

PalArch's Journal of Archaeology  
of Egypt / Egyptology

**DEVELOPING LEARNERS WRITING SKILLS THROUGH PROCESS  
WRITING APPROACH**

**Tariq<sup>1</sup>, Shaukat Ali<sup>2</sup>, and Qaisar Khan<sup>3</sup>**

**<sup>1</sup>Lecturer, University of Malakand.**

**<sup>2</sup>Assistant Professor, University of Malakand.**

**<sup>3</sup>Professor, University of Malakand.**

**Tariq, Shaukat Ali, and Qaisar Khan, Developing Learnerswriting Skills Through  
Process Writing Approach, Palarch's Journal Of Archaeology Of Egypt/Egyptology  
18(8). ISSN 1567-214x.**

**Key words: process writing approach and product writing approach.**

**Abstract:**

This study investigated students' writing competence by involving them in different writing activities in groups. Participants N= 63, ages 22 to 24, from Government Post Graduate College Jahan Zeb. This study used quasi-experimental study design; participants were assigned to control group and experimental group non-randomly. Control group was taught through lecture based teaching, whereas Experimental group used process writing approach. The data instruments include: pre-test and post-test, an adapted analytical scoring rubrics was used for measuring the scores made on the pre-test and post-test, also utilized as an instruction guide for students in writing activities during the treatment period of two and half months. Independent t test was used to analyse the data gathered from pre-test and post-test. The findings of this study revealed that Experimental group outperformed the comparison group. The findings of this study may help teachers and educationists to initiate reforms in teaching strategies and techniques and also change the teaching of writing from product writing approach (rote learning) to process writing approach.

## 1. Introduction:

Generally writing skills in the education domains is perceived as a finished product disregarding its recursive processes; pre-writing, drafting, revising, editing and finalizing. Quite contrary to what writing really is, it is most often seen as a support skill rather than an independent and social activity per se. However, writing skills can come into a fuller play when writers are made aware of its different types and different processes. For, it has different texts and contexts each of which requires varied conventions, modes (genres) and rhetoric to address the needs and fulfill the purposes of varying audience and contexts. Writing is a socially constructed and cognitively demanding task. In addition, “writing is not an innate natural ability but is a cognitive ability” (Harris,1993, p.78), which needs to be developed and polished by consistence efforts and training. There is a common belief among writersthat having good ideas do not automatically transform into good written texts.

The ability to write effectively using standard written English is vital in academic sphere, where competency in written communication is regarded critical for student learning outcome (SLO). A study carried out by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) found that 99% of the chief academic officers from 433 higher education institutions rated writing as one of the most important intellectual skills for their students. Owing to which, writing is central to many domains such as academic institutions, workplaces and organizations where the writer is supposed to produce effective written texts.

To produce effective texts, writer has to draw on his/her previous experience and existing knowledge to convince a diverse number of audience from varied perspectives (Bargiela-Chiappini and Nickerson 2014). Learning to write effectively in L2 is a daunting and challenging task. However, it should not come as a surprise even for those who speak English as a first language requires extensive and specialized instruction to write efficiently and effectively (Hyland 2003). Developing writing skills involves knowledge about texts, contexts, audiences (readers) and composing skills. O’Brien (2004), defines the process of writing an activity where teachers urge students to see writing not as an exercise of grammar rather a discovery of meaning and ideas. He further remarks that teachers during the writing process can encourage students to explore their thoughts and improve their own writing. Writing is a process of discovery of meaning. Communicating ideas, information and decisions in writing are virtually central to all disciplines whether it is an organization, school/college, university or workplace (Zamel 1982; Spack 1985).

Although the development of writing is dependent on various components and elements, contrarily most of the academic institutions tend to follow one fixed approach, particularly in the context of Pakistan. There is less likelihood of engaging learners in writing activities or to do writing on their own (Khan 2012).To make the development of writing skills interesting, engaging students in different writing activities should be at the core of teaching. In a situation, where there exists no concept of making errors and mistakes and only finished product is valued, expecting good writing and critical thinking is virtually non-existent. Most importantly, where there is a zero tolerance towards errors and mistakes, ignoring the fact that making errors is part of learning process. There lies much learning outcomes when students make mistakes or correct each other mistakes(Baker and Westrup 2000).

Certainly writing is an area that needs attention, research in this regard has identified that interventions have produced better results, such as expressive writing(Engelmann and Silbert 1983), reasoning and writing (Graves 1990; Englemann and Bruner 1995; Englemann and Grossen 2001), procedural facilitation goal-setting(MacArthur, Graham et al. 1995)and cognitive strategy instruction(Graham and Harris 1989). A study conducted in Taiwan, indicates that according to the Statistic of Language Training Testing Centre (LTTC, 2011), Taiwanese students' writing performance is the poorest of all the skills; thus students complain that English courses do not meet their needs.Likewise in Pakistan almost all courses are designed to focus on reading and mechanic writing (spellings, grammar, punctuation and correct form). It is also well-accepted that basic mechanical skills, such as handwriting, spelling, punctuations, capitalizations and correct form reduce the scanty resources of working memory in students, hence restricting their capacity to create language fluently (Kellogg 2008). Due to its complex and complicated nature it is often ignored in school and colleges.

Similarly a study in Japan, reveals that rhetorical differences in language are unique from culture to culture(Connor 2002) and causes difficulties for second language writers due to the differences of organizational patterns(Kubota 1997; Casanave 2004). For example, Japanese students who had not been given instruction on English writing ('inexperienced student writers') preferred the Japanese rhetorical pattern and those who received favoured English rhetorical pattern.

## **2. Objective of the study:**

1. The aim of this study is to develop students overall writing skills through process writing approachby engaging them in group writing activities.

## **3. Research Question:**

1. How does process writing approach help students improve their writing skills?

## **4. Methodology:**

### **4.1 Research Design:**

This study used quasi-experimental study design as in most educational settings, random assignment is not possible. Participants of the study wereBS four years programme, aged between 19, and 22. Being a quasi-experimental study, the assignment of students was carried out non-randomly. They were assigned to control group and experimental group non-randomly. Control group was taught through lecture based teaching, whereas Experimental group used process writing approach. A Quasi-Experimental like experiment design, tests causal hypothesis in which a programme or policy is seen as “intervention” and is tested on how well it works or achieve its objectives. Quasi-experiment lacks random assignment, however assignment of participants to a treatment group or control group is made either by means of self-selection, by administrator selection or teachers.

Group writing activities in the intervention were performed by students under the supervision of the researcher on different topics according the process writing recursive stages. The results of pre-test were collected and analysedusing analytic scoring rubrics. The experimental group was given treatment for nine weeks during which different group writing

activities were performed using process writing approach. For pre-test, independent t-test was applied for comparing the means of the two groups. Post-test was conducted at the end of the treatment. The results obtained from the post-test were evaluated using rubrics. An independent t-test was applied to compare the mean scores obtained from post-test between the two groups. This was followed by a paired t-test to compare the means score of each participant within the group.

#### 4.2 Research instruments:

The data instruments include: pre-test and post-test, and an adapted analytical scoring rubrics was used for measuring the scores made on the pre-test and post-test, also utilized as an instruction guide for students in writing activities during the treatment period of two and half months.

#### 5. Results of the study:

An independent t-test was applied to compare the mean score of the two groups (experimental and control) on their pre-test in order to find out their language proficiency for the intervention. Table 1.1 shows that there was no significant difference between the mean scores of the two groups with  $p > .05$ . Therefore, it can be assumed that the two groups were at the same level of English writing proficiency before the treatment.

Table 1.1: Independent-Samples T-Test of Pre-Test Scores for the Two Groups

Genres of Writing	Group					
	EG (n=32)		CG (n=31)		t	p value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Essay 1	124.25	10.33	22.48	6.38	.751	.456
Essay 2	24.59	10.07	24.52	7.03	.031	.975
Essay 3	18.65	7.42	19.04	5.90	.211	.829

#### 6. Comparison of the Mean Scores on the Post-Test of the Experimental and Control Groups:

Table 1.2 displays and compares the mean score gained by EG and CG on post-test. As shown in table 1.2, the students' mean gained scores lie within a range of 21.08 to 31.84. An independent t-test was used to compare the mean scores for the two groups on the post-test. The

results of Table 1.2 show that students Experimental Group made a significantly higher mean scores on the post-test than the CG students, with a  $p < .05$ .

Table 1.2 Independent-Samples T-Test of Post-Test Scores for the Two Groups

Genres of Writing	EG (n=32)		CG (n=31)		t	p value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Essay 1	31.84	9.92	23.88	8.17	3.24	0.002
Essay 2	30.28	13.40	23.92	8.94	2.042	0.046
Essay 3	26.00	12.64	21.08	8.03	1.695	0.096

## 7. Discussion:

The main objective of this paper is to examine whether group writing activities using process approach help student participants improve their overall writing skills by producing different types of texts. To test this, students from both experimental and control groups were pretested and post-tested. Their gained scores on pretest and post-test were analysed using statistical techniques. An independent-sample t-test was applied to compare the mean scores of the pre-test and post-test obtained by the two groups; experimental and control groups.

The results from the comparison of the pre-test and post-test mean scores indicate that students in experimental group have gained significantly higher mean scores on the three essays in general and on first and second in particular  $p < .05$ . The highest increase made by students in EG, was on essay 1 followed by essay 2. On the other hand, students in CG did not make a significant increase in any of the three essays, rather regressed on essay 2 from 24.52 to 23.92. Hence, it can be concluded that students in experimental group made greater improvement in essay 1, essay 2, but did not make bigger improvement on essay 3. The higher mean scores gained by students in experimental group might be attributed to group writing activities on these three essays using process approach.

Students with lower mean scores in the control group are indicative of lack of group writing activities using different process of process writing approach. In teacher centered approach classroom, students mostly depend on rote learning and are supposed to memorise what is taught to them as prescribed in the syllabus. They are supposed only to reproduce them in their examination. Emphasis is on the linguistically correct product rather than how to produce the correct texts. In addition, students are not engaged in any problem solving activities. This inductive way of teaching and learning fails to help students determine how the choice of words, organizational structure and conventions are influenced by social context.

## 8. Conclusion:

The findings this study support the claim put forward by scholars that explicit teaching on writing process could help produce quality texts (e.g. Badger & White, 2000; Hyland, 2003b, 2004; Tribble, 1996), as the gained scores of experimental group was greater than the mean scores of control group in all three essays. The results of the study suggest that process writing approach be adopted in teaching of writing skills. Findings of the study also support the theoretical discussion that writer's knowledge is essential to deal with the complex nature of writing. Since writing is a complex activity it should be viewed from cognitive aspect. Writer has to have knowledge of writing process to produce effective texts like writing multiple drafts and getting these drafts reviewed by their peers, teachers, and by themselves, and revising their drafts in the light of the feedback into a final draft improve their writing skills. Thus, results from the pre-test and post-test shown support the theoretical view that students have improved their writing skills.

## References:

- Baker, J. and H. Westrup (2000). *English Language Teacher's Handbook: How to Teach Large Classes with Few Resources*, Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Bargiela-Chiappini, F. and C. R. Nickerson (2014). *Writing business: Genres, media and discourses*, Routledge.
- Casanave, C. P. (2004). *Controversies in second language writing: Dilemmas and decisions in research and instruction*, University of Michigan Press.
- Connor, U. (2002). "New directions in contrastive rhetoric." *TESOL quarterly*: 493-510.
- Engelmann, S. and J. Silbert (1983). *Expressive Writing I*. Desoto, TX: SRA, McGraw-Hill.
- Englemann, S. and E. Bruner (1995). "SRA Reading Mastery Rainbow Edition." Chicago, IL: SRA: McGraw-Hill.
- Englemann, S. and B. Grossen (2001). "Reasoning and writing." Blacklick, OH: Science Research Associates.
- Graham, S. and K. R. Harris (1989). "Components analysis of cognitive strategy instruction: Effects on learning disabled students' compositions and self-efficacy." *Journal of educational Psychology* **81**(3): 353.
- Graves, A. (1990). "The Effects of Procedural Facilitation on the Story Composition of Learning Disabled Students." *Learning Disabilities Research* **5**(2): 88-93.
- Harris, J., R. Carter, et al. (1993). *Introducing writing*, Penguin English.

Hyland (2003). *Second language writing*, Ernst Klett Sprachen.

Kellogg, R. T. (2008). "Training writing skills-A cognitive developmental perspective."

Khan, H. I. (2012). "English teachers' perceptions about creativity and teaching creative writing in Pakistan." *American International Journal of Contemporary Research* **2**(3): 57-67.

Kubota, R. (1997). "A reevaluation of the uniqueness of Japanese written discourse implications for contrastive rhetoric." *Written communication* **14**(4): 460-480.

MacArthur, C. A., S. Graham, et al. (1995). "Evaluation of a writing instruction model that integrated a process approach, strategy instruction, and word processing." *Learning Disability Quarterly* **18**(4): 278-291.

Spack, R. (1985). "Literature, reading, writing, and ESL: Bridging the gaps." *Tesol Quarterly* **19**(4): 703-725.

Zamel, V. (1982). "Writing: The process of discovering meaning." *Tesol Quarterly* **16**(2): 195-209.