Publisher homepage: www.universepg.com, ISSN: 2707-4668 (Online) & 2707-465X (Print)
https://doi.org/10.34104/ajssls.024.0920103
Asian Journal of Social Sciences and Legal Studies
Journal homepage: www.universepg.com/journal/ajssls

Building EFL Learners' Writing Coherence through Tasks: A Comparison of Genre and Process-based Tasks

Behdohkht Mall-Amiri[1]* and Atefeh Moradian[1]

[1]Department of English Language, Central Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran.
*Correspondence: bmallamiri@gmail.com (Dr. Behdohkht Mall-Amiri, Assistant Professor, Department of English Language, Central Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran).

ABSTRACT

This study intended to investigate the impact of genre-based and process-based tasks on the EFL learners' writing coherence. To prove this, 60 intermediate EFL undergraduates at Elmi Karbordi University, including 40 females and 20 males majoring in English translation, were selected through nonrandom convenience sampling. Following this, they were randomly divided into two experimental groups each of which was exposed to two different interventions (genre-based and process-based tasks). Each treatment lasted for 15 sessions, over 8 weeks. After taking the writing posttest, their means were compared via an independent samples t-test which led to the conclusion that there is a significant difference between the effect of genre-based and process-based tasks on the EFL learners' writing coherence, with the genre-based task group outperforming the process-based task group.

Keywords: Genre-based task, Process-based task, EFL learners, and Writing coherence.

INTRODUCTION:

Coherence is considered to be an elusive and abstract notion (Connor, 2009) as a group of authors mistake cohesion for coherence. They believe that a coherent text should use a network of connectiveness, such connectivity is facilitated through transition signals or through skillful use of nouns, and pronouns(Jones, 2007). However, McCarthy, (2001) emphasized that the study of cohesion does not have relevance to the surface linguistic connections in the text. KUo, (1995) also stated that cohesion which means using the appropriate topic-related vocabulary and appropriate grammar does not necessarily lead to the ability of constructing a sensible text. A coherent or sensible text, in contrast, is built through meaning realization, choosing appropriate grammar and context fit- in. (Kopple, 1986 as cited in Cooper and Greenbaum, (1986) suggested that paragraphs given-before new information enables the readers understand what they need to know before going through the rest of the writing. To be more exact, coherence refers to the way a text has a clear meaning and is easily understood by individuals. Indeed, the way the content is organized, its relevance to the main topic and the clearly explained ideas let the readers fully understand the text. Thus, a paragraph is coherent if sentences develop a main idea (Richards & Schmidt, 2002).

Jones, (2007) suggested that the learners' difficulty arises from where sentences and ideas do not relate to one another. Such problems results in missing links of meaning despite the fact that the sentence structures are connected correctly. The meaning should not be fragmented but it needs to be internally consistent.

Unfortunately, most students write as they speak; the voices in mind that come to them while writing are often spoken voices (Wertsch, 1991). They jump from one topic to another, not making relations between ideas and assuming that the readers understand the relations and continue to follow (Jones, 2007). According to Hayes and Flower, (1983) writers are required to plan in the cognitivist sense. They emphasized that planning involves higher- order of thinking skill and the writers need to consider readers. The most important fact is that students should realize that writing is a process, therefore, simple messages in mind can be encoded through selecting appropriate vocabulary, considering audience, and deciding on the format. Various process-based approaches in writing have been suggested by different researchers and educators. For instance, process writing instructors use procedures including brainstorming, journal writing, small-group activities, free writing, revising, and editing (Applebee, 1984). Shih, (1986) also used suitable inquiry strategies for brainstorming, planning, drafting, giving recommendations, revising, and editing. Flower and Hayes, (1980) proposed the process-based model of writing which entails three cognitive processes including planning, translating, and reviewing. Another mode of process approach proposed by Badger and White, (2000): Learners usually brainstorm for the topic of houses as a prewriting activity. As for the drafting stage, they plan how to organize their writing while applying appropriate structure. This would lead them to produce the initial draft of an explanation of a certain house. After discussing their ideas, the students might do the revision of the first draft in groups or on their own. In the final stage, the writings would be proof-read or edited. Unlike process approach which mainly focuses on brainstorming, planning and drafting of the writing, genre approach considers the setting where the writing is generated (Badger & White, 2000). Various types of writing, or genres, such as an apology letter, recipes, or reports of law, are used to fulfill different kinds of purposes (Flowerdew, 1993). Different scholars proposed various models to be used in EFL context. For instance, Cope and Kalantzis, (1993) proposed a genre model called wheel. Three stages of genre approach have also been proposed by Kay and Dudley-Evans, (1998). First, one certain genre is introduced and analyzed. The learners are then supposed to do an exercise focusing on form. Following this activity, they are expected to generate a text Binoy (Roy, 2023).

A number of studies related to genre approach and its impact on the learners' writing skill have been carried out : application of genre-based approach in a writing course by Myskow and Gordon, (2009) using genre-approach for instructing writing content by Reppen, (1994) and genre-based teaching report writing through genre-based approach by Marshall, (1991). There are also studies focusing on the process approach namely the process writing approach: an alternative study to influence the students' writing by Martínez, (2005); A meta-analysis by Graham and Sandmel, (2011) on the process writing approach; application of genre approach in teaching middle school students living in urban areas by Patthey-Chavez *et al.* (2004). Moreover, some studies' focus was on the integrated genre and process approaches, for example, combination of genre and process approaches to enhance students' writing skills by Tangpermpoon, (2008) the impact of integrated approach to writing on the expository compositions of ESL learners in a secondary school in Malaysia by Chow, (2007). However, based on the researchers' information, there is no study investigating the comparative effect of genre-based and process-based tasks on EFL learners' writing coherence. Indeed, in this research, the task-based approach has been employed to compensate for the shortcomings of process-based and genre-based approaches. Regarding the process approach, the teacher helps the learners develop the writing unconsciously while providing input is deemed to be of less importance (Badger & White, 2000). Indeed, an appropriate task not only generates interest and a certain amount of challenge, but also provides opportunities for the students to produce as much language as they can (Willis & Willis, 2007). Task-Based Learning is a new style which makes students engage in tasks leading to an outcome (Shahzad, 2022; Ellis, 2003).

In genre approach, also, the writing development is seen as the imitation and analysis of the input by the instructors rather than the students (Badger & White, 2000). However, the TBLT bridges the gap between

genre approach and students' passivity. According to Ellis, (2003) as the students engage in doing tasks, the learning takes place. Swan, (2005) also put emphasis on the instruction through which the learners' involvement increases and the teacher only facilitates the learning for them. Larsen-Freeman, (2000) states, in task based, the learners have the rich opportunity to interact with their classmates to perform the tasks. These interactions paved the way for the learners to understand each other and present what they mean. Thus, according to what has been mentioned in terms of the disadvantages of the both approaches, the following research question was raised by the researchers. Is there any significant difference between the impact of genre and process-based tasks on the EFL learners' writing coherence?

METHODOLOGY:

Participants

This research was carried out on 60 male and female EFL learners studying at Elmi Karbordi university in Iran, Tehran, majoring in English Translation and passing the Paragraph Development course. For the purpose of selecting participants, a Piloted Preliminary English Test (PET) was administered to 90 students whose major was English translation and who were passing paragraph development course. Having considered 60 students whose scores fell one standard deviation above and below the mean, the researchers divided them randomly into two experimental groups including 30 intermediate students. The writing and speaking parts of the PET test were measured by two examiners whose inter-rater reliability had been calculated through Cronbach Alpha. (Speaking: p =.0001<.05, r =. 924, writing: p=.0001<.05, r=.935,).

Instrumentation and materials

Preliminary English Test (PET)

The PET test has been developed by Cambridge ESOL Examination and designed for different levels of English language proficiency. Among 5 Levels of English ability, the threshold is B1 according to the Council of Europe's Common European Framework. It measures 4 skills including Reading/writing. After conducting the piloted version of Preliminary English Test, the reliability of the participant's scores was .92 through Cronbach alphas.

Coherence scale

The writing part of PET includes three parts testing a range of writing skills namely producing variations on simple sentences to pieces of continuous text. Questions 1-5 carry one mark as the candidates are assessed based on the linguistic feature and questions 7/8 are marked out of 15. The questions 7 and 8 in the writing part are scored based on the band descriptor designed by the Cambridge ESOL Examination (**Table 1**). Overall, the writing part represents 25% of total marks (equal to 42.5). According to the writing band descriptor (**Table 1**), the participants' overall writing score is calculated out of raw score of 5 which is converted to 42.5(25% of the total score of 170). To calculate the writing coherence for both posttest and pretest, the researchers only consider Coherence part of PET band descriptor which accounts for a quarter of total score (Total score:42.5/4=10.6). Thus, the learners' writing coherence for both pretest and posttest has been calculated out of 10.6.

Table 1: PET Writing Band Descriptors (Cambridge ESOL Examation).

Mark	Task Response	Coherence	Grammar	Lexical choice
5	All elements of the content are covered appropriately.	Messages contain clarity and they are communicated to readers. There will be an organized response as well as linking devices which are simple.	The language is used confidently and ambitiously according to the level. It includes using different kinds of grammatical structures. Minor errors are occurred and do not impede comprehension, they might take place as a result of attempts which are made ambitiously. Generally, the reader understands takes	The language is used confidently and ambitiously according to the level. It includes using different kinds of lexical choices. Minor errors are occurred and do not impede comprehension, they might take place as a result of attempts which are made ambitiously. Generally, the reader understands takes place with no effort.

			place with no effort.	
4	All the elements of content are adequately covered. The message will be sent desirably to the reader.	The message is communicated successfully. The linking devices and organization are occasionally notable.	The language use will be quite ambitious. There are a range of grammatical structures; however, there are some errors which are not impeding. Generally, little effort is made by the reader.	The language use will be quite ambitious. There are a range of grammatical structures; however, there are some errors which are not impeding. Generally, little effort is made by the reader.
3	All elements of the content are attempted. The candidates might put a lot of effort to send the message to the reader.	The reader put some effort to understand the message. The organization is always attempted but the linking of sentences is not always attempted.	The grammar use is not ambitious. if it is ambitious, the flaws will occur. There are some errors which might occur occasionally. However, they are not impeding. Overall, the reader might put some effort.	The vocabulary use is not ambitious. if it is ambitious, the flaws will occur. There are some errors which might occur occasionally. However, they are not impeding. Overall, the reader might put some effort.
2	Two elements of content are eliminated, or successfully covered. The candidate puts a lot of effort to convey the message to the reader.	Only part of the message is conveyed to the reader. The writing might be a little short (20-25 words). The use of punctuation does not follow an organized pattern. The writing might not be coherent.	The language use will be simple, repetitive, and simple. There are a lot of grammatical errors which occasionally impede communication. Generally, reader needs to put a lot of effort to understand the meaning.	The language use will be simple, repetitive, and simple. There are a lot of lexical errors which occasionally impede communication. Generally, reader needs to put a lot of effort to understand the meaning.
1	There is not much relevance to the content. This influences negatively on the reader.	The reader should put excessive effort to understand the message. Writing is very short, (10-15) words. The entire writing is not coherent at all. The lack of punctuation may be notable.	The language use is severely limited, and there is no sign of the range of grammar. Language is not controlled well. And the message is hard to understand. Generally, the reader should put a lot of effort to understand the meaning.	The language use is severely limited, and there is no sign of the range of words. Language is not controlled well. And the message is hard to understand. Generally, the reader should put a lot of effort to understand the meaning.
0	It is completely irrelevant. Too little language is used so the assessment will be challenging. The writing seems illegible and not relevant to the task.	It cannot be comprehended or it is too short (Below 10 words). The content is totally impeding and incomprehensible.		

Course book

The book for both experimental groups was Paragraph Development published by Prentice Hall Regents and written by Arnaudet and Barrett, (1997) for inter-mediate to advanced learners of English. This book has been complied based on the theory that if a student is capable of writing an organized, coherent paragraph, he/she will not find the writing process difficult. Four chapters of this book including topic sentence, and developing ideas, namely, compare and contrast, cause and effect, and process were covered in this study.

Procedure

Having divided the participants into two groups, the researchers commenced the treatments. The period of

the study lasted for 15 sessions of 90 minutes (the whole treatment spanned over a period of 8 weeks). Both experimental groups were instructed by one teacher (one of the researchers) and similar materials.

Experimental group 1 - Genre-based task

The first section of the Paragraph Development Book has been allocated to the topic sentence. According to the wheel model suggested by Cope and Kalantzis, (1993) the learners were first exposed to several authentic models of topic sentences provided by the book and asked several questions with regard to the surface structure (linguistic features and lexical items) and the meaning. In groups, they were supposed to generate their own topic sentences and exchange their piece of work with their partners. (Based on the advantage Larsen-Freeman, (2000) mentioned about group work in TBLT). They were required to assess the peers' topic sentences in terms of the linguistic feature, meaning, and lexical choice, which gives them the opportunity not only see another sample but ask themselves the questions: if the linguistic features, lexical items, and the meaning of the sentence really meet the standards shown by teacher or not. In the second session, the students were provided with different models of topic sentences and their following examples.

After the exchange of questions and answers between the teacher and the students based on the surface structure, meaning, and coherence (whether the first sentence is related to the second one, and how?), they were then expected to create two sentences which were assessed by the two or three partners. In this way, the learners could see and evaluate the genres created by their classmates and ask themselves the questions according to the linguistic features, clarity and coherence (being exposed to different inputs proposed by Dudley-Evans, (1998) and Cope and Kalantzis, (1993). The learners were required to practice a wide variety of topic sentences and their examples within 2-4 sessions so that they were able to reach an in-depth understanding of this part which is the fundamental concept in writing. After teaching the basics through genre approach within the framework of the task, the teacher showed the process model of the paragraph. However, the students were required to discuss different features of the process paragraph with their partners. The questions related to structure, word choice, coherence, were no longer asked by the teacher but by the partners. (The learners' involvement stated by Swan, (2005) in performing a task). For example, they were provided with a text about different stages a caterpillar takes to turn into a butterfly. They then had to put a tick mark beside the statements including:

- The sentences are grammatically correct.
- The sentences are correct in terms of choice of the words.
- The sentences are related to one another by how and why.
- There is a flow/progression through the whole paragraph.
- The whole paragraph is meaningful.
- The whole paragraph transmits a clear message

Indeed, these features give the learners an insight into how a meaningful paragraph could be developed. After discussing these features, they were supposed to write a paragraph that all the items mentioned in the above statements should be considered. Following this stage, their writing was scored by one or several learners based on the criteria mentioned above. These procedures were followed for the opinion, cause and effect and compare and contrast paragraphs.

An example of genre-based task could clarify the writing procedure better

Changing a flat tire is really a very simple operation if you have the right tools. When you have removed the hubcap from the wheel which has the flat, correctly place the jack to lift the car off the ground. Now you are ready to jack up the car high enough for the tire to clear the ground. After you have done that, carefully loosen the nuts that hold the tire and rim in place; the tool you use to do that is called a lug wrench. Remove the tire and put the spare tire in place. Now you are ready to put the nuts back on the wheel and tighten them as firmly as you can with the lug wrench. All that remains is to replace the hubcap, lower the car to the ground, give the nuts a final tightening, and remove the jack.

After showing process model of the paragraph on changing a flat tire, the teacher had the students discuss different features of the process paragraph with their partners. The questions which had relevance

to the structure, word choice, coherence, asked by the learners in pairs. For example, they were supposed to put a tick mark beside the statements including:

- The sentences are grammatically correct.
- The sentences are correct in terms of choice of the words.
- The sentences are related to one another by how and why.
- There is a flow/progression through the whole paragraph.
- The whole paragraph is meaningful.
- The whole paragraph transmits a clear message.

Indeed, these features give the learners an insight in to how a meaningful paragraph could be developed. After discussing these features, they were asked to write a paragraph that all the items mentioned in the above statements should be considered. Following this stage, their writing was scored by one or several learners based on the criteria mentioned above.

Experimental group 2- Process-based task

During the first sessions, the students were taught how to brainstorm (the first stage of process approach proposed by Badger and White, (2000)). After provided by different brainstorms of process paragraphs, the learners were then asked to brainstorm one topic by themselves and compare them with their partners. (The group work suggested by the proponents of TBLT). For instance, the teacher provided them with different procedures a caterpillar should take to become a butterfly like the following diagram: Caterpillar hatching eating its eggshell=> eating and growing- the skin splitting=> a Chrysalis=>butterfly pushing through=>hardening its wings-drying its wings

The learners were supposed to brainstorm for baking a cake

Preheating the oven – creaming the butter and sugar-adding eggs and vanilla-mixing the ingredients in the cake flour-pouring the cake batter into the pan-baking the cake for an hour.

Having realized the brainstorm, the students learnt how to plan their writing. For the process paragraph writing, they were taught what they were supposed to write a paragraph. First, they were required to write a topic sentence then the stages related to that topic. For example:

Topic sentence: Different stages that a caterpillar should take to become a butterfly

- First Caterpillar hatching
- Next-eating its eggshell
- Following this- eating and growing
- Then - the skin splitting
- Following a Chrysalis-butterfly pushing through-
- At last, hardening its wings
- Finally drying its wings

By doing this, the students were aware of what they were required to write, where they were expected to write topic sentence, how they were supposed to write the sentences in sequence, and what words or phrases they needed to use to signal the transitions between sentences. After planning their writing, they were corrected by their teacher. In next stage, they were taught how to write a paragraph based on what they had planned earlier. After the teacher provided the paragraph related to the caterpillar, the students were asked to write a paragraph about how to bake a cake. The writing pieces were collected by the teacher according to grammatical feature, choice of lexis and coherence and reverted back to the student in the following session. As for the cause-and-effect session, they were provided with a topic and its brainstorm about the effects of some topics: For example, the topic related to the effects of global warming

1- The effects of global warming=>temperature increase=>changes in agricultural patterns, example, =>great plains in Saudi Arabia
2- Changes in rainfall pattern=>water supplies in some areas=>For examples: southeast Asian countries=>require irrigation to sustain crops

Having learned about the brainstorm, the learners were taught how they plan their writing to look meaningful and correct in terms of structure and lexical choice. The panning of the effects of global warming are as follows

Topic sentence=> The phenomenon of global warming causes dramatic changes around the world. Firstly, the rise of temperature results in changes in agricultural patterns, for example: ….

Secondly, the changes in rainfall pattern led to shortage of water supplies, an example could be

In conclusion: the effects of global warming are irreversible so we need to take measures to cope with the problems caused by such problem…

After planning, the teacher showed the full paragraph as the final draft for the analysis. Also, she had them discuss the questions with regard to the grammar, lexical choice, coherence, meaning, and the message of the writing with their partner. They were then given a topic to brainstorm/ plan/and write full paragraph. Finally, the final drafts were corrected by the students' partners based on the grammar, lexical choice, coherence, and meaning.

RESULTS:

Participant selection

The researchers employed a sample PET to decide on the participants. Prior to the PET administration, it had been piloted to be guaranteed that it could be applied for choosing the main participants. (Reliability of the scores at this piloting was 0.92). Following this, the main participants were tested by the piloted version of the test. **Table 2** shows the descriptive statistics of this administration with the mean score equal to 152.8 and the standard deviation 4.57. Based on the obtained results, learners with one standard deviation above and below the mean were selected to participate in the experimentation.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of the Scores in Piloted Preliminary English Test.

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic
Population	90	145.00	162.00	152.8000	4.57693
Valid N (listwise)	90				

Writing skill in proficiency test, according to the **Table 1**, was assessed based on 4 criteria, namely Task Response, Coherence, Grammar, and Vocabulary. Writing Coherence accounts for 25% of total writing score which is equal to 10.62 (**Table 1**). Accordingly, the mean scores of participants' writing coherence in two groups were compared out of 10.2 prior to the treatment to assure that two groups are homogenous in terms of writing coherence. The mean scores of groups 1 and 2 are 5.7833 and 5.5833 respectively (**Table 3**).

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics of the Writing Coherence Scores Obtained by the Two Groups before Treatment.

Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
1	30	5.7833	.55216	.10081
2	30	5.5833	.68334	.12476

Table 4: The Independent Sample T-test of the Two Groups' Mean Scores on the Writing Coherence before Treatment.

	Levene's test for equality of variances		est for Equality of Means					95% confidence interval of the difference	
	F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Equal variances Assumed	3.070	.085	1.247	58	.217	.20000	.16040	-.12107	.52107
Equal variances not assumed			1.247	55.551	.218	.20000	.16040	-.12138	.52138

As displayed in **Table 4**, the variances were not significantly different (F=3.07, *p*= .08>.05), therefore the first row was consulted for the result. As indicted there, the difference between the two groups turned out to be non-significant (t=1.247 *p*=.217.0.05*)* Therefore, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between the two groups' writing coherence before the treatment. Thus, the participants' writing coherence scores in posttest and pre- test have also been calculated out of 10.62 for the purpose of comparison. According to the data, the learners' mean scores in posttest are better than those of the writing proficiency test (**Table 5**).

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics of the scores obtained through Pretest and posttest a

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error
Group 1	60	4.0	6.50	5.6833	.62414	-1.335	.309
Group 2	60	6.0	10.50	7.3333	.89095	1.195	.309
Valid N (list wise)	60						

Inter-rater reliability

A writing posttest was selected from PET Cambridge book designed by the Cambridge ESOL examination and administered to two experimental groups as soon as the treatments were completed. The learners' compositions were scored according to only one criterion (Writing Coherence). The writing scoring was done by two scorers whose inter-rater reliability had been established earlier to guarantee the consistency among the writing scores in both pretest and posttest. As displayed in **Table 6**, the inter-rate reliability of two scorers is 93.3.

Table 6: Reliability Statistics.

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Scorers
.933	.933	2

Posttest

The descriptive statistics of the posttest have been displayed in **Table 7**. It is clear that the mean and standard deviation of the first experimental group were 7.7 and .70 respectively. However, those of the second experimental group were 6.9 and .88 respectively.

Table 7: Descriptive Statistics of the Scores Obtained by the Two Groups on the Writing Posttest.

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error
Group 1	30	7.0	10	7.73	.70385	1.03	.427
Group 2	30	6.0	10.50	6.93	.88798	1.80	.427
Total	60	6.0	10.50	7.33	.89095	.309	1.195

Testing the null hypothesis

The null hypothesis of the study formulated in terms of the research question was as follows: there is no significant difference between the impact of genre and process-based tasks on the EFL learners' writing coherence. Before conducting an independent t-test, the normality of the distribution of the scores had been required to be checked. According to the **Table** 7, the skewness ratios of both groups were within the acceptable range of ±1.96 (1.03 and 1.80). This shows that the scores distributions in both groups displayed normality, running a t-test was not violated. Concerning **Table 8**, with *F* value of 0.51 at the significance level of .082 being larger than 0.05, the variances between the groups were not significantly different. Therefore, the results of the t-test with regard to the assumption of the homogeneity of the variances were as follows: the results t=3.86 *p* =0.001<0.05 show that there was a significant difference between the mean scores of two groups. Thus, the null hypothesis should be formulated as there is no significant difference between genre-based and process-based tasks on EFL learners' writing coherence.

Table 8: The Independent Sample T-test of the Two Groups' Mean Scores on the Writing Coherence Posttest.

	Levene's test for equality of variances		T-test for Equality of Means						
								95% confidence interval of the difference	
	F	**Sig.**	**T**	**df**	**Sig. (2-tailed)**	**Mean Difference**	**Std. Error Difference**	**Lower**	**Upper**
Equal variances Assumed	.051	.823	3.86	58	0.001	.80000	.20687	.35590	1.2141
Equal variances not assumed			3.86	55.127	0.001	.80000	.20687	.3854	1.2145

DISCUSSION:

The results of the study concerning the comparison between the learners' mean scores in the proficiency test and posttest have shown that their writing coherence in both groups has improved (**Table 5**). Similarly, the study conducted by Birjandi and Malmir, (2011) on the effect of task-based approach on the Iranian advanced EFL learners' narrative vs. expository revealed the fact that teaching through task is more effective than teaching through traditional approach. In the present study, based on the teacher's observation, prior to the treatment, the learners were passive and only knew the technical aspect of writing including where they were required to write a topic sentence, examples, and supporting sentences. However, the TBLT let them be active when they were supposed to write a sentence or a paragraph and gave them an in-depth understanding of not only where to write the important elements of writing but also how to generate those elements. Also, when they knew that they were able to generate meaningful paragraphs as a result of executing the tasks, they became more motivated to involve themselves in performing the tasks. In addition to this, the goal-oriented tasks given to both groups made them work seriously on the writing procedure as they realized that they were expected to create a meaningful and coherent paragraph while using the language. This might be the reason why the learners were confidently engaged in analyzing an original paragraph or the paragraph produced by themselves or with their classmates in the revision cycle. The result of this study was also aligned with what Myskow and Gordon, (2009) concluded about using genre approach in an EFL context: If the content and structure of the text is analyzed by the learners in the genre approach, they can apply the information to fulfill social purposes. For instance, if they are taught letter writing, they might apply it for writing a cover letter, resume, or filling an application form. Although in the current study letter writing was not taught, they applied what they had seen as a model in their writing class in their exam. Moreover, the study by Rodrigues-Bonces, (2010) showed that the genre approach encourages the learners to consider writing a tool they can use, and understand how the writer manages content to develop logical organization. Similarly in the present study, the teacher drew the learners' attention to the different components of a paragraph from topic sentence to the supporting sentences and to the conclusion. They realized that how the sentences were arranged to look meaningful and coherent. Such approach to writing assured them to generate the writing which is similar to what they had been displayed by the teacher. On the other hand, the analysis done by Widodo, (2008) on process approach on the writing revealed the fact that pre writing activates the students' schemata through which they can organize their thoughts and help them what to write and how to write. Accordingly in this study, the brainstorming stage enabled them to consider meaning and not to impose form on the writing in the planning section. This let them produce sentences with unity and coherence in a way that the flow of speech was transparently obvious compared to the writing task they had written in the PET test. Planning for the writing enabled the learners to

develop their ideas into the drafts while considering grammatical structure and lexical choice. They were also empowered to think critically to what they had produced, so that they could apply such a view in the revising and also editing part. For assessment part, giving score to the students seemed really rewarding and motivated them to generate more pieces while considering the techniques or rules they had learned. The feedback comments provided by the teacher also helped them with the revising and editing part of their writing.

During last sessions they became independent enough to revise and edit their own mistakes also give comments on their peers' errors. However, the result of the study showed that the genre group outperformed the process group. Being exposed to a wide range of authentic paragraphs gave the learners in genre group an insight into how they were required to generate their compositions. In stark contrast, the process group could consider and analyze what they had been generated by teacher, themselves, and their classmates, resulting in their lower performance compared to their counterparts in another group (Genre Group). They performed better in the posttest in comparison with their proficiency test, but this improvement could be attributed to the effect of task-based teaching and learning rather than the rules of process approach.

CONCLUSION:

The present study has revealed that the genre-based task group outperformed the process-based task group in writing coherence. Accordingly, these findings help the teachers, EFL/ESL learners, curriculum designers, and book publishers gain a richer picture of teaching and learning of two approaches (genre and process) through tasks. The TBLT's nature (being goal-oriented) helps all the stakeholders have a purpose for what they learn, teach, and design. The EFL/ESL learners specifically realize when they learn materials through tasks and accomplish them; they confidently perform these procedures in the real-life settings, namely producing a paragraph or essay in the exam. The teachers also benefited from tasks changing their role from the teacher to the facilitator. Although they should allocate a certain amount of time designing the task before the class, they only accompany students during accomplishing the task (as a facilitator). The EFL/ESL learners will probably embrace the materials by book publishers focusing on the task-based approach as the books enable the students to become familiar with the real-life situations, namely job interviews, banking affairs, shopping, taking and official exam, applying for a university, and so many other conditions. Concerning the genre-based approach, the learners' exposure to this approach helps them identify the difference between a coherent writing and an incoherent one. Providing the students with the sufficient input raises their awareness, as a result, they know what to write. In this study, the learners were provided with the one of the good examples of writing and an average model generated by the students. Thus, they realized what improves their writing coherence and what mistakes cause them to lose mark. Therefore, when a choice between the task types to be applied is the decision to be made by EFL teachers, genre-based task is recommended based on the results of the present study.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT:

I would like to express my gratitude to my advisor (Dr Behdokht Mall-Amiri) for her invaluable advice and assistance in accomplishing this article. My heartfelt thanks also extend to my parents and my husband for their wholehearted support. Finally, thank you (son), your presence brightens my life.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST:

The authors declare they have all read the manuscript and have no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES:

1) Applebee, A. N. (1984). Writing and reasoning. *Review of Educational Research*, **54**(4), 577-596.
2) Arnaudet, M. L., & Barrett, M. E. (1997). Paragraph Development: A Guide for Students of English. *Prentice Hall Regents*. https://books.google.com/books?id=nDAvNwAACAAJ
3) Badger, R., & White, G. (2000). A process genre approach to teaching writing. *ELT J.*, **54**(2), 153-160. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/54.2.153
4) Birjandi, P., & Malmir, A. (2011). The Effect of Task-Based Approach on the Iranian Advanced EFL Learners' Narrative vs. Expository Writing.

Iranian J. of Applied Language Studies, **1**(2), 1-26. https://doi.org/10.22111/ijals.2011.50

5) Roy B. (2023). Learner beliefs vs learner strategies: a review of the literature, *Br. J. Arts Humanit*., **5**(4), 228-232. https://doi.org/10.34104/bjah.02302280232
6) Chow, T. (2007). The effects of the process-genre approach to writing instruction on the expository essays of ESL students in a Malaysian secondary school. *PhD diss., Universiti Sains Malaysia, Penang, Malaysia*.
7) Connor, U. (2009). A study of cohesion and coherence in English as a second language students' writing. *Paper in Linguistics*, **17**(3), 301-316. https://doi.org/10.1080/08351818409389208
8) Cooper, C. R., & Greenbaum, S. (1986). Studying Writing: Linguistic Approaches. Written Communication Annual: An International Survey of Research and Theory Series, Volume **1**. ERIC.
9) Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (1993). The Powers of Literacy: A Genre Approach to Teaching Writing. *Falmer*. https://books.google.com/books?id=DtM9AAAAIAAJ
10) Dudley-Evans, H. K. a. T. (1998). Genre: what teachers think. *ELT Journal*, **52**.
11) Ellis, R. (2003). Task-based language learning and teaching. *Oxford university press*.
12) Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1980). The cognition of discovery: Defining a rhetorical problem. *College composition and communication*, **31**(1), 21-32.
13) Flowerdew, J. (1993). An educational, or process, approach to the teaching of professional genres. *ELT J., Oxford University Press*, **4714**, 305-3016.
14) Graham, S., & Sandmel, K. (2011). The Process Writing Approach: A Meta-analysis. *The J. of Educational Research*, **104**(6), 396-407. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2010.488703
15) Hayes, J. R., & Flower, L. S. (1983). A Cognitive Model of the Writing Process in Adults. Final Report.
16) Jones, J. (2007). Losing and finding coherence in academic writing. *University of Sydney Papers in TESOL*, **2**(2), 125-148.
17) Kay, H., & Dudley-Evans, T. (1998). Genre: What teachers think.
18) KUo, C.-H. (1995). Cohesion and Coherence in Academic Writing: From Lexical Choice to Organization. *National Chiao Tung University Taiwan Republic of China*, **1**, 47-62.
19) Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching. *Oxford University Press*. https://books.google.com/books?id=iJ3Y_wkkwa8C
20) Marshall, S. (1991). A genre-based approach to the teaching of report-writing. *English for specific purposes*, **10**(1), 3-13.
21) Martínez, A. V. A. (2005). Process-Writing Approach: An Alternative to Guide the Students'Compositions. *National University of Colombia, Faculty of Human Sciences, Department of Foreign Languages.*
22) McCarthy, M. (2001). Issues in applied linguistics. *Cambridge University Press*.
23) Myskow, G., & Gordon, K. (2009). A focus on purpose: using a genre approach in an EFL writing class. *ELT Journal*, **64**(3), 283-292. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccp057
24) Patthey-Chavez, G. G., Matsumura, L. C., & Valdes, R. (2004). Investigating the process approach to writing instruction in urban middle schools. *J. of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, **47**(6), 462-476.
25) Reppen, R. (1994). A genre-based approach to content writing instruction. *TESOL journal*, **4**(2), 32-35.
26) Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. W. (2002). Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics. *Routledge*.
27) Shahzad F. (2022). An essay on investigating factors influencing comprehensibility of world Englishes by critically evaluating studies in the domain, *Br. J. Arts Humanit*., **4**(3), 72-78. https://doi.org/10.34104/bjah.022072078
28) Shih, M. (1986). Content-based approaches to teaching academic writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, **20**(4), 617-648.

29) Swan, M. (2005). Legislation by Hypothesis: The Case of Task-Based Instruction. *Applied Linguistics*, **26**(3), 376-401. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/ami013
30) Tangpermpoon, T. (2008). Integrated approaches to improve students writing skills for English major students. *ABAC journal*, **28**(2).
31) Wertsch, J. V. (1991). Voices of the mind: Sociocultural approach to mediated action. *Harvard University Press*.
32) Widodo, H. P. (2008). Process-based academic essay writing instruction in an EFL context. *IKIP Negeri Malang: J. Bahasa dan Seni Tahun*, **36**.
33) Willis, D., & Willis, J. (2007). Doing Task-Based Teaching: A practical guide to task-based teaching for ELT training courses and practising teachers. *OUP Oxford*. https://books.google.com/books?id=yVSPQAAACAAJ

Citation: Mall-Amiri B., and Moradian A. (2024). Building EFL learners' writing coherence through tasks: a comparison of genre and process-based tasks, *Asian J. Soc. Sci. Leg. Stud.*, **6**(3), 92-103. https://doi.org/10.34104/ajssls.024.0920103