Sinergi : Jurnal Ilmiah Multidisiplin
E-ISSN : 3109-0559
Volume 2 Nomor 11 Tahun 2026
Copyright © 2026 The Author(s)
https://publikasi.ahlalkamal.com/index.php/sinergi



How Project-Based Learning Supports Tenth-Grade EFL Students' Narrative Writing Development: A Qualitative Case Study at MA Raudlatuttholibin NW Surabaya Sakti

Abdul Aziz[1], Lilik Purwaningsih[2], Endah Kurtianti[3]
[1,2,3]English Education Department, Teacher Training and Education Faculty, Doctor Nugroho University Magetan, Indonesia
Email : abangziz03@gmail.com

Abstract

This study examines the implementation of Project-Based Learning (PjBL) in narrative writing instruction for tenth-grade EFL students at MA Raudlatuttholibin NW Surabaya Sakti. A qualitative case study design was employed with one English teacher and 15 tenth-grade students as participants. Data were collected through classroom observations across four sessions, semi-structured interviews, document analysis of students' narrative writings, and reflective journals. Thematic analysis with source triangulation was applied to ensure trustworthiness. Findings reveal that: (1) PjBL implementation progressed through initial exploration, story planning using the Beginning-Middle-End framework, drafting, peer feedback, revision, presentation, and reflection; (2) PjBL significantly supported students' narrative writing development, particularly in plot organization, idea development, and narrative coherence, while linguistic accuracy remained limited; and (3) primary challenges included difficulty understanding procedural instructions, unequal group participation, time constraints, vocabulary and grammar limitations, variable peer feedback effectiveness, and presentation anxiety. The study concludes that PjBL offers a viable instructional framework for developing EFL students' narrative writing when supported by structured scaffolding and continuous teacher guidance.

Keywords: Project-Based Learning, Narrative Writing, EFL, Writing Development, Qualitative Case Study

1. INTRODUCTION

Writing constitutes a fundamental component of English language learning, enabling learners to communicate ideas, experiences, and information through written discourse. In English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts, writing presents particular challenges because learners must simultaneously organize ideas, attend to vocabulary and grammar, construct coherent sentences, and develop meaningful content. Research on Indonesian EFL learners has documented persistent difficulties in organizing ideas, limited vocabulary, grammatical inaccuracies, and coherence issues (Nur, 2021; Purnama, 2018).

Narrative writing represents one genre that offers students opportunities to express ideas through stories involving characters, events, problems, and resolutions. In EFL classrooms, narrative writing requires students to develop events into logical sequences while attending to linguistic features and textual organization. Purnama (2018) identified specific difficulties in students' narrative essays, including challenges with idea focus and development,

vocabulary variation, and grammatical accuracy. These findings suggest that narrative writing instruction must provide learners with adequate opportunities to generate ideas, organize events, develop details, and refine language use.

Project-Based Learning (PjBL) has emerged as a learner-centered instructional approach that engages students in extended projects leading to meaningful products. In language learning contexts, projects create authentic environments where learners use the target language to communicate, collaborate, and complete meaningful tasks. Greenier (2020) characterizes PjBL in language classrooms as emphasizing learner-centered and collaborative engagement, with the target language functioning both as an object and a means of learning. The teacher's role shifts to that of a guide supporting students throughout the project process.

The implementation of PjBL in Indonesian EFL contexts has been examined by Artini, Ratminingsih, and Padmadewi (2018), who investigated the development and implementation of project-based learning materials. Their study reported improvements in students' productive language abilities, including writing, and observed positive attitudes such as motivation, enthusiasm, and excitement during project planning, project work, and assessment. These findings indicate that project-based activities can create opportunities for active student participation rather than relying exclusively on teacher-directed instruction.

Despite growing interest in PjBL, limited research has specifically examined how this approach supports narrative writing development among tenth-grade EFL students in Indonesian Islamic secondary schools. This study addresses this gap by investigating the implementation of PjBL in narrative writing instruction, the nature of students' writing development, and the challenges encountered during implementation.

This study is guided by three research questions. First, how is Project-Based Learning implemented in narrative writing instruction for tenth-grade EFL students at MA Raudlatuttholibin NW Surabaya Sakti? Second, how does Project-Based Learning support tenth-grade EFL students' narrative writing development? Third, what challenges are encountered by the teacher and students during the implementation of Project-Based Learning?

The objectives of this study are to examine the implementation of Project-Based Learning in teaching narrative writing, to investigate how PjBL supports tenth-grade EFL students' narrative writing development, and to identify the challenges encountered by both the teacher and students during implementation. Theoretically, this study contributes to the growing body of literature on PjBL in EFL writing instruction, particularly in the context of narrative writing. Practically, the findings offer insights for English teachers seeking to implement PjBL in their classrooms, provide guidance for curriculum developers, and inform future researchers about the complexities of PjBL implementation in similar educational contexts.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Writing in EFL contexts involves complex cognitive and linguistic processes. Learners must navigate multiple dimensions simultaneously: generating content, organizing ideas, selecting appropriate vocabulary, constructing grammatically accurate sentences, and ensuring coherence and cohesion. Hyland (2003) emphasizes that writing is a socially situated activity that involves both cognitive processes and social contexts. In EFL settings, these challenges are compounded by limited exposure to the target language and cultural differences in rhetorical conventions. Research on Indonesian EFL learners has identified recurring difficulties in writing. Nur (2021) reported that students struggle with organizing ideas coherently, limited vocabulary repertoire, grammatical inaccuracies, and difficulty developing topics. Purnama (2018) found similar challenges in narrative writing, including problems with idea focus and development, vocabulary variation, and grammatical accuracy. These findings underscore the need for instructional approaches that provide structured support for writing development.

Narrative writing is a genre that tells a story involving characters, events, settings, and plots. In EFL contexts, narrative writing serves as a vehicle for students to express experiences and ideas while developing language proficiency. According to the Indonesian curriculum framework, narrative texts have specific social functions, generic structures including orientation, complication, and resolution, and linguistic features such as the use of past tense, action verbs, and temporal conjunctions. Four dimensions of narrative writing are particularly relevant to this study. Organization refers to the structural arrangement of narrative elements, including orientation, complication, and resolution. Effective organization ensures that readers can follow the narrative flow logically. Idea development involves the elaboration of narrative elements with sufficient detail, requiring students to go beyond superficial descriptions and create vivid, meaningful narratives. Language use refers to the appropriate application of grammatical structures, vocabulary, and mechanics, including correct use of past tense, varied sentence structures, appropriate vocabulary, and accurate spelling and punctuation. Coherence and cohesion refer to the logical connections between ideas and events within the narrative. Coherence refers to the overall clarity and logical flow of the text, while cohesion involves the use of linguistic devices such as pronouns, conjunctions, and lexical repetition to connect sentences and paragraphs.

The process approach to writing views writing as a recursive rather than linear activity. Writers generate ideas, draft, revise, and edit in iterative cycles. Flower and Hayes (1981) proposed a cognitive process model of writing that includes planning, translating, and reviewing. This model highlights the complex mental operations involved in writing and the importance of supporting learners through each stage. In EFL contexts, process-oriented writing instruction has been shown to benefit learners. Jang (2019) found that process-oriented writing instruction involving brainstorming, first-draft writing, feedback exchanges, self-assessment, and teacher feedback supported EFL students' writing development. Such activities provide learners with opportunities to reconsider and improve their written work, treating writing as an evolving process rather than a final product.

Project-Based Learning is an instructional approach that organizes learning around extended projects. According to Blumenfeld et al. (1991), PjBL involves students in investigating authentic problems and producing meaningful artifacts. Key characteristics of PjBL include a driving question or problem that organizes activities, student-centered inquiry, collaboration and communication, production of a final product, and reflection on the learning process. In language learning contexts, PjBL creates opportunities for authentic language use. Greenier (2020) describes PjBL in language classrooms as emphasizing learner-centered and collaborative engagement, with the target language functioning both as an object and a means of learning. The teacher's role is repositioned as a guide who supports students throughout the project process rather than simply delivering information.

Research on PjBL in EFL writing contexts has reported positive outcomes. Artini, Ratminingsih, and Padmadewi (2018) investigated the development and implementation of project-based learning materials in Indonesian EFL classrooms. Their study reported improvement in students' productive language abilities, including writing, and observed positive attitudes such as motivation, enthusiasm, and excitement during project planning, project work, and assessment. Syarifah and Emiliasari (2019) examined the use of PjBL in teaching narrative writing and found that students showed improvement in writing achievement and increased motivation. Argawati and Suryani (2020) reported similar findings, noting that PjBL enhanced students' writing performance and engagement. Ismail (2023) investigated PjBL in EFL writing instruction and found that the approach supported students' idea development and organizational skills.

The intersection of PjBL and narrative writing instruction offers particular affordances. Narrative writing projects can involve students in creating stories, writing scripts, producing digital narratives, or compiling anthologies. These projects provide authentic purposes for writing and create opportunities for students to engage in the full writing process from idea generation to final product. Rifda, Wirawati, and Deniati (2023) examined PjBL in narrative writing instruction and found that students demonstrated improvements in narrative structure and content development. Putri (2023) reported that PjBL supported students' narrative writing by providing scaffolding through the project process. Batuah, Aunurrahman, and Hafis (2023) found that PjBL enhanced students' narrative writing skills while also developing their collaboration and communication abilities.

This study is grounded in the understanding that PjBL can provide a structured yet flexible framework for narrative writing instruction. The conceptual framework posits that PjBL supports writing development through extended time for planning and drafting, authentic purposes for writing, collaborative learning opportunities, iterative feedback and revision processes, and reflection on learning. These elements align with the process approach to writing and provide multiple entry points for students to develop their narrative writing abilities.

3. RESEARCH METHOD

This study employed a qualitative case study design. According to Yin (2018), case study research is appropriate for investigating contemporary phenomena in depth within their real-world contexts, particularly when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident. The case in this study is the implementation of PjBL in narrative writing instruction at one specific school, bounded by time, place, and participants.

The research was conducted at MA Raudlatuttholibin NW Surabaya Sakti, a private Islamic senior high school. The school follows the national curriculum while incorporating Islamic values into its educational program. English is taught as a compulsory subject with emphasis on developing students' communicative competence. Participants comprised one English teacher and 15 tenth-grade students, consisting of 9 females and 6 males. The teacher had approximately five years of experience teaching English at the secondary level. Students were selected based on their enrollment in the English class and willingness to participate. Among the 15 students, three focal students named Abi, Udin, and Bina were selected for in-depth analysis based on their diverse writing abilities and engagement levels.

Data were collected from multiple sources to ensure comprehensive understanding and enable triangulation. Classroom observation was conducted as non-participant observation across four sessions, documenting the implementation of PjBL, teacher-student interactions, student engagement, and classroom dynamics. An observation checklist was used to guide data collection. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with the teacher and three focal students. The teacher interview explored perceptions of PjBL implementation, observed student development, and challenges encountered. Student interviews examined their experiences with PjBL, perceptions of their writing development, and challenges faced. Students' writing documents, including baseline essays and final drafts, were collected and analyzed. Baseline writing was collected before PjBL implementation to establish students' initial writing abilities. Final drafts were collected after PjBL implementation to assess development. Students maintained reflective journals throughout the project, documenting their learning experiences, challenges, and insights. These journals provided insights into students' metacognitive awareness and emotional responses to PjBL.

Data collection proceeded through several stages. Before PjBL implementation, students wrote a narrative essay based on a given prompt. This baseline established students' initial writing abilities and provided a point of comparison for assessing development. In Meeting 1, the teacher introduced the concept of narrative writing and the PjBL approach. Students explored narrative texts, identified key features, and discussed potential project topics. The driving question was established: how can we create engaging narratives that share our experiences? In Meeting 2, students learned the Beginning-Middle-End framework for narrative planning. They brainstormed story ideas, developed characters and settings, and created story outlines. The teacher provided scaffolding through modeling and guided practice. In Meeting 3, students produced first drafts of their narratives. Peer review sessions were conducted where students exchanged feedback using a structured protocol. The teacher monitored progress and provided individual guidance. In Meeting 4, students revised their drafts based on peer and teacher feedback, produced final versions, and presented their

narratives to the class. Reflection activities concluded the project, where students documented their learning experiences.

Data were analyzed using thematic analysis following Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase framework: familiarization with data through repeated reading, generating initial codes, searching for themes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes, and producing the report. Writing documents were analyzed using an adapted rubric assessing four dimensions: organization, idea development, language use, and coherence and cohesion. Each dimension was rated on a scale from 1 for emerging to 4 for proficient. Baseline and final scores were compared to identify patterns of development.

Trustworthiness was ensured through several strategies. Source triangulation involved collecting data from multiple sources including observations, interviews, documents, and journals to corroborate findings. Member checking was conducted by sharing preliminary findings with participants for verification. Prolonged engagement in the research setting allowed for deeper understanding of the context. Peer debriefing with colleagues provided external perspectives on data interpretation. Ethical approval was obtained from the university and the school. Informed consent was obtained from all participants, with assurances of confidentiality and anonymity. Participants were informed of their right to withdraw at any time without consequences. Data were stored securely and accessed only by the researcher.

The research procedure comprised three phases: preparation, data collection, and data analysis and reporting. Preparation involved obtaining permissions, developing instruments, and piloting data collection tools. Data collection followed the timeline described above. Data analysis and reporting involved systematic analysis of all data sources and preparation of the research report.

4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

MA Raudlatuttholibin NW Surabaya Sakti is a private Islamic senior high school located in Surabaya Sakti. The school serves students from diverse backgrounds and emphasizes both academic achievement and character development. The English language program aims to develop students' communicative competence through integrated instruction in listening, speaking, reading, and writing. The school has adequate facilities including classrooms equipped with whiteboards and projection capabilities, though resources for technology-enhanced learning remain limited.

The implementation of PjBL in narrative writing instruction progressed through four main stages across four sessions. The first session introduced students to narrative writing and the PjBL approach. The teacher began by activating students' prior knowledge about stories and narrative texts. Students discussed their favorite stories and identified common elements such as characters, settings, problems, and resolutions. The teacher then introduced the concept of narrative writing in English, explaining the generic structure including orientation, complication, and resolution, and linguistic features such as past tense, action verbs, and

temporal conjunctions. Students were shown examples of narrative texts and guided to identify these features. A crucial component of this session was establishing the driving question for the project: how can we create engaging narratives that share our experiences? This question framed the project and provided a sense of purpose for students' writing activities. The teacher explained that students would work on creating their own narratives through a process of planning, drafting, feedback, revision, and presentation. Observation data revealed that students initially struggled to understand the project requirements. Several students asked clarifying questions about the expected product, the timeline, and the assessment criteria. The teacher addressed these concerns by providing a project overview, explaining each stage, and showing examples of completed projects from previous years.

The second session focused on story planning and framework development. The teacher introduced the Beginning-Middle-End framework as a tool for organizing narrative structure. This framework corresponds to the orientation, complication, and resolution structure of narrative texts but uses more accessible terminology for students. Students were guided through a series of planning activities. First, they brainstormed story ideas based on personal experiences or imagination. The teacher encouraged students to draw on their own lives, suggesting that authentic experiences would make their stories more engaging and easier to write about. Next, students developed their story outlines using the Beginning-Middle-End framework. They identified their main character, setting, and the problem or conflict for the beginning; the sequence of events leading to the climax for the middle; and the resolution for the end. The teacher circulated among students, providing individual guidance and feedback on their outlines. Observation notes documented an interaction where the teacher asked a student what problem the character would face in the middle of the story. The student replied that the character would get lost in the forest. The teacher then asked how the story would end and what the resolution would be. The student suggested that the character might find his way home. The teacher affirmed this and prompted the student to think about what events would lead from getting lost to finding the way home. This interaction illustrates the scaffolding provided during planning. The teacher helped students think through their narrative structure by asking guiding questions and prompting them to elaborate on their ideas. Student interviews revealed that the planning stage was helpful for organizing their ideas. One student stated that before making the outline, he did not know where to start, and the Beginning-Middle-End framework helped him see the whole story.

The third session involved drafting, peer feedback, and teacher monitoring. Students used their outlines to write first drafts of their narratives. The teacher reminded students to focus on getting their ideas down rather than worrying about perfection at this stage. During the drafting process, the teacher monitored student progress and provided individual assistance. Observation data showed that students worked at different paces: some completed their drafts quickly, while others struggled to develop their ideas into full paragraphs. The teacher allocated additional time for students who needed it and provided sentence starters and vocabulary support for those who were stuck. The peer feedback session followed a structured protocol. Students were paired and asked to read each other's drafts, providing feedback on three aspects: whether the story made sense, whether there were parts that needed more detail, and whether

there were any grammatical errors to fix. Feedback was recorded on a simple form with prompts such as one thing I liked about your story and one suggestion I have is. Analysis of peer feedback forms revealed that students primarily focused on content-related feedback rather than linguistic accuracy. Common comments included that the story is interesting and that the writer should add more details about the setting. Few students commented on grammatical errors, suggesting limited ability to identify and address language issues. Student interviews revealed mixed responses to peer feedback. Some students found it helpful, noting that their partner helped them see that they needed to explain why the character was sad. Others found it less useful, commenting that their partner just said it was good and they did not know if that was true or if the partner was just being nice.

The fourth session involved final writing, presentation, and reflection. Students revised their drafts based on peer and teacher feedback, produced final versions of their narratives, and presented their work to the class. Observation data showed that students made various revisions to their narratives. Some students added details to their stories, while others corrected grammatical errors. The extent of revision varied considerably: some students made substantial changes while others made only minor edits. The presentation session required students to read their narratives aloud to the class. This component was designed to provide an authentic audience for students' writing and to develop their oral communication skills. However, observation data revealed that many students experienced anxiety during presentations. Several students read quickly, avoided eye contact, and spoke softly. The teacher provided encouragement and led the class in supportive applause after each presentation. The reflection session engaged students in thinking about their learning throughout the project. Students wrote in their reflective journals, responding to prompts such as what did you learn about writing narratives, what was challenging about this project, and what would you do differently next time. Analysis of reflective journals revealed insights into students' learning experiences. Many students mentioned the importance of planning, noting that they learned that making an outline first makes writing easier. Others discussed the challenges of writing in English, explaining that they had many ideas but did not know the English words for them. Several students expressed pride in completing their narratives, stating that they were happy with their stories and that while not perfect, they did their best.

The implementation of PjBL in narrative writing instruction at MA Raudlatuttholibin NW Surabaya Sakti followed a structured sequence of exploration, planning, drafting, feedback, revision, presentation, and reflection. This sequence aligns with both the project-based learning framework and the process approach to writing.

Analysis of students' baseline and final narratives revealed patterns of development across the four dimensions of narrative writing. Abi was a student with moderate writing abilities at baseline. His initial narrative showed basic organization with a clear beginning and end but an underdeveloped middle. The complication was introduced but not fully developed, and the resolution was abrupt. Abi's final narrative showed noticeable improvement in organization and coherence. He developed a more substantial middle section, providing details about the events leading to the climax. The resolution was more satisfying, showing how the character changed as a result of the experience. His use of transition words improved, creating

better flow between events. In his interview, Abi attributed his improvement to the planning process, stating that making the outline helped him see where he needed more details. Before, he just started writing and did not know where he was going.

Udin began with limited writing abilities. His baseline narrative was short, lacked clear structure, and had numerous grammatical errors. The story was difficult to follow due to unclear connections between events. Udin's final narrative showed modest but meaningful improvement. He incorporated the Beginning-Middle-End structure, providing a clearer framework for his story. He added more details to his narrative, making it more engaging. While grammatical errors persisted, there were fewer instances that impeded comprehension. His use of simple past tense became more consistent. Udin's reflection captured his progress, noting that he knew his English was not perfect but that he thought his story was better now. He learned to plan before writing and to check his work.

Bina was one of the stronger writers in the class at baseline. Her initial narrative showed clear organization, developed ideas, and generally accurate language use. Her narrative engaged the reader with vivid descriptions and a clear conflict. Bina's final narrative demonstrated refinement in all dimensions. Her organization was more sophisticated, with a well-developed complication and a satisfying resolution. Her idea development showed increased attention to character motivation and emotional depth. Her language use remained generally accurate, with some improvements in vocabulary variety. Coherence was enhanced through more strategic use of cohesive devices. Bina reflected on her development, noting that she already liked writing before this project but learned that getting feedback helps her see things she missed. Her partner pointed out that she needed to explain why her character made that decision.

Across all students, organization showed the most consistent improvement. The Beginning-Middle-End framework provided a clear structure that students could apply to their narratives. Baseline narratives often lacked clear structure, with underdeveloped complications or abrupt resolutions. Final narratives demonstrated improved structural awareness, with more developed middle sections and more satisfying endings. The mean score for organization increased from 1.60 to 2.40, representing a substantial improvement. This finding aligns with the explicit instruction in narrative structure provided during the planning stage.

Idea development also showed meaningful improvement, though with more variation across students. The mean score increased from 1.33 to 2.07. Students who engaged actively in brainstorming and planning activities demonstrated greater development in this dimension. The peer feedback and revision processes encouraged students to add details and elaborate on their ideas. However, some students continued to struggle with idea development, producing narratives with limited elaboration. These students often had limited vocabulary and found it difficult to express complex ideas in English.

Language use was the dimension with the least improvement. The mean score increased only from 1.20 to 1.60. Grammatical errors persisted in students' final narratives, particularly in areas such as verb tense consistency, subject-verb agreement, and article usage. Spelling

errors were also common. Several factors may explain the limited progress in language use. First, the PjBL activities focused primarily on content and organization, with limited explicit grammar instruction. Second, students had limited exposure to English outside the classroom, constraining their language development. Third, the peer feedback process did not effectively address grammatical errors, as students lacked the knowledge to identify and correct them.

Coherence and cohesion showed moderate improvement, with the mean score increasing from 1.53 to 2.33. Students improved in their ability to connect ideas and events logically. The use of transition words such as then, after that, and finally became more common in final narratives. However, some students continued to produce narratives with unclear connections between events, requiring readers to infer meaning. The improvement in coherence and cohesion can be attributed to the planning process, which encouraged students to think about the logical sequence of events, and the revision process, which provided opportunities to clarify connections.

The implementation of PjBL in narrative writing instruction presented several challenges for both the teacher and students. Students experienced initial difficulties understanding the PjBL approach and its requirements. Many students were accustomed to traditional instruction where the teacher provides explicit directions and students complete assigned tasks. The PjBL approach, with its emphasis on student inquiry and extended project work, was unfamiliar to them. Observation data revealed that during the first session, students asked numerous clarifying questions about what exactly they had to make, how long it would take, and whether it would be graded. The teacher addressed these questions by providing a project overview, explaining each stage, and showing examples of completed projects. Student interviews confirmed this challenge. One student stated that at first he was confused and did not understand what they were supposed to do, but after the teacher explained again, he started to understand.

Although the project was designed as individual work with peer feedback, collaboration was an implicit component. Students were expected to support each other through feedback and discussion. However, observation data revealed unequal participation in collaborative activities. Some students engaged actively in peer feedback sessions, while others were passive, providing minimal feedback or simply agreeing with their partners. The teacher noted in her interview that some students are very active and want to help their friends, but others are shy or maybe lazy and just say it is good without really thinking about how to help. This challenge reflects the broader issue of student engagement in collaborative learning activities. Students with stronger social skills and language abilities tended to dominate interactions, while quieter or less confident students withdrew.

Time constraints emerged as a significant challenge. The four sessions allocated for the project proved insufficient for completing all planned activities. The drafting and revision processes required more time than anticipated, as students worked at different paces and needed varying levels of support. The teacher expressed frustration with the time limitations, noting that she wanted to give more time for feedback and revision but had to move on to the next topic because the curriculum is very packed. Students also felt the time pressure. One student

commented that he needed more time to make his story better and that he finished but knew he could do better if he had more time.

Vocabulary and grammar limitations were persistent challenges throughout the project. Students frequently struggled to find the English words to express their ideas, leading to simplified narratives or gaps in content. Grammatical errors, particularly in verb tense and sentence structure, were common in students' drafts. Observation data captured numerous instances of students asking for vocabulary help, such as how to say a particular Indonesian word in English or what the past tense of a verb was. The teacher provided assistance when possible but could not address every individual need given the large class size. The teacher acknowledged this challenge, noting that students' vocabulary is very limited and that they have good ideas but cannot express them in English, describing this as the biggest obstacle.

Some students struggled to develop their narrative ideas beyond a basic outline. They found it difficult to elaborate on characters, settings, and events, resulting in narratives that were thin and underdeveloped. This challenge was particularly pronounced among students with limited reading experience and exposure to stories. These students lacked models for narrative development and struggled to generate details independently. The teacher observed that some students can only write very simple stories and do not know how to add details or make the story interesting, noting that they need more examples and more practice.

The peer feedback process presented several challenges. Students' limited language proficiency affected their ability to identify errors and provide useful feedback. Many students focused on surface-level features such as spelling and punctuation rather than deeper issues such as content and organization. Some students were reluctant to provide critical feedback to their peers, fearing it might hurt feelings or damage relationships. The revision process also proved challenging. Some students made minimal revisions, either because they did not understand the feedback or because they were satisfied with their initial drafts. Others made revisions that did not improve the quality of their narratives. The teacher reflected that peer feedback is good in theory but difficult in practice, noting that the students do not have the skills to give good feedback and that she needs to train them more.

The presentation component of the project generated significant anxiety for many students. Reading their narratives aloud in front of the class was a stressful experience, particularly for students with limited oral proficiency and low confidence. Observation data revealed visible signs of anxiety including trembling hands, rapid speech, avoidance of eye contact, and soft voices. Several students required encouragement to complete their presentations. One student shared in her interview that she was very nervous and afraid she would make mistakes and everyone would laugh, but they did not laugh and they clapped. Incomplete preparation was also an issue. Some students had not practiced their presentations and stumbled over words or lost their place. This added to their anxiety and reduced the effectiveness of the presentation activity.

The teacher employed several strategies to address the challenges. She provided additional scaffolding for students who needed it, simplified instructions, and offered one-on-

one support during drafting. She also adjusted the timeline to accommodate students' needs, extending the drafting and revision phases when possible. Students developed their own coping strategies. Some students sought help from peers or family members. Others used dictionaries or translation apps to find vocabulary. Some students simplified their stories to align with their language abilities.

The implementation of PjBL in narrative writing instruction at MA Raudlatuttholibin NW Surabaya Sakti followed a structured sequence of exploration, planning, drafting, feedback, revision, presentation, and reflection. This sequence aligns with the project-based learning framework described by Blumenfeld et al. (1991), which emphasizes extended inquiry, meaningful products, and reflection. The implementation also reflects the process approach to writing, which views writing as a recursive process involving planning, drafting, and revising. The explicit focus on planning through the Beginning-Middle-End framework provided students with a clear structure for organizing their narratives. The peer feedback and revision stages provided opportunities for students to improve their writing based on input from others.

However, the implementation also revealed tensions between PjBL ideals and contextual constraints. The time allocated for the project proved insufficient for the full realization of PjBL principles. The four sessions allowed for only a compressed version of PjBL, with limited opportunity for extended inquiry and iteration. This finding aligns with concerns raised by researchers about the challenges of implementing PjBL within the constraints of traditional school schedules, as noted by Thomas (2000). The teacher's role in the implementation was crucial. She provided scaffolding through explicit instruction, modeling, and individual guidance. This aligns with Greenier's (2020) characterization of the teacher as a guide who supports students throughout the project process. However, the teacher also faced challenges in managing the diverse needs of 15 students with varying abilities and engagement levels.

The findings revealed that PjBL supported students' narrative writing development, particularly in organization, idea development, and coherence and cohesion. These findings align with previous research on PjBL in EFL writing instruction. Artini, Ratminingsih, and Padmadewi (2018) reported improvements in students' productive language abilities, including writing. Syarifah and Emiliasari (2019) found that PjBL enhanced students' writing achievement in narrative writing. The substantial improvement in organization with a mean gain of 0.80 can be attributed to the explicit instruction in narrative structure provided during the planning stage. The Beginning-Middle-End framework gave students a clear structure to apply to their narratives. This finding supports the importance of explicit genre instruction in EFL writing contexts.

The improvement in idea development with a mean gain of 0.74 reflects the effectiveness of the planning and revision processes. Brainstorming activities encouraged students to generate ideas, while peer feedback and revision prompted students to elaborate on their narratives. This finding aligns with the process approach to writing, which emphasizes the importance of idea generation and development. The moderate improvement in coherence

and cohesion with a mean gain of 0.80 indicates that students developed greater awareness of the logical connections between ideas and events. The use of transition words increased in final narratives, suggesting that students internalized some cohesive devices. However, some students continued to struggle with coherence, indicating the need for continued instruction in this area.

The limited improvement in language use with a mean gain of 0.40 is a significant finding. While students made some progress in grammatical accuracy and vocabulary use, the gains were modest. This finding highlights the persistent challenge of developing linguistic accuracy in EFL contexts. It also suggests that PjBL, with its focus on content and process, may need to be complemented by explicit language instruction to support students' linguistic development. Several factors may explain the limited progress in language use. First, the project activities focused primarily on content and organization, with limited explicit grammar instruction. Second, students' limited exposure to English outside the classroom constrains their language development. Third, the peer feedback process did not effectively address grammatical errors, as students lacked the knowledge to identify and correct them. These findings have implications for PjBL implementation in EFL contexts. While PjBL can support writing development in terms of content and organization, it may need to be supplemented with focused language instruction to address grammatical accuracy. Teachers should consider integrating mini-lessons on grammar and vocabulary into PjBL activities.

The challenges encountered during PjBL implementation reflect the complexities of implementing learner-centered approaches in EFL contexts. The difficulty understanding PjBL instructions indicates students' unfamiliarity with this instructional approach. Students accustomed to teacher-directed instruction may struggle to adapt to the increased autonomy and responsibility expected in PjBL. This finding suggests the need for clear explanations, examples, and gradual introduction of PjBL principles. The unequal participation in collaborative activities reflects broader issues of student engagement and social dynamics. Students with stronger language abilities and social skills tended to dominate interactions, while quieter or less confident students withdrew. This finding highlights the importance of structured collaboration with clear roles and expectations. Teachers should monitor group dynamics and provide support for students who struggle to participate.

Time constraints emerged as a significant challenge, reflecting the tension between PjBL ideals and curriculum demands. The four sessions allocated for the project proved insufficient for the full realization of PjBL principles. This finding aligns with concerns raised by researchers about the challenges of implementing PjBL within traditional school schedules, as noted by Thomas (2000). Teachers implementing PjBL need to consider how to manage time effectively while maintaining the integrity of the approach.

Vocabulary and grammar difficulties were persistent challenges throughout the project. Students' limited language proficiency constrained their ability to express ideas and develop narratives. This finding highlights the importance of vocabulary and grammar instruction in EFL writing contexts. Teachers should provide explicit instruction in vocabulary and grammar, integrated with writing activities. The difficulty developing narrative ideas reflects some

students' limited exposure to stories and narrative structures. Students who lacked reading experience and familiarity with narrative conventions struggled to generate details and develop engaging stories. This finding suggests the importance of providing models and examples of narrative texts. Teachers should expose students to a range of narratives and guide them in analyzing narrative features.

The challenges in peer feedback and revision reflect students' developing abilities as readers and writers. Students' limited language proficiency affected their ability to identify errors and provide useful feedback. Their reluctance to provide critical feedback may reflect cultural norms of politeness and face-saving. This finding suggests the need for training in peer feedback and structured protocols that guide students in providing constructive feedback. Presentation anxiety emerged as a significant challenge, particularly for students with limited oral proficiency and low confidence. The fear of public speaking is common among EFL learners, who may be self-conscious about their accents and language abilities. This finding suggests the importance of creating supportive environments for oral performance. Teachers should provide opportunities for practice and encourage a supportive classroom culture.

The findings of this study contribute to the growing body of literature on PjBL in EFL writing instruction. The study confirms that PjBL can support students' narrative writing development, particularly in organization, idea development, and coherence. However, the study also reveals limitations, particularly in developing linguistic accuracy. The findings suggest that PjBL is most effective when complemented by explicit instruction and structured scaffolding. Students need clear guidance on narrative structure, language features, and revision strategies. The teacher's role as a guide and facilitator is crucial in providing this support.

The study also highlights the importance of context in PjBL implementation. The challenges encountered at MA Raudlatuttholibin NW Surabaya Sakti including limited language proficiency, time constraints, and curriculum demands are common in Indonesian EFL contexts. Teachers implementing PjBL need to adapt the approach to their specific contexts, considering students' needs and available resources. The study has implications for teacher education and professional development. Teachers need support in implementing PjBL, including training in project design, scaffolding strategies, and assessment methods. They also need opportunities to reflect on their practice and learn from other teachers' experiences.

5. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Based on the findings and discussion, the following conclusions are drawn. First, the implementation of PjBL in narrative writing instruction at MA Raudlatuttholibin NW Surabaya Sakti followed a structured sequence of initial exploration, story planning using the Beginning-Middle-End framework, drafting, peer feedback, revision, presentation, and reflection. This sequence aligns with both the PjBL framework and the process approach to writing. The teacher played a crucial role as a guide and facilitator, providing scaffolding through explicit instruction, modeling, and individual guidance. However, the implementation was constrained

by time limitations and curriculum demands, resulting in a compressed version of PjBL that did not fully realize the approach's potential for extended inquiry and iteration.

Second, PjBL supported students' narrative writing development, particularly in organization, idea development, and coherence and cohesion. Students demonstrated improved ability to structure their narratives using the Beginning-Middle-End framework, develop their ideas with greater detail, and connect events logically. However, progress in language use, including grammar and vocabulary, remained limited. This finding suggests that PjBL, while effective for developing content and organization, may need to be complemented by explicit language instruction to address grammatical accuracy and vocabulary development.

Third, the primary challenges encountered during PjBL implementation included students' initial difficulties understanding PjBL instructions and requirements, unequal participation in collaborative activities, time constraints that limited the depth of project work, persistent vocabulary and grammar difficulties, challenges in developing narrative ideas, variable effectiveness of peer feedback, and presentation anxiety. These challenges reflect the complexities of implementing learner-centered approaches in EFL contexts with students of varying abilities and engagement levels.

The findings of this study have several pedagogical implications. For English teachers, teachers should provide clear explanations and examples when introducing PjBL, as students unfamiliar with this approach need explicit guidance on expectations and procedures. Teachers should integrate explicit language instruction into PjBL activities, using mini-lessons on grammar and vocabulary to address students' linguistic needs while maintaining the focus on project work. Teachers should provide structured scaffolding for narrative writing, as the Beginning-Middle-End framework proved effective and can be adapted for other writing genres. Teachers should train students in peer feedback, using structured protocols and modeling to help students provide more useful feedback to their peers. Teachers should create supportive environments for oral performance, providing opportunities for practice and a supportive classroom culture to reduce presentation anxiety.

For curriculum developers, curriculum should allocate sufficient time for PjBL implementation, as compressed timelines limit the effectiveness of project-based approaches. Curriculum should integrate language instruction with writing activities, as explicit attention to grammar and vocabulary is necessary for EFL learners' writing development. For teacher education, teacher education programs should prepare teachers to implement PjBL in EFL contexts, with training that includes project design, scaffolding strategies, and assessment methods. Professional development should provide opportunities for teachers to share experiences and learn from each other's PjBL implementation.

English teachers implementing PjBL in narrative writing instruction should consider several suggestions. Teachers should provide clear structure and scaffolding, as the Beginning-Middle-End framework was effective in this study and can be adapted for other contexts. Teachers should provide templates, models, and guided practice to support students' narrative planning. Teachers should integrate language instruction, as grammar and vocabulary mini-

lessons should be integrated into PjBL activities. Teachers can address common errors and vocabulary needs during drafting and revision stages. Teachers should train students in peer feedback, using structured protocols with clear prompts and modeling to help students provide more useful feedback. Teachers should monitor peer feedback sessions and provide guidance. Teachers should create supportive environments for oral performance, providing opportunities for practice, encouraging a supportive classroom culture, and considering alternative presentation formats such as small group presentations or recorded presentations for students with high anxiety. Teachers should manage time effectively, planning PjBL activities carefully and allocating sufficient time for each stage. They should also be flexible in adjusting timelines based on students' needs.

Future researchers interested in PjBL in EFL writing instruction should consider several directions. Longitudinal studies examining PjBL implementation over extended periods would provide insights into long-term effects on writing development. Comparative studies comparing PjBL with other instructional approaches such as genre-based instruction or process writing would help identify the relative effectiveness of different approaches. Studies with larger samples involving multiple sites would enhance the generalizability of findings. Research examining the effects of PjBL on specific dimensions of writing would provide more nuanced understanding of PjBL's impact. Research exploring teachers' experiences, challenges, and strategies in implementing PjBL would provide valuable insights for professional development. Research examining the integration of technology in PjBL for writing instruction would address the growing role of digital tools in education.

REFERENCES

Argawati, N. O., & Suryani, L. (2020). Project-based learning in teaching writing: The implementation and students' perception. English Review: Journal of English Education, 8(2), 239-248.

Artini, L. P., Ratminingsih, N. M., & Padmadewi, N. N. (2018). Project-based learning in EFL contexts: The development of learning materials and its implementation. International Journal of Instruction, 11(3), 345-360.

Batuah, S., Aunurrahman, A., & Hafis, M. (2023). The implementation of project-based learning in teaching narrative writing. Journal of English Language Teaching, 12(1), 45-58.

Blumenfeld, P. C., Soloway, E., Marx, R. W., Krajcik, J. S., Guzdial, M., & Palincsar, A. (1991). Motivating project-based learning: Sustaining the doing, supporting the learning. Educational Psychologist, 26(3-4), 369-398.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77-101.

Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. College Composition and Communication, 32(4), 365-387.

Greenier, V. T. (2020). Project-based learning in the language classroom. In The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching (pp. 1-7). Wiley.

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

Ismail, I. (2023). Project-based learning in EFL writing instruction: A case study. Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 12(3), 567-578.

Jang, E. E. (2019). Process-oriented writing instruction in EFL contexts. Language Teaching Research, 23(4), 456-475.

Nur, S. (2021). Students' difficulties in writing narrative text. Journal of English Education, 5(1), 23-35.

Purnama, D. (2018). An analysis of students' difficulties in writing narrative text. Journal of English Language Teaching, 7(2), 89-102.

Putri, A. (2023). The effect of project-based learning on students' narrative writing achievement. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 14(2), 345-356.

Rifda, S., Wirawati, D., & Deniati, E. (2023). Project-based learning in narrative writing: A case study. English Education Journal, 13(1), 67-78.

Syarifah, E. F., & Emiliasari, R. (2019). The use of project-based learning in teaching narrative writing. Professional Journal of English Education, 2(4), 478-485.

Thomas, J. W. (2000). A review of research on project-based learning. Autodesk Foundation.

Yin, R. K. (2018). Case study research and applications: Design and methods (6th ed.). Sage Publications.