



Effects of Process Writing Approach on the Students' Paragraph Writing Skills

Abeje Yoseph Orkojo, Ph.D. candidate, Lecturer in English,

Department of English Language and Literature, Bule Hora University, Ethiopia.

Dr. Wondwosen Tesfamichael, Associate Professor in TEFL, Wolaita Sodo University, Ethiopia.

Dr. Hailu Wubeshet, Associate Professor, College of Social Sciences and Humanities, Wachemo University, Hossana, Ethiopia.

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17237694

Abstract

This research endorsed the process writing methodology research findings on the writing skills of the students. The respondents of the research were Grade 11 students of Durame High School, Ethiopia. The respondents numbered 90, whose ages varied from 18 years to 21 years. It used a mixed design, and the design applied was a quasi-experimental design. The investigational group underwent training on paragraph writing skills based on the process writing methodology principle. The tools used in the research were 1) pre-test and post-test writing of paragraphs, as well as a focus group discussion. Data were analysed through SPSS V20, where the descriptive statistics, as well as the inferential statistics, were used. Effects of the current research later endorsed that there resulted in the investigation guide where the investigational group significantly scored more than the control group ($p < 0.05$) on the writing of paragraphs post-test, on content, vocabulary, grammar, as well as on mechanics. Finally, but not least, the results of the focus group discussion also showed that the participants of the experimental group had a preference for utilising an applicable implementation of the process writing methodology over utilising. In the end, it has been generalised that the experimental group respondents writing as a result of the application of the process writing approach in a writing class effectively wrote paragraphs with improved content, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics. Based on the results and conclusions, careful application of the process writing approach at every stage of writing paragraphs is suggested.

Keywords: Process Writing Approach, Writing paragraph, Traditional teaching Method, Vocabulary, Grammar, Mechanics, Ethiopia.

1. Introduction

For EFL students, writing is the most difficult skill. In contrast to speaking, listening, and reading, writing is considered to be the most challenging, if not the most complex, skill to improve. Because it requires certain standards of appropriateness in comparison to various aspects of writing, such as content, organisation, grammar, vocabulary, spelling, punctuation, and proper capitalisation and paragraphing, writing is a very challenging task for EFL and ESL learners (Hamadouche, 2010). Instruction may identify two characteristics that could be viewed as deficiencies when young students are developing the habit of writing. Initially, they struggle with writing because they do not know enough words, and their written texts contain spelling, grammar, and syntax mistakes. In addition, there is no interest in addressing writing activities. Therefore, this researcher aimed to examine the effects of the process writing methodology suggested by Harmer (2004).



Writing is a socially constructed and cognitively demanding task. In addition, “writing is not an inborn natural ability but is a cognitive ability” (Harris, 1993, p.78), which needs to be developed and polished by consistent efforts and exercise. There is a common belief among writers that having good ideas does not automatically transform into good written texts. The process writing approach can help students explore their thoughts and improve their own writing skills. Writing is a process of discovering meaning. Communicating ideas, information and decisions in writing is virtually central to all disciplines, whether it is an organisation, school/college, university or workplace (Zamel 1982; Spack 1985). Moreover, students have some problems in the beginning to write a paragraph based on a topic. It is a challenging task for students to organise their ideas well in a piece of writing. Sanchez & Lopez (2019) reported that one of the discouraging challenges EFL learners face in writing is integrating source information into their piece of writing. Alshakhi (2018) stated that writing is the most challenging ability since learners learn to focus more on essays and grammatical rules. On the other side, Irawansyah (2016) explored that the students wrote shorter sentences to develop paragraphs; the supporting sentences did not support the main idea; the section needed consistency and unity. Based on this, Setyowati (2017) stated that students found problems with their writing ability because they felt that they were not good writers and could not write a well-constructed paragraph.

Although the development of writing is dependent on various components and elements, uncooperatively, most of the academic institutions tend to follow the product approach, particularly in the context of Ethiopia. Students’ writing skills indicate that many students fail to meet the principles of grammatical accuracy required of them by their teachers (Geremew, 1999). Furthermore, the proper implementation of the process writing approach in Ethiopia has faced several problems (Geremew, 1999). Ambaye (1999) stated that many teachers in Ethiopia lack the critical determination of effective teaching strategy; that is, they lack the instructive content knowledge and motivation, although they are at the front line of education improvement programmes. Ambaye further clarified that teachers in the current teaching organisations of Ethiopia predominantly use old-fashioned types of teaching methods that they are familiar with, perhaps even the ones that they themselves experienced when they were students at schools. Moreover, there could be different factors for students’ incompetence to write a piece of information properly. For instance, internally conducted studies by Mesfine (2004) and Wondwosen (2018) have proved that the quality of English language instruction in general and specifically writing skills suffers mainly from a lack of qualified English language teachers, inappropriate and inefficient teaching methodology, overcrowded classes and a lack of sufficient teaching materials and facilities.

However, 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 the finished product is valued, expecting good writing and critical thinking is virtually nonexistent. Most importantly, there is a zero tolerance towards errors and mistakes, ignoring the fact that making errors is part of the learning process. There are many learning outcomes when students make mistakes or correct each other’s 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 Bruner, 1995), reasoning and writing (Graves, 199 & Grossen, 2001), procedural facilitation goal-setting (MacArthur, Graham et al. 1995) and cognitive strategy instruction (Graham and Harris, 1989). All of them show the gradual development of writing techniques in the process of ELT.

2. Hypotheses of the Study

This study evaluated the comparisons between the control and experimental groups' total results in paragraph writing in terms of content, vocabulary, grammar and mechanics, and the implementation of the process writing approach in the paragraph writing lessons. Thus, the study endeavours to address the following research hypotheses. Ho: After the implementation of the process writing approach, there is no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental and control groups on the post-test for paragraph writing in terms of content, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics. Ha: After the implementation of the process writing approach, there is a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental and control groups on the post-test on paragraph writing in terms of content, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics.

3. Literature Review

3.1. Writing Process

Our thought of the improvement of writing is not the end, but enough is known to guarantee that the path to skills depends on the environment. This is where writing happens and changes in students' writing abilities, approaches, knowledge, and motivation over time (Graham, 2006b). One level of writing is a social activity involving an implicit or explicit discussion between writers and readers that occurs in a wider context. Where cultural, social, institutional, and historical events affect the objectives and meaning of writing (e.g., Nystrand, 2006; Russell, 1997). On another level, writing calls on a range of cognitive and affective systems. It is a self-sustained, goal-directed mental activity calling for skilful management of the writing site; the constraints imposed by the writing theme; the objectives of the author (s); and the processes, knowledge, and skills required in composition (Zimmerman and Reisemberg, 1997), including the effective usage of arrange of writing instruments (e.g. paper and pencil, word processing, or mobile message devices). Writing process as a linear process involves defining the audience, planning, drafting, and revising (Goldstein & Carr, 1996). The process is naturally recursive (Campbell, 1998) since the writers move from one step to another as they create their final product. There are several benefits of employing the writing process in the classroom. Brown (2001) also maintained that the writing process has the potential to involve students in writing by providing an opportunity for them to reflect while generating the writing. Martinez et al (2020) also affirmed that such topic sentences, as well as a more systematic writing structure, can help students pay more attention to the quality of the texts, such as topic sentences and a more systematic writing structure; thus, their writing performance improved.

The writing process models progressed step-wise over time by some of the researchers (e.g., Burton, 2005; Flower & Hayes, 1981; Galbraith, 2009; Grenville, 2001; Kellogg, 2008; Murray, 2004; Williams, 2005). The writing process models of writing skill development of students comprise some developmental steps which are like a cycle or recursive but non-linear. These writing process models of students' writing skill development were applied by some studies as follows.

For instance, one model example of Imelda et al. (2019) has been developed based on Grenville (2001) and Murray (2004), comprising five steps, i.e., pre-writing, planning, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing. These steps have been carried out via three sessions: 1) planning, which should be performed by students as pairs; 2) drafting and revising, which students may work individually; 3) editing and publishing, which should compel students to work individually. It has been found from the results that the successful writing process improved students' writing capacity of paragraphs, as well as made them

confident enough to work on their writing material.

Grenville (2001) stated that the paragraph writing experiment was regarding the impacts of the writing process regime on the success of paragraph writing by English language students. The writing process fundamentally consists of four principal writing steps: planning, drafting (writing), revising (redrafting), and editing, and three more steps, i.e., responding, evaluating, and post-writing. It was proven that the writing process enhanced students' thinking process as well as the analysis of a text during the brainstorming stage. Therefore, students' writing ability is enhanced to a greater extent by the analysis of a text, as well as their ability in terms of planning and discourse organisation.

3.2. Process Approach versus Product Approach

Nunan (2001) strongly expounds on how the process approach differs from the former product-oriented approach, which is about writing activities on which the student copies, imitates, and recycles models presented by the teacher; the process one is about steps that precede the production of a piece of writing. Process writing permits recognition of the impossibility of presenting an absolutely reliable writing, but that a writer will approximate infallibility by coming up with, thinking through, arguing over, and practising successive drafting of writing. While there are differences among such theorists in charting their histories of the division of process from product-oriented writing, there is one surprising claim on which there is convergence: a good product relies on good process.

3.3. Paragraph

When we are discussing script structure and body, the key thing to say here still goes to the paragraph. Words make a sentence; sentences make a paragraph; paragraphs make a letter, reports, essays, and other massive writing (Sattayatham & Ratanapinyowong, 2008). The significance of the paragraph remains as the head of every form of writing, hence. A paragraph consists of just a topic sentence, aiding or details sentences and the conclusion sentence (O'Donnell & Paiva, 1993), and all these sentences must relate to one idea only (Rajatanuml, 1988). A theme sentence is a sentence that states the whole idea of the paragraph and typically occupies the first part of the paragraph. It has sentences that go with them, bearing facts that support the whole idea in the correct structure. It lends finality at the end of the paragraph that can produce restatement of the theme sentence or restatement of the whole paragraph (Kemper, Meyer, Van Rys, & Sebranek, 2018).

4. Methodology

The participants of the study were students of Durame City Administration Secondary School in the 2024/25 academic year. Grade 11 had four EFL teachers. Out of them, conveniently, one of the teachers of EFL was sampled and approached to participate in the study. Since the subjects had not been assigned to the treatment group by randomisation, sometimes there was a threat to external and internal validity (Basil, 2010). There were two classes of Grade 11 students taught by the teacher, and members of only the two sections were given the pre-test on the paragraphs by them. These sections were given pre-existing and had been pre-allotted by the administrative system of the school. Therefore, the researcher merely maintained the same two sections as they were. They duly responded to the pre-test, 90 students, and thus, only they formed the experimental group, as well as 45 for the control group, by a convenient means.

4.1 Research Design

Quasi-experimental research design had been applied since the research context had been established through convenience sampling, and participants were not sampled from a strictly randomly sampled population (Creswell, 2014). Thus, the research participants (the

experimental and control groups) had been intact groups. Citing that, Gashaw (2016) states that a quasi-experimental design should be employed if random assignment of the sample is absolutely impossible. Accordingly, the experimental group had been non-randomly assigned, and the research participants had been Grade 11 students, aged between 18 and 21 years. The control group had been taught through traditional learning methodology, while the experimental group had applied process writing methodology. Paragraph writing activities of the intervention were conducted by the students under the supervision of the researcher on various topics, which were centred on the process writing cyclic phases. Pre-test data were computed through SPSS Version 20. Descriptive as well as statistical inferential analyses were computed through SPSS Version 20. Treatment has been provided to the experimental group for eight weeks, and in between various paragraphs, writing exercises were conducted through the process writing technique. Post-test data were collected through the questions, i.e., the answers of the students, which revealed the result of the post-test. Independent samples 't' tests as well as paired samples 't' tests have been used to determine mean scores derived from pre- and post-test between inter- and intra-groups.

4.2. Tasks and Materials

4.2.1. For the Teacher

The researcher provided training to the chosen group, along with the English language teacher, regarding the process writing approach because his knowledge of this method could influence the intervention results. The teacher delivered a week-long training to students before the intervention, which included the definition of the process writing approach, along with its reasons for classroom use in English writing instruction and comparisons between process writing and product-based methods and paragraph writing fundamentals. The researcher based his training materials on the following books: Practical English Language Teaching and How to Teach Writing by Nunan and Hammer, published in 2003 and 2004. The training materials draw from Booyesen and Grosser's 2008 publication titled "Enhancing Paragraph Writing through Cooperative Learning". The intervention training dedicated one week to explaining the process writing approach, definition and its practical applications for the intervention. The researcher conducted training sessions based on his own theoretical understanding of how to teach paragraph writing skills using the process writing approach, as well as his practical teaching experiences in writing classes.

4.2.2. For the Students

Tests exist in multiple forms, which enable evaluators to measure participant understanding and their ability to apply this knowledge in different contexts. The evaluation methods consist of multiple-choice questions and short-answer questions as well as extended-response questions (Guba & Lincoln, 1981). The researcher used pre- and post-tests based on Guba and Lincoln's (1981) concepts to evaluate the paragraph writing skills of experimental and control groups. The paragraph writing tests were adapted from Brenda (1997). The tests included four different topic types from which students could choose any two topics to write about. During the pre-test, students needed to produce three types of paragraphs, starting with a personal narrative about themselves, and then a descriptive paragraph about their mother, followed by an expository paragraph about their hobby and finally an argumentative paragraph supporting or opposing the ideas from Using Chat for Reading Purposes. The topics were familiar to all participants because they related to their everyday lives. The researcher evaluated the papers which the students submitted. Students from the control group completed identical writing assignments through a conventional product-based learning approach. The lesson plans were prepared by the subject teacher based on the



textbook and instructor's guide, which was prepared by the subject teacher. Though it is focused on this investigation. The Together model was chosen as a type of intervention since it incorporates all the essential components of the process writing approach to teaching and learning: a focus on positive interdependence, freedom of ideas, communication, and students. Johnson, Johnson, and Holubec (1994; 2003) created a checklist of teacher roles and lesson models, which served as the foundation for the experimental group's lesson plans. Each group received an equal amount of time to conduct discussions and write paragraphs, which summed to 10 minutes for discussions and 30 minutes for paragraph writing. The experimental period ran for two months. The paragraph-writing post-test was administered after the treatment phase. The post-test contained four questions which mirrored the same subjects that appeared in the pre-test. The participants needed to write about two different subjects from the list. The post-test for paragraph writing aimed to evaluate how the intervention might affect the experimental group's writing abilities. Nunan (2001) establishes the fundamental distinction between the process approach and the traditional product-oriented approach.

The process writing method prioritises all steps which lead to work creation, yet the product method requires students to duplicate and adapt teacher-provided models. A product writer aims to generate a text which maintains error-free and consistent characteristics. The writing process approach accepts that perfect texts remain unattainable, but writers can move toward perfection by making multiple drafts through creation, contemplation, debate and revision. All theorists agree that a strong product depends on a strong process, even though they define process- and product-oriented writing differently. Two instructors with TEFL master's degrees corrected all the essays submitted by the group members. Each paragraph received a score from 0 to 4 in four assessment categories: content, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics, which summed to 20 marks per paragraph. After marking the students' work, the researcher examined how the two teachers assigned results to each student.

4.3. Research instruments

The research instruments, which included a pre-test, post-test questionnaire and FGDs, were utilised by the researcher to study the effects of the process writing method on students' paragraph writing abilities at Hidase Secondary School. Six students from the experimental group participated in the FGDs to discuss how the process writing method affected their paragraph writing content and vocabulary, along with grammar and mechanics. Students were separated into three performance groups, consisting of two students from the high-achieving group, two students from the average group and two students from the low-achieving group. An independent samples t-test was utilised to compare the average scores between the control group and experimental group. The research evaluated participant performance through comparison of pre-test and post-test results, which measured grammar and vocabulary alongside content and mechanics in paragraph writing.

5. Analysis

5.1. The Paragraph Writing Pre- and Post-test Outcomes

The independent samples t-test evaluated the mean score differences between experimental and control group participants. The participants' paragraph writing abilities were evaluated through a comparison of pre-test and post-test results, which included content, vocabulary, grammar and mechanics measurements. The Cohen's d index of effect size formula was used to determine the strength of the relationship between the variables (Cohen, 1988). Elis (2010) and Coe (2002) demonstrated that the difference between two groups may be calculated by dividing the result by the standard deviation of the population from which

the groups were sampled and subtracting the mean of one group from the other (M1-M2). The degrees of effect sizes were categorised by Cohen [1988] into four groups: 0–0.20 as weak; 0.21–0.50 as moderate; 0.51–1.00 as moderate; and gt; 1.00 as strong. The tests' results and analyses are presented in the following section. The measurement of students' paragraph writing required two paragraph writing tests, which functioned as a pre-test and a post-test. First, a report of pre-test results and interpretation was followed by the post-test results and interpretation.

Table 1. Independent Samples T-Test Result of the Control and Experimental Groups on Paragraph Writing Post-Test (N= 90)

| Groups | Mean | SD | Std. Error Mean | T | Df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|--------------|-------|-------|-----------------|--------|----|-----------------|
| Control | 11.29 | 1.489 | .222 | -7.423 | 44 | 0.000 |
| Experimental | 13.47 | 1.290 | .192 | -7.423 | 44 | 0.000 |

Table 1 shows a comparison of the post-test paragraph writing performance between the control and experimental groups. The results from the post-test paragraph writing test show that the two sections had nearly identical results in the post-test. Table 1 displays that the average score of the control group before the paragraph writing test was lower than the experimental group's average score. Table 1 shows the variation in average scores between inter-group results on the paragraph writing post-test. The paragraph writing post-test mean scores ($t = -7.423$, $df = 88$, $p = 0.672$) show that the control and experimental groups have a statistically significant difference in their mean gain score on the paragraph writing post-test at the 0.05 alpha level in favour of the latter. The effect size value of 1.463 demonstrates a strong difference in paragraph writing pre-test results between the control and experimental groups. The experimental group participants received treatment that possibly led to this outcome.

Table 2. Paired Samples: T-Test Result of Experimental Group on Paragraph Writing Pre-Post Tests in Terms of Content, Vocabulary, Grammar, and Mechanics

| Variables | Tests | Mean | SD | Std. Error Mean | T | Df | Sig.(2-tailed) |
|------------|-------|--------|--------|-----------------|--------|----|----------------|
| Content | Pre | 3.3667 | .5289 | .05575 | -7.652 | 44 | .000 |
| | Post | 3.9223 | .7378 | .07778 | | | |
| Vocabulary | Pre | 3.300 | .6262 | .06601 | -5.403 | 44 | .000 |
| | Post | 3.6778 | .6504 | .06856 | | | |
| Grammar | Pre | 3.2667 | .5958 | .06281 | -5.793 | 44 | .000 |
| | Post | 3.6111 | .6652 | .07012 | | | |
| Mechanics | Pre | 3.300 | .50072 | .5347 | -6.586 | 44 | .000 |
| | Post | 3.7556 | .6414 | .06762 | | | |

***P> 0.05.**

The experimental group paragraph writing pre-post results scores appear in Table 2. The paragraph writing pre-test scores for content, vocabulary, grammar and mechanics by the experimental group are 3.366, 3.300, 3.266 and 3.300, respectively. The post-test mean scores for the experimental group show 3.922 in content, 3.67 in vocabulary, 3.626 in grammar and 3.755 in mechanics. The post-test results exceed the results of the pre-test. The intervention led to better performance in paragraph writing among the participants. The

experimental group's pre-test paragraph writing standard deviations for content, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics components are .5289, .6262, .5958 and .5072, respectively, while their post-test standard deviations for these components are .7378, .6504, .6652 and .6414. The mean scores of the experimental groups show differences from the control group. The paired samples t-test results ($t = -7.652$, $df = 44$, $p = .000$; $t = -5.403$, $df = 44$, $p = .000$; $t = -5.793$, $df = 44$, $p = .000$ and $t = -6.568$, $df = 44$, $p = .000$) demonstrate that the experimental group achieved significant progress in paragraph writing post-test in the specified components. The experimental group displayed higher post-test mean scores for paragraph writing content, vocabulary, grammar and mechanics compared to their pre-test mean scores. The research shows significant statistical variance in experimental group mean scores between pre-test and post-test results for specified components at the 0.05 alpha level, which supports post-test outcomes. The effect sizes for content, vocabulary, grammar and mechanics stand at 1.0504, 0.603, 0.5780, and 0.9098, respectively, which indicate that the experimental group research participants demonstrated substantial and moderate differences in test outcomes for these components.

Table 3. Paired Samples: T-Test Result of Control Group on Paragraph Writing Pre-Post Tests in Terms of Content, Vocabulary, Grammar, and Mechanics

| Variables | Tests | Mean | SD | Std. Error Mean | T | Df | Sig.(2-tailed) |
|-------------------|-------|-------|-------|-----------------|--------|----|----------------|
| Content | Pre | 2.20 | .748 | .082 | -6.701 | 44 | .000 |
| | Post | 2.844 | .6013 | .08964 | | | |
| Vocabulary | Pre | 2.423 | .683 | .087 | -2.106 | 44 | .041 |
| | Post | 2.711 | .6260 | .09332 | | | |
| Grammar | Pre | 2.40 | .496 | .674 | -4.313 | 44 | .000 |
| | Post | 2.822 | .3866 | .0576 | | | |
| Mechanics | Pre | 2.71 | .549 | .5347 | -.892 | 44 | .377 |
| | Post | 2.800 | .4045 | | | | |

***P> 0.05.**

Table 3 shows the mean scores from the pre-and post-results of the paragraph writing for the control group. The experimental groups' mean scores for content, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics in the pre-test are 2.20, 2.423, 2.40, and 2.71, respectively. In comparison, their mean scores for the same areas in the post-test are 2.844, 2.711, 2.822, and 2.800, respectively. The standard deviations for the post-tests are slightly lower than those for the pre-test. This indicates a gap in the students' post-test scores. As shown in the table, $t = -6.701$, $df = 45$, $p = .000$; $t = -2.106$, $df = 45$, $p = .041$; $t = -4.313$, $df = 45$, $p = .000$; and $t = -.892$, $df = 45$, $p = .377$ indicate no significant difference in mean scores between the pre-and post-tests for the control group at the 0.05 level. The results suggest that the control group participants did not show significant improvement in their paragraph writing skills in the post-test. The effect sizes for content, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics in paragraph writing are 0.860, 0.421, 0.850, and 0.163, indicating that the differences in mean scores between the pre-and post-tests are small.

5.2. Findings Drawn through FGDs

To gain additional insights into the writing experiences of Grade 11 students with the process writing approach, focus group discussions (FGDs) were held with six students from the experimental group. This section presents the results of these FGDs, organised into three



main themes: 1) students' readiness to handle writing challenges with peers, 2) their relationship with subject teachers, and 3) their approach to writing information. The six FGD participants are identified with codes ExS1-6, reflecting their selection from the experimental group.

5.2.1. The Students' Readiness in Dealing with Writing Challenges with Other Students

The discussions revealed that the experimental group students strongly believed that sharing ideas with other students significantly improved their paragraph writing. ExS4 highlighted this importance, stating, "Since there is not enough time to write a paragraph and resources in libraries, one way to address our writing skill issues is through peer discussions, especially with senior students." Some participants mentioned their subject teachers encouraged them to use different strategies and discussions as alternative sources of input. As ExS6 noted, "My teacher usually tells me that I shouldn't expect everything from him and should instead read and write daily, both alone and with friends." However, the discussions showed that Grade 11 students seldom practised paragraph writing or any writing during classroom sessions. This lack of practice contributed to their difficulties in writing effective paragraphs. ExS2 commented, "Regarding our views on writing approaches and background knowledge, the culture is to write individually and keep it to ourselves; we avoid writing collaboratively. I think this habit harms our writing skills." Another serious issue affecting students' willingness to discuss paragraph writing is their fear of having their writing skills judged as weak by others. ExS1 remarked, "We notice that some students copy and paste everything from their friends and submit it secretly. Because of this, I personally don't feel comfortable discussing my writing abilities." Participants also reflected a lack of professional qualities among staff that hinder their learning. ExS5 stated, **"As a Grade 11 student, I hope to learn many things. I want to know not just how to write effective paragraphs but also how to argue cooperatively and exchange ideas freely with others. I expect to learn these qualities from experienced professionals, like our teachers. But we never see our teachers doing this, such as by presenting their work."**

5.2.2. Students' Relationship with Their Teachers

Evidence from this study indicated that Grade 11 students have more discussions with their teachers than with classmates. However, these interactions often involve a one-way flow of ideas from teachers. This means students mainly listen during discussions and lack the confidence to engage in open dialogue. As ExS1 pointed out,

"I have more discussions with my teacher than with my classmates because he takes responsibility, and I acknowledge that. I trust he can help me with my weaknesses. But during our talks, I don't feel brave enough to say what I think. I just accept his feedback, and when he asks me to change something I hadn't considered, I try my best to do it. Otherwise, I don't want to share my feelings directly." ExS5 added, **"For me, there is always a formal relationship between us, students, and our teachers, and that distance exists even in high school. So, without a friendly relationship, I think it's hard to have free and open discussions with teachers."**

Some participants noted they sometimes felt pressured to accept ideas that contradicted their own understanding. ExS3 described how his attempt to convince a teacher ended in frustration. He said,

"Even though students usually need more support from their teachers, the teachers often have more authority on the topic. When I went to my teacher for feedback, he tended to push me to accept his suggestions. For instance, one time

when he told me to change something in my writing, I explained that my choices were based on what I feel and have read recently. Rather than respecting my opinion, he got upset and asked if I believed he had accepted or rejected ideas.”

Participants generally agreed that the tradition of assigning teachers without mutual understanding contributes to the lack of open communication. ExS6 noted,

“Writing involves what you write, how you write it, and who you write for. This always raises dilemmas that students should clarify with teachers. I believe openness can occur when the teacher's class work, homework, and assignments are based on the students' understanding. But that doesn't happen here, so whenever I want to ask my teacher a question, I lack the confidence to express myself freely.”

This data shows that while Grade 11 students engage in more discussions with their teachers than with their classmates, their role in these discussions is mainly passive. Even when they hold differing opinions from their teachers, they hesitate to share those ideas. The traditional divide between teachers and students, along with communication difficulties, contributes to the lack of a friendly relationship between them.

5.3 Students' Writing Approach to Practising Paragraph Writing

Focus group discussions indicated that Grade 11 students recognise the importance of everyday writing activities for developing their writing skills. Two participants shared what they gained from these sessions:

“I couldn't have produced even a single sentence if I hadn't attended such sessions” (ExS2). “We learn lessons from these sessions; we take insights from both what teachers present and how students respond” (ExS6). Participants mentioned that some teachers provide genuine support when helping students write a paragraph. ExS5 explained, “They offer helpful feedback, suggest important directions, and remind the writer to focus on a single main idea.”

6. Discussions

This study shows a statistically significant difference between the average scores of both groups on the paragraph writing post-test regarding content, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics at the 0.05 alpha level. This difference likely occurred because the method used by the experimental group during the intervention was more effective than that of the control group in developing these skills. Students also appeared to react positively to the writing process. The process writing approach helped students realise their potential, discover new information, and develop their writing skills. However, there were significant differences between the pre- and post-test scores of the control group students regarding content, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics. The difference between the pre- and post-test results can be linked to the traditional method used to teach the control group, as this method primarily focuses on structure, grammar, and punctuation. Traditionally, writing was mainly seen as a tool for practising and reinforcing specific grammatical and lexical patterns. Writing did not feel real or meaningful, as students wrote just to receive feedback. As a result, students lacked motivation to work hard and write. This failure inhibited the development of their writing performance. Therefore, the results suggest that the process writing approach could effectively improve students' writing skills. This finding aligns with other studies examining similar topics, such as Atwell (2003) and Bae (2011). Additionally, these studies likely showcase writing strategies across various English language skill levels (Azodi & Lotfi, 2020; Dobao, 2012).

7. Conclusion

Based on the statistical analyses and descriptions of the findings, the following conclusions can be drawn: The results of the paragraph writing post-test, analysed through independent samples t-tests, show that the experimental group significantly outperformed the control group. This occurred because the participants in the experimental group practised paragraph writing using the principles of the process writing approach. Thus, participants in this group frequently interacted based on the process writing approach they learned while discussing writing activities in their mixed groups. Accordingly, the null hypothesis, which stated that there is a significant difference between the average scores of the experimental and control groups on the paragraph writing post-test regarding content, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics, was accepted, as the difference between the average scores of the groups was significant at the 0.05 alpha level. Overall, the process writing approach offered the experimental group the chance to review what they had written together. This peer criticism helps students develop their understanding of paragraph structure and grammatical rules. It also allows them to evaluate their own work, build confidence in their writing, and reduce their fears about learning writing skills.

According to the focus group interview responses, learning through the process writing approach is interesting for both teachers and students. Students working with partners ask each other for help, which improves their writing and social skills. Therefore, properly implementing this method in EFL classes will greatly benefit students looking to enhance their writing abilities. The study concludes that the process approach significantly impacts students' paragraph writing. After implementing the process approach, the students' post-test scores were higher than their pre-test scores. The findings support the idea that explicit teaching about the writing process can help create quality texts (e.g., Badger & White, 2000; Hyland, 2003b; Tribble, 1996), as the scores of the experimental group were greater than those of the control group in paragraph writing. The study results suggest that the process writing approach should be adopted in teaching writing skills. Additionally, the findings support the theoretical debate about the importance of a writer's knowledge in addressing the complexities of writing. Since writing is a complex activity, it should be viewed from a cognitive perspective. Writers need to understand the writing process to produce effective texts, which includes going through multiple steps, receiving feedback from peers, teachers, and themselves, and revising their initial drafts into final written works to enhance their writing skills. Thus, the results from the pre-test and post-test indicate that students improved their writing skills.

8. Recommendations for further research

1. More studies should be conducted to explore the effects of the process writing approach on students' paragraph writing skills.
2. In-depth studies in specific areas are needed to understand the steps of the process writing approach with younger students.
3. Additional research is necessary to determine whether the current study's results regarding the impact of the process writing approach on students' paragraph writing skills should be reconsidered due to potential shortcomings.

References

- [1] Addison Wesley Longman. Casanave, C. P. (2004). *Controversies in Second Language Writing: Dilemmas and decisions in research and instruction*. University of Michigan Press.



- [2] Alshakhi, A. (2018). "Revisiting the writing assessment process at a Saudi English language institute: Problems and solutions." *English Language Teaching*, 12(1), 176.
- [3] Anderson, M. and Ambaye Tsehaye (1999). "Curriculum evaluation: Monitoring the harmony of the TTI syllabus with the new primary level curriculum vis-a-vis standard models and new education and training policy." *The Ethiopian Journal of Education* 6(19).
- [4] Atwell, N. (2003). "Hard trying these recipes: Voice from the middle." 11(2), 16-19
- [5] Azodi, N., & Lotfi, A. (2020). "E-collaborative tasks and the enhancement of writing performance among Iranian university-level EFL learners." *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*. 21(1), 165–180.
- [6] Badger, R., & White, G. (2000). "A Process Genre Approach to Teaching Writing." *ELT Journal*, 54(2), 153-160.
- [7] Bae, J. (2011). *Teaching Process Writing for Intermediate: Advanced learners in South Korea*.
- [8] Baker, J. & H. Westrup (2000). *English language teacher's handbook: How to teach large classes with few resources*. Bloomsbury Publishing
- [9] Brenda, P. (1997). "Teaching Writing: Ask better questions; gather writers!" *Instructor* (Primary), 107 (4), 60-61.
- [10] Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by Principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. (2nd Ed.). New York.
- [11] Burton, J. (2005). 'The Importance of Teachers Writing on TESOL.' *TESL-EJ*. 9(2).
- [12] Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1998). "Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research on teaching." In N. L. Gage (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 171–246). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- [13] Coe, R. (2002). *Understanding, Using, and Calculating Effect Size*.
- [14] Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioural Sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- [15] Connor, U. (2002). "New Directions in Contrastive Rhetoric." *TESOL Quarterly*: 93-510.
- [16] Creswell, J.W. (2014). *Educational Research: planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Pearson, Boston.
- [17] Dobao, A.F. (2012). *Collaborative writing tasks in the L2 classroom: Comparing group, pair, and individual work*. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21, 40-58.
- [18] Elis, P. D. (2010). *The essential guide to effect sizes*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- [19] Englemann, S. & B. Grossen. (2001). "Reasoning and writing." Blacklick, OH: Science Research Associates.
- [20] Englemann, S. & E. Bruner (1995). "SRA reading mastery rainbow edition." Chicago, IL: SRA: McGraw-Hill.
- [21] Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). "A pregnant pause: An inquiry into the nature of planning." *Research in the Teaching of English*, 15(3); 229-244.
- [22] Geremew, Lemu (1999). *A Study of the requirements in writing for academic purposes at AAU: Four Departments in Focus*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Addis Ababa University.
- [23] Graham, S. (2006b). "Strategy instruction and the teaching of writing: A meta-analysis." In C. MacArthur, S. Graham, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Handbook of writing research* (pp.187–207). New York: Guilford.



- [24] Graham, S. & K. R. Harris (1989). "Components analysis of cognitive strategy instruction." Hillsdale, NJ, Erlbaum.
- [25] Graves, A. (1990). "The Effects of Procedural Facilitation on the Story Composition of Learning Disabled Students." *Learning Disabilities Research*, 5(2):88-93.
- [26] Grenville, K. (2001). *Writing from Start to Finish: A Six-Step Guide*. Griffin Press, Australia.
- [27] Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1981). *Effective Evaluation*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.
- [28] Hamadouche, M. (2010). *Developing the writing skill through increasing learners' awareness of the writing process*. M.A. thesis. University of Constantine.
- [29] Harmer, J. (2004). *How to Teach Writing*. Pearson Longman, Harlow, UK.
- [30] Harris, J. (1993). *Introducing Writing English*. Penguin.
- [31] Hyland, K. (2003b). *Second Language Writing*. Ernst Klett Sprachen.
- [32] ICDR. (1999). *Teacher Education Handbook*. Finfine Printing and Publishing, Addis Ababa.
- [33] Imelda, Cahyono, B. Y., & Astuti, U. P. (2019). "Effect of the process writing approach combined with video-based mobile learning on Indonesian EFL learners' writing skill across creativity levels." *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(3), 325-340.
- [34] Irawansyah, I. (2016). "Genre-Based Approach. A way to enhance students' writing ability." *English Education: Jurnal Tadris Bahasa Inggris IAIN Raden Intan*, 9(1): 74–88.
- [35] Johnson, D.W., Johnson, R.T., & Holubec, E. (1994). *The new circles of learning: Cooperation in the classroom and school*. Boston. Association for supervision and curriculum development.
- [36] Kellogg, R. T. (2008). "Training Writing Skills Cognitive Developmental Perspective." Applications (pp. 57-71). Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- [37] Kemper, D., Meyer, V., Van Rys, J., & Sebranek, P. (2018). *Fusion: Integrated reading and writing*. Boston, MA: Cengage Learning
- [38] MacArthur, C. 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
- [39] McCrimmon, J. (1994). *Writing with a Purpose*. Houghton Mifflin Co.
- [40] Mesfin Abera. (2004). *An investigation of the level of effectiveness of peer-correction versus self-correction on grade twelve students' Writing with Particular Reference to Menilik II Secondary School*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Addis Ababa University.
- [41] Murray, D. (2004). "Writing as Process: How Writing Finds its Own Meaning." In T.R. Donovan and B.W. Mec Clell and (eds), *English Approach in Teaching Writing*.
- [42] Nunan, D. (2003). *Practical English Language Teaching* (International Edition). McGraw-Hill. Singapore. p.88
- [43] Nunan, David. (2001). *Second, English teaching and learning*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- [44] Nystrand, M. (2006). *The social and historical context for writing research*. In S. MacArthur, S.
- [45] Graham, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Handbook of writing research* (pp.11–27). New York: Guilford.
- [46] O'Donnell, T. D., & Paiva, J. L. (1993). *Independent writing*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle

- [47] Rajatanuml, K. (1988). *A refresher course in writing*. Thammasat University Press, Bangkok, TH.
- [48] Russell, D. (1997). "Rethinking genre in school and society: An activity theory analysis." *Written Communication*, 14, 504–554.
- [49] Sánchez, L., & López, M. (2019). "The effect of the process-based approach on the writing skills of bilingual elementary students. A pilot study." *Latin American Journal of Content & Language Integrated Learning*, 12(1), 72-98.
- [50] Sattayatham, A., & Ratanapinyowong, P. (2008). "Analysis of errors in paragraph writing in English by first year medical students from the four medical schools at mahidol university." *Silpakorn University International Journal*, 8, 17-38.
- [51] Spack, R. (1985). "Literature, reading, writing, and ESL: Bridging the gaps." *TESOL Quarterly* 19(4): 703-725.
- [52] Tribble, C. (1996). *Writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [53] Williams, J. G. (2005). "Providing feedback on ESL students' written assignments." *The Internet TESL Journal*: 9(10).
- [54] Wondwosen Tesfamichael. (2018). "Impacts of Social Learning (SL) on Paragraph Writing Skills." *Science Research*, Vol. 6, pp. 15-23:
- [55] Zamel, V. (1982). "Writing: the process of discovering meaning." *TESOL Quarterly*, 16(2).
- [56] Zimmerman, B., & Reisemberg, R. (1997). "Becoming a self-regulated writer: A social cognitive perspective." *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 22, 73–101.

Author (s) Contribution Statement: Nil

Author (s) Acknowledgement: Nil

Author (s) Declaration: I declare that there is no competing interest in the content and authorship of this scholarly work.



The content of the article is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.