Enhancing student participation in learning to write a recount text: Learning from EFL pre-service teachers in implementing R2L pedagogy

Iyen Nurlaelawati[*], Wawan Gunawan, and Nenden Sri Lengkanawati
Department of EnglishEducation, Faculty of Language and Literature Education, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Jl. Dr. Setiabudhi No. 229 Bandung, West Java, Indonesia

ABSTRACT
Reading to Learn (R2L) Pedagogy evolved from the development of genre pedagogy, which has gained more attraction in language teaching and learning. In an effort to continuously yield empirical advantages in supporting students' learning in reading and writing, genre pedagogy has been much researched in the field of teaching involving experienced teachers. Nonetheless, investigating R2L pedagogy enacted by EFL preservice teachers having no experience in teaching leaves a gap in the existing literature, thus becoming the aim of this study. The study was carried out in a case study design, involving three preservice teachers in a teaching practicum program as the participants. The study took place in a high school in West Java Province, Indonesia. The data were collected through classroom observations and interviews, which then were analyzed to search for themes generated by a qualitative approach and amplified by pedagogic register analysis. The findings showed that through adaptation and modification, the participants implemented most of the stages of R2L pedagogy in their teaching context. The phases of teaching and learning created classroom interaction better between the preservice teachers and students, leading to enhancing student participation in the teaching and learning activities. The analysis also indicated the challenges that the participants encountered, such as text selection and contextual strategies of detailed reading. This study suggests that R2L pedagogy provides purposeful staged activities significant in enhancing students' participation, thus leading to better student learning engagement.

Keywords: Genre pedagogy; preservice teachers; Reading to Learn pedagogy; student participation

INTRODUCTION
Reading to Learn (R2L) pedagogy has gained much attention for its success in teaching writing for more than a decade (Kartika-Ningsih & Rose, 2021; Tardy et al., 2018; Wen et al., 2022;). It offers a pedagogical tool for teachers and students to examine the network of lexico-grammatical choices and use them in making meaning in their texts. R2L evolved from genre pedagogy which is derived from the systemic functional linguistics, a work of Michael Halliday, that sees the relationship between language and its function in social settings (Hyon, 1996). Within the SFL paradigm, language is seen as a system of meaning-making used to shape and interpret the world interactively (Halliday, 1994). This paradigm solidifies the socio-cultural perspective that genre-based pedagogy takes up in informing the way language and language teaching

---
* Corresponding Author
Email: iyenn@upi.edu

are conceptualized (Gebhard et al., 2011). It focuses on the functions of language as a system of choices when performing communication (Hyland, 2004). Using the language system, people can convey their experiences of the world in coherent messages and interact with others (Hasan & Akhand, 2010).

Reading to Learn pedagogy provides guidance to teachers so that they can help students to write through stages. A set of stages (also called curriculum genres) is made available to enable students to write target genres. The stages include Preparing for Reading, Detailed Reading, Sentence Making, Spelling, Sentence Writing, Joint Rewriting, and Joint Construction. The first stage, Preparing for Reading, aims to prepare students to read texts that might be beyond their independent reading skill (Rose & Martin, 2012). This stage should enable teachers to explore students' background knowledge and preview potential fields that build a discourse. The second stage, Detailed Reading, should enable teachers to have students engaged in reading activities in depth and details and guide students to identify and highlight key words in the text to access and explore the detailed information of the text. The next stage of this pedagogy should enable teachers to build students' awareness of language use at word and sentence levels that commonly construe a targeted genre. The deconstruction and reconstruction of the discourse elements of the text that students use for the detailed reading stage are common practices in this stage.

The next stage in R2L is Joint Rewriting in which students work together to write a new text using the words that they have identified and highlighted in during the detailed reading activity. At this stage some activities may be coordinated by teachers or collaboratively enacted by teachers and students in writing a new text with a similar genre. The process of collaborative rewriting becomes apparent as it manifests for the whole class to see, so the whole class promotes the sense of individual and collective achievement. This joint rewriting stage is expected to support students' confidence and readiness to construct their own text. The last stage of the pedagogy is individual construction in which students write their own text individually.

The pedagogical practices through those mentioned stages involve student-teacher exchanges which are essential in promoting effective teaching practices (Rose, 2018). The exchanges realize a dialogic discourse and pedagogic registers between the two primary parties, which can be observed and analyzed in terms of pedagogic activities, relations, and modalities (Rose, 2014). With regard to the R2L pedagogy, a dialogic discourse and pedagogical registers are analyzable in terms of the situations such as the ones in which teachers facilitate some doable activities for students to build their skills at sentence levels, textual deconstruction and reconstruction, discussion to build the students' field

of knowledge, and, in addition, the exchanges of communication to gain positive attitudes toward learning and to create positive learning atmospheres. Those exchanges are to realize pedagogic relations that should enable teachers and students to negotiate hierarchies of authority to allow all of the students to have the same opportunities to succeed in learning. Pedagogic modalities as Rose (2014) highlighted refer to multiple modalities of how sources of knowledge in the classroom are shared (whether orally or in written, face-to-face or online, texts or discussion, and so forth).

R2L pedagogy promotes explicit instruction to support students in making meaning, thus their understanding of the lesson help enact their learning participation, which contributes to what is so called classroom democratization (Rose & Martin, 2012). In light of this, the classroom practices are always managed by explicit instruction starting from a whole text level to sentence and word level, as explicitly accentuated in classroom activities. Next, the text structure and language features explicitly and repeatedly are discussed to develop students' mastery of text types (Hyon, 1996) or genres. This informs students about how written genres are constructed in the model texts (Rose, 2005). Moreover, with explicit teaching, struggling students could be supported to be successful in the learning process, thus close the gap between the less and more successful students. In so doing, this pedagogy provides similar opportunity for all students to succeed in reading and writing skills (Acevedo & Rose, 2007). Inspirationally, the curriculum genres guide students to acquire language resources of accomplished authors (Rose, 2015).

In the classroom, teachers and students' interaction is built through "guidance through interaction in the context of shared experience" (Rose & Martin, 2012, p. 52) through what is also known as scaffolding (Martin & Rose, 2005) in which a more knowledgeable person supports a less knowledgeable person to complete a task. In the scaffolding process, teachers build interaction with students to help them achieve the completion of a task that at first is beyond their ability. The support is gradually lessened as students reach their expected ability. During the interaction, teachers prepare students to incrementally reach the expected knowledge and skills while at the same time elevate their capacity when responding teachers' questions or interacting with more knowledgeable peers.

The R2L pedagogy strongly advocates for student participation (Rose & Martin, 2015, p. 265). However, previous studies on R2L practices in language learning focus much on interactive text movability (Hallesson et al., 2018), L1 use in teaching English in bilingual classes (Kartika-Ningsih & Rose, 2018), students' writing improvement from all different levels of

achievement through R2L teaching cycles (Shum & Shi, 2017; Shum et al., 2018), teachers' awareness of step-by-step stages to help students to tell and write a story (Damayanti, 2017), and metalanguage focus by which students were supported to talk, read and write curricular target genres (Palincsar & Schleppegrell, 2014). In non-language classes, genre pedagogy and R2L are reportedly found effective in teaching subject matters such as history and science (Accurso et al., 2017; Accurso et al., 2016; Humphrey et al., 2020; Schall-Leckrone, 2016; Smit, et al., 2016; Whittaker, 2018).

Those studies involved experienced participating teachers in their studies. On the other hand, studies involving young and inexperienced teachers are vital, especially because they are not usually familiar with some technical and specific techniques in supporting student participation. On this front, Rose and Martin (2012) argue that R2L pedagogy provides tools for teachers to support student participation so that all students have access to their success. Arguably, maximal support enables all students to participate actively and acquire knowledge of curriculum (Kartika-Ningsih & Rose, 2021). In their study, Fenwick and Herrington (2022) reported that teaching strategies from genre pedagogy such as preparing, focusing, and elaborating during text deconstruction, increased the number of students who participate in the classroom dialogue. As for the preservice teachers, R2L pedagogy could as well equip inexperienced teachers to foster students' learning participation. Therefore, they need to be exposed with well researched practices such as R2L pedagogy to accelerate their knowledge of having their students engaged in learning. Previous studies that involved preservice teachers in genre pedagogy mostly focused on their participation in course works (Correa & Acheverri, 2017; Gebhard, et al., 2013; Yayli, 2011) and in the practice teaching of field experience (Nurlaelawati & Novianti, 2017; Worden, 2019).

This study, thus, aimed to investigate the answers to these research questions:
1. How is student participation enhanced through the implementation of R2L pedagogy by the preservice teachers?
2. What are the challenges faced by the preservice teachers in implementing the R2L pedagogy in enhancing student participation?

Such a study can provide much-needed literature and scholarship in illuminating the preservice teachers' practice in implementing genre pedagogy in Indonesia to inform teacher education programs in guiding and improving prospective EFL teachers' teaching in engaging student participation.

METHOD

This study employed a case study design as it involved real people in real situations as its unique example (Cohen et al., 2018). Particularly, it sought to understand the practice and challenges of genre pedagogy implementation by preservice teachers to support their students' reading and writing skills during their teaching practicum. It was participated by three preservice teachers who were all female with an age range of 20-22 years old; henceforth called as PST1, PST 2, and PST 3. The recruitment of the participants was based on convenience basis of which the participants were under the teaching practicum supervision of one of the authors. Nevertheless, the participants agreed to participate in the study by completing the consent letter.

A high school in the West Java Province, Indonesia, where the participants performed their practice teaching, became the site of the study. The school provided English lessons as a compulsory subject. Per the school's policy, the time allotment of the lesson for three learning hours (lasted for 135 minutes) in each meeting every week. The participants taught in the school for three weeks before the government announced restrictions of community activities, hence the opportunity to conduct full-time of face-to-face lessons for about two weeks upon their field assignment to the school.

As part of the study, the participants were given a series of activities by their university supervisor intensively, such as a workshop on Reading to Learn pedagogy, teaching practice, debriefings, and teaching reflective journals. The pedagogy focused on teaching reading and writing in an integrated way, which is relevant to the Curriculum 2013 that was used by the school. The curriculum mandated integrated language skills of teaching several text types such as recount text, narrative text, and announcement text.

After the workshop, the participants were asked to develop their lesson plans to teach reading and writing by using the stages of genre pedagogy. The participants wrote a lesson about teaching recount text to Grade 10 students. The lessons were developed by adapting the stages of Reading to Learn pedagogy. Adaptation or recontextualization should not be avoided because teachers have lists of considerations to support their students' learning (Kartika-Ningsih & Gunawan, 2019; Worden, 2018). In addition, modification of genre pedagogy in the classroom links socially-situated writing performance and choices of language use (Yasuda, 2011). In their adaptation, the participants chose not to focus too much on the grammar instruction to anticipate the students' restlessness towards the topic. Instead, they planned to provide lessons that made the students explore recount text toward the meaning-making in both reading and joint rewriting.

The data of the study were collected through observations of teaching practice and interviews.

The classroom observations were conducted to identify the participants' behaviors and attitudes toward the implementation of the Reading to Learn pedagogy. The observations were recorded by using an audio-visual device. The interviews were expected to get in-depth information related to the participants' opinions on the implementation of genre pedagogy. The collected data were then transcribed verbatim and analyzed using thematic analysis to identify the participants' challenges of the pedagogy implementation and its implications. The analysis went through the stages suggested by Braun and Clarke (2006). After making the data familiar, the analysis proceeded with initial codes to generate and collate themes. The observation data were also analyzed by using register analysis (Rose & Martin, 2014).

FINDINGS
The findings are divided into two parts following the research questions of the study. Generally, the study found that clarity and good order of R2L pedagogy and students' awareness of learning supported the enhancement of student participation in learning recount text. On the other hand, some challenges were faced by the participants, such as text selection and strategies of keyword identification.

Enhancing student participation in learning: the preservice teachers' experience in implementing R2L pedagogy

The findings in this section focus on the strategies that the preservice teachers used to support students' writing. The findings highlight the preservice teachers' concern, that is, student participation, when working with students in the classroom. This was a valid concern for the preservice teachers due to the importance of a positive classroom atmosphere for supporting learning.

Student Participation Resulting from Clarity and Good Order of Pedagogy
Based on the data from the observations, the preservice teachers enacted the adapted stages of Reading to Learn pedagogy, such as preparing for reading, detailed reading, sentence making and sentence writing, and joint rewriting. The participants taught recount text to support students' writing of recount text. Due to the school schedule of mid-term test and the Covid-19 outbreak, the students did not write individually-constructed recount texts after the joint rewriting activity. Instead, they revised the recount text they had written with their main English teacher.

The detailed instruction went as follows. The first stage that the preservice teachers had with their students was preparing for reading. The participants showed a video or a picture to prepare the students to learn the recount text. At this stage, they attempted to explore the students' prior knowledge about the topic in the recount text that they would share afterward. For example, PST 1 played a video for her students, which was about a family who traveled to London from their hometown. After watching the video, she guided the students to identify the key information from what they had seen in the video.

Due to some technical restrictions, the video was not well seen and heard by the students. The projector was not clear enough to project the audio-visual display. However, when PST 1 started the discussion of the video they were not hesitant to respond to the teacher's questions. almost all of the students answered the teachers' questions in chorus (See Table 1).

Table 1
Exchange 1 PST 1's Preparing for Reading

Speaker	Text	Phases
T	*playing a video*	
T	OK. I'll give you a clue.	Prepare
	The clue is British Airways.	Point
	Where are the people in the video going?	Focus
Ss	To England	Identify
T	Yes. Exactly.	Affirm
	They are going to London in England.	
T	What is the place in the video?	Focus
Ss	Airport.	Propose
T	How do you know?	Focus
Ss	Bags.	Propose
T	Bags?	Reject
Ss	Suitcases.	Propose
T	Suitcases.	Affirm
Ss	Airplanes.	Propose
T	Airplanes.	Affirm
	Very nice	Affirm
T	If you see people with big suitcases, they usually are going by planes.	Elaborate

Based on the exchanges, after asking the students to watch the video, PST 1 had the students focus on several identifications based on the content of the video. Pointing to the video, she asked several questions related to what was shown in the video. For example, she focused the students on the destination that the people were going to and to the place where the people were in the video. The students referring the answer to the video by answering the destination of the people and made proposals to identify the position of the people. The students used their knowledge after watching the video and their prior knowledge to identify the place (England, airport). The preservice teacher affirmed the students' response, sometimes with praise. At times, she disapproved of the response (Are they/Are there bags?) and hinted it to the students to revise the answer. When the students said "bags", PST 1 did not seem to be sure about the students' response. Picking up on the teacher's tone, the students gave another word "suitcases" for bigger bags. The students' response might be either an additional answer to the first word or revising the first word into another word that signified a more specific item.

After the preparing-to-read stage, the participants distributed copies of a recount text to the students. They guided the students in a close reading activity where they directed the students to highlight the words or phrases in the text through directive questioning. Next, the preservice teachers and their students discussed the meaning of each sentence in the texts. For example, PST 1 gave a recount text of a family who made a travel to London. Despite the title "Vacation to London", the text did not tell the family's vacation in London. The text in Table 2 sequenced the events of the family's way of getting the tickets and having the flight to London.

Table 2
Exchange 2 PST 1's Detailed Reading

Speaker	Text	Phases
T	Okay, next.	Point
	They saw their travel agent and booked their tickets.	Prepare
	Did Mr. Richard bbuy the ticket by himself?	Focus
S #10	No.	Propose
T	How did he buy the ticket?	Focus
S #10	They saw their travel agent and booked their tickets	Propose
T	They saw their travel agent and booked their tickets.	Affirm
	Do you know what the travel agent is?	Focus
T	Travel agent serves clients who are going to travel, especially abroad.	Elaborate
	That's the meaning of travel agent.	
	You can underline the word travel agent.	

At the Detailed Reading stage, PST 1 read the text loudly to the students while the students listened attentively to her reading of the text. Then, she read each sentence in the text and made questions and answers about the sentence. The table above shows an example of PST 1's detailed reading activities. First, she read a sentence to prepare the students. Next, she focused on the students to confirm whether the participant in the text (Mr. Richard) bought the tickets to London himself. The students proposed their answer "No". PST 1 did not just accept the students' proposal. She demanded evidence for the proposal. The students mentioned their identification of the sentence by reading the sentence to the teacher (They saw their travel agent and booked their tickets). PST 1 gave an affirmation for the answer by repeating it. Then, she gave elaboration on what a travel agent was. After that, she asked the students to highlight the phrase "travel agent".

During the detailed reading, the participants reviewed the grammar and structure of the text. PST 1, at times, led the students to focus on the form of certain verbs that were written in past form. She also took the students' attention to the structure of the recount text, such as orientation and series of events. During this stage, however, the participants did not engage in too much discussion on grammar due to consideration of the students' boredom with learning about past tense.

After the detailed reading stage, the participants took the students to the next stage, i.e., sentence making and sentence writing. The participants prepared copies of strips of sentences of a paragraph taken from the text used in detailed reading. They asked the students in groups to arrange the sentences into coherent paragraphs. They guided the students to identify clauses, phrases, and words out of the strips. To end the stage, they asked the students to make sentences from cut-out words.

Excerpt 1 PST 1

I found some students struggled to focus their attention to the lesson. I think they were thinking of being afraid of missing out of the stages. They might think if they missed one stage or instruction, they might not be able to understand the materials in the next stage or instruction.

Excerpt 2 PST 3

They learn together in the classroom. They don't learn individually. That way, they were encouraged to learn. Everybody in the classroom was demanded to participate, to be active. Not only the smartest.

Up to this stage, the participants looked comfortable because of the fact that the students voluntarily participated in the activities and were willing to take turns to give their responses. PST 1 stated that she found some students who struggled to focus themselves on the lesson. She thought they were afraid of missing what they were doing in the lesson because they might not able to understand the materials if they did not focus. PST 3 asserted that in the process of the implementation of R2L the students learned together in the classroom instead of individually. Everybody was encouraged to participate actively.

Excerpt 3 PST 2

In the first meeting the students did not show their attention to me. When I asked them, they did not respond to my questions. Some of them were even sleeping. I was afraid of waking them because I was a new teacher.

It was more fun than the other day I met them. The students actively participated. They showed their responses even before their turns.

Before the class, as revealed in the interview, the participants experienced anxiety when they had a face-to-face interaction for the first time. They were in difficulty to gain the students' attention to the lesson. PST 2, for example, at first complained that the students did not pay attention to her. The students did not give responses to her questions. But she gave a different claim after she implemented R2L. She said that the lesson was more fun. She found the students being active in responding to her questions, even before they had their turns.

Student Participation Resulting from their Awareness of Learning

Joint construction was the last stage that the participants did in the classroom with the students. After reviewing the keywords that the class had identified earlier at the detailed reading stage, they encouraged the students to take turns writing the keywords on the board to be later made into sentences to construct a paragraph. They asked the students to work together and help each other when any of them needed help in writing on the board. Evidently, as students were at different levels of proficiency and understanding of the genre being taught, some students were confident to write their sentences, while some others needed support from their peers.

The following is the sample taken from PST 1's class in doing joint rewriting. The students, working together, managed to write a paragraph of recount by adapting the text that they had in the detailed reading activity on the board. It can be seen that the text is about a family (My family) who had a trip to Paris and London for a vacation. The first three sentences can be identified as the orientation describing the participants (My family, two daughters) and destinations (Paris). The next sentences show the events such as booking ticket, trip to Paris, and trip to London. The paragraph is ended with an evaluation to the event in the flight to London.

My family was on vacation. She has two daughters. We went to Paris. We booked travel agent to get tickets. We transit in Britain. We have fourteen days tour. The travel and accommodation provided what we need in Paris. After we finish vacation in Paris we went tours around London. We flight to London at nine a.m. In airplane we read newspaper and magazine. The cabin crews offers food and drink. In the plane we watch entertainment. We had a very pleasant. Finally we slept part of the way.

Students' Text in Joint Rewriting

The participants gave feedback on the students' paragraphs on the board. For example, PST 1 pointed to several aspects in the paragraph, such as the participant, the chronological events, and the past tense of some verbs. She guided the students to pay attention to the use of the participant "She" in the second sentence, that did not seem to match the preceded sentence. She also led the students to focus on several verbs that needed revisions in a way to show past events, such as "transit", "have", "finish", and so on. Furthermore, she took the students' attention to the chronological events of the family's vacations.

Based on the findings above, it is evident that the students learned from the text they had read earlier. They used the keywords from the earlier text to write a recount with a new field. They seemed to be more aware of the function and structure of the recount text. Several aspects they needed to pay attention to more were on language features and chronological events. Their teacher (PST 1) was so perceptive that she took the students' attention to revise those matters.

Excerpt 4 PST 1

I thought the joint rewriting stage were the most challenging stage. The students might refuse to come forward to write. Even though some of them lost their focus, I think many of them were still following the lesson. I had to assure the students that it is okay to come forward to write on the board because everybody will help.

Excerpt 5 PST 2

Each student had opportunities to participate. Teacher provided the opportunity. When they feel shy to participate, I encouraged them to be just fine. They can say what they know about the answer. In joint rewriting, many students looked restless. But the encouragement from the teacher made the students come forward. Especially when they knew that their friends helped them.

Before attending this stage, the participants were not sure of whether the students would be willing to participate eagerly as this might be considered the most challenging activity for the students. They had to reconstruct the text that they had read with a new topic. The participants knew that they had to work harder at this stage to encourage and make sure that they would be fine when writing a sentence on the board. PST 1 voiced that she was afraid of the students' refusal to write on the board. She had to assure the students that they would be fine if they came to the front of the class to write on the board. Everybody in the class would help each other with what to write on the board. PST 2 claimed that all the students had the opportunity to participate in all stages of the lesson, including the joint rewriting. At the joint rewriting stage, she encouraged the students to write on the board and told them that they would be helped by their peers.

Challenges faced by the preservice teachers in implementing the R2L pedagogy in enhancing student participation.

The findings in this section focus on the challenges that the preservice teachers encountered in the classroom when using R2L pedagogy to enhance student participation. The challenges begin from the preparation of text to classroom practice.

Text Selection

The classroom observations show that the participants used different texts for their instructions. The participants adapted recount texts from online sources. They argued that the adaptation was needed to fit students' interests and level of proficiency. Students' familiarity with the topic was also their consideration of text selection.

Excerpt 6 PST 1

I searched for the texts online. I read the texts again and again. I checked the structure and the language. Then I took that one I used in the classroom. I changed some parts to suit the students' level of proficiency. I'm afraid that the students could not understand the text.

For example, PST 1 searched the target texts in online sources (see excerpt 6). She searched for more than one recount text to compare. Each text was analyzed in terms of text structure and language features. She also evaluated the texts to see if they suited the students' level of proficiency. She feared that the students could not access the text due to its high level of difficulty. She would finally decide one text that might get the students' interest for the instruction.

Identifying Keywords

In the process of detailed reading activities, the participants did several strategies to make the students comprehend the text better. As shown earlier in the previous subsections, the participants made interaction cycles by preparing what the students would have to respond. Then, the teachers drove the students to focus on each part of the sentence in the text. There were times when the participants rushed to finish the stage by giving the translation of words or phrases that the students had to identify in sentences of the text or the meanings of words in the students' first language.

For example, as shown in Table 3 above, PST 2 guided the students to identify meanings in the text. Going deeper in understanding the text was interrupted by rushing to get the students' responses to her focus. This may lead to the misassumption that detailed reading means identifying the meanings of words or phrases without observing the context of the text.

Table 3
Exchange 3 PST 2's Detailed Reading

Speaker	Text	Phases
T	Next, in the sentence	Prepare
	what is a word that means a place?	Focus
S#21	Supermarket	Identify
T	Supermarket	Affirm
	What are two words that show a place to live?	Focus
S#22	Old house	Identify

DISCUSSION

This study reported the preservice teachers' use of R2L pedagogy in enhancing student participation and the challenges they encountered. Three preservice teachers enacted R2L in their classes to teach integrated reading and writing in their teaching practicum program. After joining a workshop on R2L pedagogy, they developed a lesson adapting the stages of R2L and used the adapted cycles in their actual teaching of writing a recount text. Their main concern of teaching by following R2L teaching cycles was to elevate students' low participation in learning the lesson. When they followed the R2L pedagogy, they found out that the student participation in the lesson was high. However, they encountered some challenges in practicing the lesson, such as text selection and keyword identification.

In the teaching of recount text, the preservice teachers followed the adapted stages from R2L pedagogy, which included Preparing for Reading, Detailed Reading, Sentence Making, Spelling, Sentence Writing, and Joint Rewriting. The stages of R2L pedagogy enabled students to write target genres, confirming other researchers that students improved their writing after they went through the stages of R2L (Damayanti, 2017; Shum & Shi, 2017; Shum et al, 2018). Not only did the students improve in their writing, student participation in their learning could also be enhanced. This study demonstrates that R2L can be used to develop student participation in the lesson. The strategies used by the preservice teachers were consistent with Kartika-Ningsih and Rose (2021) and Fenwick and Herrington's (2022) findings. Through the strategies, they were able to manage students' attention to the text and to guide the students to write a recount text.

Student participation in the preservice teachers' classes during the implementation of R2L resulted from the clarity and good order of the pedagogy and students' awareness of learning. The order of the pedagogy, as adapted by the preservice teachers, began from the stages of preparing for reading to joint rewriting. The preservice teachers enabled the students to experience a systematic way of learning, so it attracted the students' attention to the lesson. The systematic stages result from the integration of reading and writing and pedagogic support that has become the uniqueness of R2L pedagogy (Shum et al., 2018). In addition, the step-by-step strategies in initiating communication in the classroom, that is, preparing, focusing, and elaborating, guided the students to follow the instructions and kept them focused on the lesson. Strategies of R2L pedagogy can be used to extend student participation in the classroom (Fenwick & Herrington, 2022). Students' involvement in joint rewriting stage is evidence of student participation. When a scribe wrote on the board the other students supported him or her. The preservice teachers also show their support to make sure that the students felt comfortable. The process of adapting the text they had in the earlier stage shows their awareness of learning throughout the stages of R2L pedagogy. The involvement of teacher, scribes, and reciters (students who helped the scribes) ensures that students are active and supported to success (Katika-Ningsih & Rose, 2021)

Despite the practice that helped students learn genre and improved student participation, the preservice teachers' challenges lingered around the preparation of text and strategies of identifying meanings in the text. This is a continued challenge for teachers. For this case, Harders and Macken-Horarik (2008) suggest that teaching by using genre pedagogy demands a high level of preparation such as having the ability to predict areas of difficulty for students, to enable students to decode both hard words and hard wordings, draw language patterns in a mentor text into dependent construction. This also includes the text selection as the text would become mentor text that the students see as a good model to look up in terms of language choices and organization (Rose & Martin, 2012).

This implies that EFL preservice teachers still need much more support in their teacher education programs to enable them to access more to the principles of teaching and learning a language by using genre pedagogy, especially in enhancing student participation. Despite the challenges, there is evidence that professional development in genre pedagogy has been proven to be of support for preservice teachers' development in linguistic knowledge for text deconstruction and construction (Accurso et al., 2017). However, as noted by Achugar et al. (2007), teachers need help to see how language works and develop new approaches to talking about language in meaningful ways.

CONCLUSION

In this study, the EFL pre-service teachers practiced using R2L pedagogy in the teaching practicum context to enhance student participation in learning and identify challenges of implementing R2L pedagogy. The participants in the study adapted the pedagogy to cater to the students' prior experience of learning English and the school policy. Although the pedagogy was implemented in one round due to the outbreak of Covid-19, in general, the participants shared that the pedagogy somewhat had given them experience of improving student participation through the stages of the pedagogy. Some problems were encountered by the participants, including text selection, contextual strategies of detailed reading, and time management. A model text is an essential element in genre pedagogy as it becomes the mentor text that the students learn from and serves as the basis for the text construction. In EFL settings, text selection might be a major problem due to adjustments to students' level of proficiency and consideration of the students' accessibility to the text.

When text has been selected, the preservice teachers involved in the deconstruction and reconstruction of the text. This activity takes pre-service teachers to another level of exploration. What was common among the preservice teachers in

teaching was translating into the L1 and identifying literal meanings. These pedagogical activities signal the need for more understanding about R2L concept in good practices because teaching is not about the translation of the literal meanings that students learn from a mentor text, but more about meaning making through language choices and text organization.

REFERENCES

Accurso, K., Gebhard, M., & Purington, S. B. (2017). Analyzing diverse learners' writing in mathematics: Systemic Functional Linguistics in secondary pre-service teacher education. *International Journal for Mathematics Teaching and Learning*, *18*(1), 84–108.

Accurso, K., Gebhard, M., & Selden, C. (2016). Supporting L2 elementary science writing with SFL in an age of school reform. *In* L. C. de Oliveira & T. Silva (Eds.)*, Second language writing in elementary classrooms: Instructional issues, content-area writing and teacher education* (pp. 126-150). Palgrave Macmillan.

Acevedo, C., & Rose, D. (2007). *Reading (and writing) to learn in the middle years of schooling*. Primary English Teaching Association Australia.

Achugar, M., Schleppegrell, M., & Oteíza, T. (2007). Engaging teachers in language analysis: A functional linguistics approach to reflective literacy. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, *6*(2), 8-24.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77-101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research method in education* (8th ed.). Routledge.

Correa D., & Echeverri, S. (2017). Using a systemic functional genre-based approach to promote a situated view of academic writing among EFL pre-service teachers. *HOW*, *24*(1), 44-62. http://doi.org/10.19183/ how.24.1.303.

Damayanti, I. L. (2017). From storytelling to story writing: The implementation of Reading to Learn (R2L) Pedagogy to teach English as a foreign language in Indonesia. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 6*(2), 232-245. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Fenwick, L., & Herrington, M. (2022). Teacher use of genre pedagogy: Engaging students in dialogue about content area language during text deconstruction. *Language and Education*, *36*(1), 43–58. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2021.1912082

Gebhard, M., Shin, D., & Seger, W. (2011). blogging and emergent l2 literacy development

in an urban elementary school: a functional perspective. *CALICO Journal*, *28*(2), 278-307.

Gebhard, M., Chen, I-An., Graham, H., & Gunawan, W. (2013). Teaching to mean, writing to mean: SFL, L2 literacy, and teacher education. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *22*, 107–124.

Hallesson, Y., Visén, P., Folkeryd, J. W., & Geijerstam. Å. A. (2018). Four Classrooms―Four approaches to reading: Examples of disciplinary reading in social science subjects in years five and twelve. *L1-Educational Studies in Language and Literature*, *18*, 1-29.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An Introduction to functional grammar* (2nd ed.). Arnold.

Harders, P., & Macken-Horarik, M. (2008). Scaffolding literacy and the Year Nine boys: Developing a language-centred literacy pedagogy. *TESOL in Context*, *18*(2), 4-20.

Hasan, M. K., &Akhand, M. M. (2010). Approaches to writing in EFL/ESL Context: Balancing product and process in writing class at tertiary level. *Journal of NELTA*, *15*(1-2), 77-88.

Humphrey, S., Hao, J., & Rose, D. (2020) Launching research: A Martinian perspective on science pedagogy. In M. Zappavigna & S. Dreyfus (Eds.), *Discourses of hope and reconciliation: On JR Martin's contribution to Systemic Functional Linguistics* (pp. 85-97). Bloomsbury.

Hyland, K. (2004). *Second language writing*. Cambridge University Press.

Hyon, S. (1996). Genre in three traditions: Implications for ESL. *TESOL Quarterly*, *30*(4), 693-722.

Kartika-Ningsih, H., & Rose, D. (2021). Intermodality and multilingual re-instantiation: Joint construction in bilingual genre pedagogy. *Íkala, Revista de Lenguaje y Cultura*, *26*(1), 185-205.

Kartika-Ningsih, H., & Gunawan, W. (2019). Recontextualisation of genre-based pedagogy: The case of Indonesian EFL classrooms. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 9*(2), 335-347. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v9i2.20231

Kartika-Ningsih, H., & Rose, D. (2018). Language shift: analysing language use in multilingual classroom interactions. *Functional Linguistics, 5*(1), 1-22. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40554-018-0061-0

Nurlaelawati, I., & Novianti, N. (2017). The practice of genre-based pedagogy in Indonesian schools: A case of preservice teachers in Bandung, West Java Province. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *7*(1), 160-166. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v7i1.6869

Palincsar, A., & Schleppegrel, M. J. (2014). Focusing on language and meaning while learning with text. *TESOL Quarterly*, *48*(3). 616-623. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.178

Rose, D. (2005). Democratising the classroom: A literacy pedagogy for the new generation. *Journal of Education*, *37*, 131-167.

Rose, D. (2014). Analysing pedagogic discourse: An approach from genre and register. *Functional Linguistics*, *1*(1). 1-32. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40554-014-0011-4

Rose, D. (2015) Genre, knowledge and pedagogy in the 'Sydney School'. In Artemeva, N & A Freedman (Eds.), *Trends and traditions in genre studies*. Inkshed.

Rose, D. (2018). Pedagogic register analysis: Mapping choices in teaching and learning. *Functional Linguistics*, *5*(1), 1-33. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40554-018-0053-0

Rose, D., & Martin, J. R. (2012). *Learning to write, reading to learn: Genre, knowledge and pedagogy in the Sydney School*. Equinox Publishing.

Schall-Leckrone, L. (2016). Genre Pedagogy: A Framework to Prepare History Teachers to Teach Language. *TESOL Quarterly*, *51*(2), 358–382. http://www.jstor.org/stable/44984759

Shum, M. S., Tai, C. P., & Shi, D. (2018). Using 'Reading to Learn' (R2L) pedagogy to teach discussion genre to non-Chinese-speaking students in Hong Kong. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *21*(2), 237-247. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2016.1159653

Shum, M. S. & Shi, D. (2017). "Reading to learn, learning to write" pedagogy: how effective is it on teaching narrative writing to non-Chinese speaking students? *Linguistics and Literature Studies*, *5*(3), 198-206. https://doi.org/10.13189/lls.2017.050307/

Smit, J., Bakker, A., van Earde, D., & Kujipers, M. (2016). Using genre pedagogy to promote student proficiency in the language required for interpreting line graphs. *Math Ed Res J. 28*, 457-478. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13394-016-0174-2

Tardy, C. M., Buck, R. H., Pawlowski, M., & Slinkard, J. R. (2018). Evolving conceptions of genre among first-year writing. *Composition Forum*, *38*. https://compositionforum.com/issue/38/evolving.php

Wen, Z. (E)., Zhang, L. J., Kong, H., & Han, L. (2022). Translanguaging genre pedagogy: implications for teaching business communication in the Greater Bay Area. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, *7*(32). 1-18. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-022-00161-6

Whittaker, R. (2018). Reading to Learn in CLIL subjects: Working with content-language.

CLIL Journal of Innovation and Research in Plurilingual and Pluricultural Education, *1*(1), 19-27. https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/clil.4

Worden, D. (2018). Balancing stability and flexibility in genre-based writing instruction: A case study of a novice L2 writing teacher. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *42*, 44-57. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2018.09.003

Worden, D. (2019). Developing L2 writing teachers' pedagogical content knowledge of genre through the unfamiliar genre project. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *46*, 44-57.

100667. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2019.100667

Yasuda, S. (2011). Genre-based tasks in foreign language writing: Developing writers' genre awareness, linguistic knowledge, and writing competence. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *20*, 111–133. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2011.03.001

Yayli, D. (2011). From genre awareness to cross-genre awareness: A study in an EFL context. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *10*(3), 121-129.