Hyland 2007; Liu et al. 2023).

The appreciation for collaboration is consistent with Vygotsky's (1978) sociocultural theory and genre-informed research (Schleppegrell 2020), as peer interaction during joint construction fosters metacognitive reflection and reinforces audience awareness (Harman 2013). The finding that tasks were appropriately challenging and enjoyable supports research indicating that calibrated complexity activates critical thinking while fostering a positive learning climate and affective engagement (Nguyen and Truong 2024; Hyland 2007). Finally, students' observation that GBI supported critical thinking in argument structuring and evidence evaluation aligns with the findings of Morgan and To (2023) and Jones and Derewianka (2012), further affirmed by the contextualised instruction of grammar and vocabulary proven more effective than isolated approaches (Schleppegrell 2020).

The pre-test data revealed that students particularly struggled with content development, research and citation, clarity and coherence, and grammar. These align with findings by Labicane and Oliva (2022), who emphasised the need to improve students' academic writing through explicit instruction in genre, source integration, and argumentation.

The post-test results, while reflecting improvements in all dimensions, also suggest ongoing needs in areas like research skills, editing, and higher-order reasoning. These gaps highlight the importance of continued support and modeling in writing genres that demand synthesis of evidence and nuanced arguments.

CONCLUSION

This study successfully demonstrated the effectiveness of Genre-Based Instruction (GBI) in enhancing the paragraph writing skills of college students. The GBI intervention resulted in a statis-

tically significant improvement in student performance, evidenced by substantial gains in post-test scores across all key dimensions, including clarity, coherence, content development, and critical thinking. These findings affirm that GBI effectively supports the holistic development of writing competence by explicitly teaching the structural, linguistic, and rhetorical demands of academic genres.

Furthermore, qualitative analysis confirmed the pedagogical value of GBI through overwhelmingly positive student perceptions. Students found the approach to be highly relevant, engaging, and practical, valuing the structured scaffolding provided by the modelling, joint construction, and independent writing stages. This process was perceived as fostering confidence, motivation, and collaborative learning, ultimately leading to a deeper investment in authentic writing tasks that reflected real-world and academic contexts.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Institutions should formally integrate Genre-Based Instruction (GBI) into all writing curricula. GBI's emphasis on explicit genre knowledge, purposeful communication, and contextualised grammar is crucial for equipping students with essential skills for both academic and professional success.

To ensure effective implementation, professional development programs should be provided to train educators in the principles and practices of GBI. Workshops and mentoring should focus on designing genre-informed tasks, facilitating effective scaffolding, and promoting deep genre awareness among learners.

The design of writing assignments must reflect authentic, real-world genres such as reports, editorials, and narratives. These tasks should gradually increase in complexity and incorporate opportunities for collaborative construction, peer feedback, and guided revisions to develop technical accuracy alongside rhetorical effectiveness.

Educators ought to embed formative assessment and peer review into writing instruction. These practices encourage self-reflection, build crucial audience awareness, and help students systematically refine their ideas and writing strategies over time.

Writing instruction should actively support the development of critical and information literacy.

Given noted challenges in research and citation, guided practice must be included in incorporating evidence, synthesising information, and referencing appropriately within the rhetorical boundaries of specific academic genres.

Finally, further research on GBI applications should be encouraged. Future studies need to explore how GBI supports diverse learners across various disciplines and proficiency levels, providing necessary insights for customising instructional strategies to meet varied academic needs.

In summary, Genre-Based Instruction proves to be a practical, empowering, and pedagogically sound approach to teaching writing. By centring instruction on meaningful texts, structured support, and authentic communication, GBI not only enhances writing proficiency but also promotes life-long learning, confidence, and purposeful language use among college students.

REFERENCES

- Azar AS, Nasiri H 2014. Learners' attitudes toward the effectiveness of Mobile Assisted Language Learning (MALL) in L2 listening comprehension. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98: 1836-1843. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.613>
- Birhan AT 2021. Effects of teaching lexical bundles on EFL students' abstract genre academic writing skills improvement: Corpus-based research design. *International Journal of Language Education*, 585-597. <https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v5i1.14917>
- Bogaerds-Hazenberg STM, Evers-Vermeul J, van den Bergh H 2021. A meta analysis on the effects of text structure instruction on reading comprehension in the upper elementary grades. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 56(3): 435-462. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.311>
- Braun V, Clarke V 2006. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2): 77-101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Çakmak E 2013. Metin Yapısı Öğretiminin Öğretmen Adaylarının Tartışmacı Yazma Becerilerine Etkisi / The Effect Of Teaching Argumentative Writing On Teacher Candidatesand#039; Argumentative Writing Skills. *Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama*, 9(4): 379-389. From <<https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/eku/issue/5458/74029>> (Retrieved on 12 November 2025).
- Çapan Tekin S, İperi K 2022. Lisansüstü tezlerin yöntem bölümlerinde tutarlılık ilişkileri [Coherence relationships in methodology chapters of graduate theses]. *Dil Dergisi*, 173(1): 26-48. <https://doi.org/10.33690/dilder.942555>
- Charney DH, Carlson RA 1995. Learning to Write in a Genre: What Student Writers Take from Model Texts. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 29(1): 88-125. From <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/40171424>> (Retrieved on 14 December 2025).
- Creswell JW, Creswell JD 2017. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, And Mixed Methods Approaches*. 5th Edition. SAGE Publications.
- de Oliveira LC, Smith SL 2021. A genre-based approach to writing instruction in the content areas. In: H Mohebbi, C Coombe (Eds.): *Research Questions in Language Education and Applied Linguistics: A Reference Guide*. Springer International Publishing, pp. 69-73. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-79143-8_13
- Fu Z, Liu Y 2022. Promoting L2 writing development via a concept-based approach to teaching genre: A sociocultural intervention study in Chinese EFL writing classrooms. *Language Teaching Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688221114363>
- Harman R 2013. Literary intertextuality in genre-based pedagogies: Building lexical cohesion in fifth-grade L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 22(2): 125-140. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2013.03.006>
- Hyland K 2007. Genre pedagogy: Language, literacy and L2 writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(3): 148-164. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.07.005>
- Hyland K, Hyland F 2019. Contexts and issues in feedback on L2 writing. In: K Hyland, F Hyland (Eds.): *Feedback in Second Language Writing: Contexts and Issues*. 2nd Edition. Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-22. <https://doi.org/DOI:10.1017/9781108635547.003>
- Jones P, Derewianka B 2012. *Teaching Language in Context*. Oxford University Press. From <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/315897394_Teaching_Language_in_Context> (Retrieved on 12 November 2025).
- Labicane GEM, Oliva RMM 2022. Common errors in composition writing by college students. *Language Literacy: Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Language Teaching*, 6(1): 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.30743/ll.v6i1.4975>
- Liu H, Ismail L, Ahmad NK 2023. Genre-based approaches and ESL/EFL writing: A review of the literature. *World Journal of English Language*, 14(2): 25. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v14n2p25>
- Morgan E, To V 2023. Genre-based literacy and collaboration: Promoting social justice and quality education. In: K Beasy, C Smith, J Watson (Eds.): *Education and the UN Sustainable Development Goals: Praxis Within and Beyond the Classroom*. Springer Nature Singapore, pp. 507-524. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-99-3802-5_28
- Nguyen TTA, Truong V 2024. Effects of scaffolding in genre-based writing instructions on EFL learners' writing performance. *European Journal of Education and Pedagogy*, 5(1): 23-30. <https://doi.org/10.24018/ejedu.2024.5.1.751>
- OECD 2023. *PISA 2022 Results (Volume I)* (Vol. 1). OECD. <https://doi.org/10.1787/53f23881-en>
- Pablo JCI, Lasaten RCS 2018. Writing Difficulties and Quality of Academic Essays of Senior High School Students. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 6: 46-57. From <<https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=3307375>> (Retrieved on 12 November 2025).
- Rakrak M 2024. The Genre Approach to Writing: A Socially Contextualized Pedagogy for Effective Instruction. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 5(1): 1-9. From <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/389494387_The_Genre_Approach_to_Writing_A_Socially_Contextualized_Pedagogy_for_Effective_Instruction#full-text> (Retrieved on 13October 2025).
- Rose D, Martin JR 2012. *Learning to Write/Reading to Learn: Genre, Knowledge and Pedagogy in the Sydney School*

- Equinox Textbooks and Surveys in Linguistics*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Schleppegrell MJ 2020. The Knowledge Base for Language Teaching: What Is the English to Be Taught as Content? *Language Teaching Research*, 24(1): 17-27. from From <<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1238871>> (Retrieved on 8 September 2025).
- Seiter JS, Gass RH 2007. Teaching students how to analyze and adapt to audiences. *Communication Teacher*, 21(2): 45-48. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17404620701529456>
- Thongchalerms S, Jarunthawatchai W 2020. The impact of genre based instruction on EFL learners' writing development. *International Journal of Instruction*, 13(1): 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2020.1311a>
- Tran T 2025. Enhancing EFL writing revision practices: The impact of AI- and teacher-generated feedback and their sequences. *Education Sciences*, 15: 232. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15020232>
- Vold ET 2020. Meaningful and contextualised grammar instruction: What can foreign language textbooks offer? *The Language Learning Journal*, 48(2): 133-147. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2017.1357745>
- Vygotsky LS 1978. *Mind In Society: The Development Of Higher Psychological Processes*. M Cole, V John-Steiner, S Scribner, E Souberman (Eds.). USA: Harvard University Press.
- Yasuda S 2011. Genre-based tasks in foreign language writing: Developing writers' genre awareness, linguistic knowledge, and writing competence. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 20(2): 111-133. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2011.03.001>

Paper received for publication in December, 2025
Paper accepted for publication in April, 2026