



The Effects of Process Approach to English Language Writing Skills on Students Performance within Selected Secondary Schools of Kenya

Beatrice Nasambu Wasike, Khaemba Ongeti and Anne Syomwene
Moi University

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 7 March 2022;

Received in revised form:

25 June 2022;

Accepted: 6 July 2022;

Keywords

Process Approach,
Writing Skills,
Students Performance,
Effect,
Kenya.

ABSTRACT

The study analyzed the effects of process approach to language writing skills on students' performance. Process approach stresses on the process that writers go through in composing texts. The purpose of this study was to find out the effects of process approach to English language writing skills on student performance within selected secondary schools of Kenya. The objectives were to determine the students' performance in the writing test before and after instruction using the process approach, and to analyze the effect of process approach on students' performance in the writing test in English language in selected secondary schools in Kenya. The study sample comprised 232 students and 2 English language teachers from the 6 counties. A written task and lesson observation was used to collect data which was analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics that included t-test and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). Data analysis revealed that process approach to writing skills had a significant effect on students' performance in the writing test ($t = .000, p < 0.05$). It was concluded that process approach improved students' performance in writing skills. Based on these findings it was recommended that teachers of English language should use process approach to improve students writing skills. To cater for this, English language curriculum developers should allocate more time for teaching English language in secondary schools in Kenya.

© 2022 Elixir All rights reserved.

Introduction

Process-based writing is viewed as the way writers work on their writing tasks from the beginning stage to the end of the written product. O'Brien (2004) defines the concept of this approach as an activity in which teachers encourage learners to see writing not as grammar exercises, but as the discovery of meaning and ideas. Through the writing process, professional writers or even students hardly follow the fixed sequence of writing stages linearly because they have to move back and forth among different writing steps in order to come up with better ideas. Writing processes may be viewed as the writer's tool kit. In using the tool, the writer is not constrained to use them in a fixed order or in stages, using any tool may create the need to use another. Generating ideas may require evaluation, as many writing sentences, and evaluation may force the writer to think up new ideas. Writing in the process approach can thus be seen as a dynamic and unpredictable process (Tribble, 1990) while writers try to reformulate their ideas and approximate the meaning of what they want to express in their work. Process-based approaches are well-known tools for writing instructors to teach L2 writing since they have a number of benefits. Learners are able to learn how to compose writing in L2 with process-based writing as compared to other writing approaches. They can improve their writing step by step since instructors will guide them through the whole process of their writing tasks by giving them feedback and enough time and opportunity through peer and teacher review to develop a sense of audience (Boughey, 1997), which allows them not

only to reflect upon their previous writing but also to consider the possible existence of other viewpoints. In spite of being widely used in ESL/EFL composition, process-based writing still has some limitations. Learners have to spend quite a long time to complete one particular piece of writing in the classroom. Badger and White (2000) also point out that learners have no clear understanding about the characteristics of writing and are provided insufficient linguistic input to write in L2 successfully in a certain text type. Writing is one of the language skills that enable a learner to think critically and creatively as they respond to academic discipline. It is a lifelong process and part of personal development whose usefulness stretches beyond the classroom (KICD 2006). A good writer should think in a clear and organized manner in order to present ideas logically. Process approach to writing consists of several processes planning, drafting, revising, editing and publishing. However, in writing, students often hand in the first draft of their writing as their final product (Hoogereen & Van Gelderen, 2013), they do not produce multiple drafts of the essays yet writing is a skill that demands that students plan and organize their imagination clearly and in sequential order to fulfill the essence of writing.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to find out the effects of process approach to English language writing skills on student performance within selected secondary schools of Kenya.

Tele:

E-mail address: bettywasike15@gmail.com

© 2022 Elixir All rights reserved

Objectives of the study

1. To determine the students' performance in the writing test before and after instruction using the process approach to writing skills in English language in selected secondary schools in Kenya.

2. To analyze the effect of process approach to writing skills on students' performance in the writing test in English language in selected secondary schools in Kenya.

Hypothesis

HO1. There is no significant difference between the process approach control and experimental groups in students' performance in the writing test in English language in selected secondary schools in Kenya.

Review of Related Literature

The notion of writing as process was introduced to L2 studies by Zamel (1982), unlike the product-based approach which encourages students to write activating their syntactic, lexicon, and discourse repertoire, the process-based approach emphasizes the steps involved in drafting and redrafting a text (Nunan, 1991). The process-based approach is seen by several scholars (Sutikno, 2008; Sarhadi, 2015) to be more effective than the product based approach, inasmuch as it allows learners to explore and develop personal approach to writing. Nonetheless, the opponent of the approach often refers to the lack of a good model as its key drawback. According to Torghabeh et al. (2010), model can lighten the burden of devising content on learners to some degree. Moreover, as asserted by Reppen (1995), a process approach to writing is often unsuccessful in attaching appropriate importance to written form and, as a result, causes writers to craft inaccurate product in terms of the proper use of language. Additionally, a number of practitioners (Rollinson, 2005) wonder how such a time-consuming approach demanding the employment of various pre-writing, writing, and post-writing activities can be suited to the time constraints experiencing in real setting.

However, in the case of Malaysian ESL writing instruction, according to Chow (2007), most of the ESL teachers in Malaysian schools today learn to write in the product-based approach which highlights the linguistic features but downplays the importance of language skills. Regardless of evolution in the teaching of writing methodology for the past three decades, particularly the growth and use of process-based approach to writing, Malaysian ESL students are still imposed with conventional writing instructions that are derived from the product-based approach to meet the needs of producing results in school-based assessments and public examinations (Singh, 2013). This has caused undue negligence to the writing process. Palpanadan, Ismail, & Salam (2015) argued that by focusing on the end product at the cost of disregarding the writing process will not aid the students to become effective writers. Palpanadan, Ismail, & Salam (2015) also reported that teachers feel comfortable with the way they are trained and decide to adopt and adapt writing lessons according to the way they learnt writing in school, university, or teacher education institution. This leads to the challenge of teaching writing which has been largely based on product-based approach that produces undesirable results for the Malaysian students, especially on their declining ESL writing performance.

On the other hand, Graham & Sandmel (2011) defined process-based approach as an approach to writing which conforms to five underlying principles: 1) students engage in cycles of planning (setting goals, generating ideas, and

organizing ideas), translating (putting a writing plan into action) and reviewing (evaluating, editing, and revising), 2) students write over an extended duration to deliver their expressions and thoughts to the audience, 3) students' ownership, self-reflection, and evaluation of their writing are stressed, 4) students write collaboratively with their peers and teacher facilitates the writing process in a supportive and conducive writing environment, and 5) personalized and individualized writing instruction is provided through writing conferences and teachable moments. Process-based approach is one of the notable approaches that is stated clearly in the National Malaysian Curricula and Syllabi, and even in the Malaysia Education Blueprint (2013-2025) as to be used in Malaysian ESL writing classrooms (MOE, 2015).

Process writing is an approach to writing where language learners focus on the process by which they produce their written products rather than on the products themselves. In the end, learners need to and are required to complete their products, yet the writing process itself is stressed more. By focusing on the writing process, learners come to understand themselves more, and find how to work through the writing (Brown, 2001). They may explore what strategies conform to their style of learning. Brown (2001) states that writing is a thinking process, a writer produces a final written product based on their thinking after going through the process. Writing should be thought of as an organic developmental process not as a way to transmit a message but as a way to grow and look at a message. The process approach provides a way to think about writing in terms of what the writer does instead of what the product looks like.

In the process approach, learners are looked upon as central in learning, so that learner's needs, expectations, goals, learning styles, skill and knowledge are taken into consideration. Through the writing process, learners need to make the most of their abilities such as knowledge and skills by utilizing the appropriate help and cooperation of the teacher and the other learners. It encourages learners to feel free to convey their own thoughts or feelings in written messages by providing them with plenty of time and opportunity to reconsider and revise their writing and at each step seek assistance from outside resources like the instructor. One of the significant development in the field of teaching English as a second language in the past few decades is the increasing attention given to the development of students writing competence and the emergence of ESL writing research as a field of serious inquiry (Zeng, 2005). Although writing is one of the 'four skills' commonly accepted goals of language teaching, it has long been the most reflected skill partially because writing was not considered the most important skill in ESL learning, but just a sub-skill until the 1980's. The focus of ESL writing was mainly accuracy (Reid, 1993) during the audio-lingual method that emphasized practice, punctuation and grammatical structure; learners had to copy sentence structures provided by the teacher until they acquired it. Writing classes still focused on grammar and accuracy, which stemmed from the Audio-lingual method, but they would copy the provided sentences, and change them where necessary, or fill in the blanks. This is called controlled writing. According to Silva (1990) controlled composition seems to have originated in the oral approach based on the notions that language is speech (from structural linguistics), and that learning is habit formation (from behaviorist psychology). This trend continued into the early 1980s with value placed on grammatical structure, or with language-based writing. Then some ESL teachers and

researchers started with a pattern-product approach on writing-based approach which focuses on creative composition and the organizational conventions used in the US academic prose (Reid, 1993).

This approach is still applicable in the current academic setting because of its practicality in the 1980's when ESL writing moved from a language-based approach to the process approach. It is not clear what brought the process approach to ESL. Reid (2001) claims it arose for two reasons: researchers' recognition of the newly developing field of NES composition and teacher's realization of the need of English L2 students in the academic environment. During the 1980's NES composition research conducted prior to ESL became accessible. For example Reid (2001) introduces the most remarkable approach at that time in Native English speakers' the 'expressive approach.' He regards this approach as the basis for the process approach in ESL, in which writing was taught as a process of self-discovery; writers express their feelings in a climate of encouragement. Kroll (1990) on the other hand, points out that the introduction of the process approach to ESL composition seems to have been motivated by dissatisfaction with controlled composition and the current-traditional approach. He goes on to say that neither approach fosters thought or its expression nor encourages creative thinking and writing. For those possible reasons, the process writing approach began to be embraced by various ESL researchers and teachers. More recently, some researchers have presented the post-process approach for L2 writing (Atkinson, 2003; Matsuda, 2003) which adds more social dimensions to writers (Fujieda, 2006) but the process approach seemed to remain preferred and approved approach.

The process approach has been accepted and applied to EFL and ESL writing classes because of its effectiveness. In the product approach the focus is on the end result of the learning process, and the learner is expected to perform as a fluent and competent user of the language. The process approach, in contrast, stresses the process that writers go through in composing texts. (Nunan, 1991; Brown, 2001) state that in the product approach a great deal of attention was placed on 'model' composition that students would emulate and how well a student's final product measured up against a list of criteria that included content, organization, vocabulary use, grammatical use, and mechanical considerations such as spelling and punctuation. The process approach on the other hand lets students manage their own writing by giving students a chance to think as they write (Brown, 2001). That is students convey their messages to the readers in written form through the complex writing process, prewriting, drafting revising and editing. Language skill is best learned when learners have their own intrinsic motives. Reimes (1983) indicates that in the process approach, students do not write on a given topic in a restricted time and hand in the composition, rather, they explore a topic through writing. Through the process approach teachers find that the writing process is a process of discovery for the students; discovery of new ideas and new language forms to express those ideas.

The approach also focuses more on classroom activities which promotes the development of skilled language use, and a number of interesting classroom techniques including 'conferencing' have emerged from the process approach to writing (Nunan, 1991). It also encourages collaborative group work between learners as a way of enhancing motivation and developing positive attitude towards writing. The main concern with the process approach is that it pays less attention to grammar and structure, and puts little importance on the

final products (Reid, 2001). There is a false dichotomy between process and product classrooms in the L2 pedagogy. Process teachers encourage students to use their internal resources and individuality; they neglected accuracy in favour of fluency. In contrast, product teachers focused solely on accuracy, appropriate rhetorical discourse and linguistic patterns to the exclusions of writing processes. In reality, most L2 students were being taught process writing strategies to achieve effective written communication (products), with differences occurring in emphasis. The process approach has been generally accepted, and has been widely used, even though many researchers are still doubtful of its effectiveness.

The process-based approach is seen by several scholars (Sutikno, 2008; Sarhadi, 2015) to be more effective, inasmuch as it allows learners to explore and develop personal approach to writing. Nonetheless, the opponent of the approach often refers to the lack of a good model as its key drawback. According to Torghaben et al. (2010), a model can lighten the burden of devising content on learners to some degree. Moreover, as asserted by Reppen (1995), a process approach to writing is often unsuccessful in attaching appropriate importance to written form and, as a result, causes writers to craft inaccurate product in terms of the proper use of language. Additionally, a number of practitioners (Rollinson, 2005) wonder how such a time-consuming approach demanding the employment of various pre-writing, writing, and post-writing activities can be suited to the time constraints experiencing in real setting. According to Coutts (2015) process writing involves five stages pre-writing, drafting, revising, editing and publishing. Pre-writing is the planning and idea gathering stage. Drafting refers to time spend composing a rough draft. Revising is a process of improving the draft by re-reading and changing the writing according to feedback given. Editing involves correcting mechanical errors and publishing is the final stage or product.

Methodology

The study adopted a Quasi-Experimental research design in which Solomon four-group design (Creswell & Creswell, 2018) was used. Quasi experimental research design was used that involved taking advantage of natural settings or groups with experimental and control groups. Solomon four-group design involved the random assignment of participants to four groups which controlled for both the effect of the pretest and the intervention on posttest scores (Leavy, 2017). A sample size of 232 students from public extra county secondary schools and 2 teachers of English were selected to participate in the study. Students were subjected to an English language composition test and the teachers to classroom observations during writing lessons for data collection. Data collected was analyzed with the help of SPSS version 20; results obtained were presented using both descriptive and inferential statistics.

Results

Table 1 captures the frequencies and percentages of the process approach techniques observed on a five point likert scale of always, often, sometimes, rarely and never. The highest score on the likert scale was 5 points for always, 4 points for often, 3 points for sometimes, 2 points for rarely and 1 point for never.

From classroom observations carried out, results in Table 1 shows that the teachers 15(94%) either often or always put learners in small groups when using the process approach. Also the teachers brainstormed learners ideas 16(100% and used discussion technique 15(94%). They either often or

always supported learners 15(94%) to generate vocabulary and grammatical structures. In addition, teachers often or always made learners write their first draft in groups 12 (75%), and about 11 (19%) of the observations, teachers made learners to exchange their drafts in groups after writing for peer correction: most of the time teachers who used the process approach made learners to read each other's work 12 (75%) often or always. The teachers either often or always used peer feedback or modified learners' drafts in their various groups 10 (72%). They also made learners to write either final draft often or always 13 (81%) and finally, the learners proof read their final drafts in groups and made comments about learners writing often or always 12 (75%). These specific events were used for confirmatory purposes during classroom observations to ascertain the use of process approach to writing skills.

From the Table 2 putting learners into groups was most commonly used technique (mean = 5.50, SD= .63) and use of peer feedback was the least techniques used (mean = 3.69, SD = .60) the minimum score on the likert scale was 10 and the maximum score was 50. The mean score of 40.68, SD = 4.09 suggest that the teachers always and often used the process approach to teaching writing skills.

The students were divided into 4 groups for the process approach. Those who received treatment and participated in pretest were 59 (25%), those who were in control group and participated in pretest were 55 (24%), those who did not participate in pretest but were given treatment were 62 (27%), and those who were in control group and were not given pretest were 56 (24%). All the four groups received posttest.

The objective was to find out if there was any effect on students' performance in the writing test when they are taught using the process approach to writing skills. Process approach to writing skills in this study was defined as a method of teaching writing skills that emphasizes the five stages of writing: Pre-writing, first draft composing, feedback, second, draft writing and proof-reading to develop writing skills at different stages (Sutikho, 2008; Sarhadi, 2015; Serravala, 2017; & Onozawa, 2010). Students work collaboratively and are also responsible for one another's learning as well as their own. Process approach in this study was taken as a group task where students worked together through brainstorming, discussion, feedback and proofreading one another's work and therefore drawing upon their experiences to create new knowledge in the process of developing writing skills.

In the first level students were tested on writing a complete piece of writing. An analytic scale of skills was used effectively with samples of students' writing suggested by Cooper & Odell (1977) that describes what is considered high, mid and low quality levels of writing. The second level tested students' deeper understanding of concepts and principles of writing developed by University of South Florida; the Cognitive Level and Quality Writing Assessment (CLAQWA) rubric evaluated on a 5 point continuum to make writing assessment clear because the instrument enables instructors to tailor the rubric to their writing tasks (Flateby, 2007).

The two levels of performance were measured by use of a writing test where experimental students were subjected to treatment and later to a post-test after being taught using the process approach (treatment). 121 (52%) of the students were in treatment group (C₁ and C₃) where C₁ received a pretest, treatment and posttest but for C₃, there was no pretest, but received treatment and posttest. 111(48%) of the students

were in the control group (C₂ and C₄), where C₂ received a pretest and posttest while C₄ received only a posttest. The following Table 3 shows independent samples t-test on students' scores in process approach pretest.

The results in the Table 3 show that those who participated in the treatment scored higher (M=11.45, SD= 1.64) in the pretest than those in the control group who did not participate in the treatment (M=11.90, SD = 1.81) df = 112. However the difference was not significant p = .167, suggesting that students who were in the control and experimental group did not differ in their pretest scores. Table 4 below shows the independent samples t-test on students' post test scores in process approach.

The results in table 4 indicate that there was a significant difference in post test scores between the students whose teachers used the process approach (treatment) and those that had no treatment. Those who participated in the treatment scored higher (M= 14.58, SD = 1.98) than those who were in the control group (M=11.70, SD= 1.84) df = 230, p= 0.000 < 0.05. This implies that the two groups were similar in terms of performance before administration of treatment because they did not differ in their pretest scores but differed in their post test scores.

The results in Table 5 indicated significant difference in the four means as indicated by higher F value (3.228) = 43.262, (p= 0.00 < 0.05). The F-ratio is statistically significant between and within the 4 groups (C₁, C₂, C₃ and C₄). It indicates that the post test scores obtained by the subjects in the four groups are statistically different. Post-hoc tests of multiple comparisons using Tukey HSD (honestly significant difference) was performed to point out the source of the observed significant differences among the group means because it is commonly used (Kobus, 2016) to find out where the differences lie. The Tukey HSD was used with alpha (α) = 0.05, shown in Table 6 meaning that the probability of any false rejection among all the comparisons made was not greater than 0.05, which is much stronger than controlling the probability of a false rejection.

From Table 6, it was observed that the difference between the mean scores of experimental and control groups is statistically significant. Results showed that there were significant differences between group pairs C₁ & C₂ (P=.000), C₁ & C₄ (P=.000), C₂ & C₁ (P=.000), C₂ & C₃ (p=.000), C₃ & C₂ (p=.000), C₃ & C₄ (p=.000), C₄ & C₁ (p=.000) and C₄ & C₃ (p=.000). However, there was no significant difference between the mean scores of C₁ & C₃ (p=.993), C₂ & C₄ (p=.952), C₃ & C₁ (p=.993) and C₄ & C₂ (p=.952) at 0.05 level. These results indicated that:

- There were significant differences in posttest scores between treatment and control groups that participated in pretest (Group C₁ and C₂)
- There were significant differences in posttest scores of students in treatment group who participated in pretest and control group who did not participate in pretest (Group C₁ and C₄).
- There was no significant difference in posttest mean scores between groups of students of treatment groups that participated in pretest and those that did not participate in pretest (Group C₁ and C₃). This difference in performance in the writing test can be attributed to the intervention of the process approach to teaching writing skills because it led to higher student scores in the experimental groups (C₁ and C₃) than scores in the control groups (C₂ and C₄), it is because groups C₁ and C₃ (experimental groups) obtained scores that

were significantly higher than those of groups C₂ and C₄ (control groups).

Discussion

Process approach to writing skill had ten features or activities that were observed in the writing classrooms. Learners were put in small groups of 5-8 members, there was brainstorming of learner's ideas, discussion of their opinions, instructor supporting the learners and writing of their first drafts in groups. The learners also exchanged their drafts within their groups, read the group mates work, peer feedback and modifying of drafts, writing and proof reading final drafts in groups and making final comments. Data from this study support the potency of the process approach to writing skills in meaningful learning of writing skills. The students in the experimental group in the process approach scored higher than their counterparts in the control group in the post test writing test. The experimental group therefore achieved significantly better than the control group. However the difference between the experimental and control groups was not significant in their pretest scores.

The findings are consistent with those of Odima (2015) who investigated the use of process approach in teaching writing skills in secondary schools in Busia. The findings revealed that students taught writing skills using the process approach performed better in writing because it is an effective method. Annamalai (2015) notes that focus on ESL writing instruction has shifted to process-based approach as language specialists begun paying attention to individual learning and the writing process itself. Magut (2000) carried out a study on the investigation of the use of process approach for effective teaching of writing skills in Uasin Gishu District. The findings were in tandem with this study that process approach was a more effective approach to use to teach composition writing.

Researchers agree that writing is a process that involves planning, translating and reviewing of the text (Bogard & Mackin, 2015; Escobar & Evand, 2014; Gallagher, 2011; Kare 2012; Pytash & Morgan, 2014). Murray (1980) noted that students have extensively opened the door for researchers to create effective models for the writing process. According to Murray, writing is a process of rehearsing, drafting and revising. Through writing of multiple drafts, the writer moves from exploration of ideas both to the writer and the reader and therefore becomes a proficient writer. Process approach to writing allows language learners to focus on the process by which they produce their written products rather than on the products themselves. Writing process itself is stressed more, by focusing on the writing process where learners come to understand themselves more, and find how to work through the writing as stated by (Brown, 2001; Onazawa, 2010; Graham & Sandmel, 2011). Learners may explore what strategies conform to their style of learning. Writing is a thinking process; a writer produces a final written product based on their thinking after going through the process. It should be thought of as an organic developmental process not as a way to transmit a message but as a way to grow and look at a message. The process approach provides a way to think about writing in terms of what the writer does instead of what the product looks like.

In the process approach, learners are looked upon as central in learning, so that learner's needs, expectations, goals, learning styles, skill and knowledge are taken into consideration. Through the writing process, learners need to make the most of their abilities such as knowledge and skills by utilizing the appropriate help and cooperation of the

teacher and the other learners. It encourages learners to feel free to convey their own thoughts or feelings in written messages by providing them with plenty of time and opportunity to reconsider and revise their writing and at each step seek assistance from outside resources like the instructor.

From the findings, this study agrees with Fujieda (2006) who says that process approach seems to remain preferred and an approved approach and that it has been accepted and applied to EFL and ESL writing classes because of its effectiveness. Unlike the product approach whose focus is on the end result of the learning process and the learner is expected to perform as a fluent and competent user of the language, the process approach, in contrast, stresses the process that writers go through in composing texts and lets students manage their own writing by giving students a chance to think as they write (Brown, 2001). That is students convey their messages to the readers in written form through the complex writing process, prewriting, drafting revising and editing. Writing as a language skill is best learned when learners have their own intrinsic motives. This study is in agreement with Onazawa, (2010) who says that in the process approach, students do not write on a given topic in a restricted time and hand in the composition, rather, they explore a topic through writing. Through the process approach teachers find that the writing process is a process of discovery for the students; discovery of new ideas and new language forms to express those ideas.

The findings of this study also show that process approach focuses more on classroom activities which promote the development of skilled language use and a number of interesting classroom techniques including 'conferencing' that emerge from the process approach to writing (Shin & Crandall, 2014). It also encourages collaborative group work between learners as a way of enhancing motivation and developing positive attitude towards writing. Process approach teachers encourage students to use their internal resources and individuality; they neglect accuracy in favour of fluency. In contrast, product teachers focus solely on accuracy, appropriate rhetorical discourse and linguistic patterns to the exclusions of writing processes. It considers writing as a combination of some different actions and it places more emphasis on the stages in which students perform these actions while constructing meaning in their writing. By focusing on the writing process, learners come to understand themselves more and find how to work through the writing. They may explore what strategies conform to their style of learning.

This study agrees with Shin & Grandall (2014) who state that the process-based approach to writing helps learners to express their ideas, construct meaning and explore their linguistic resources through a series of steps to structure and communicate their ideas, focusing on expression in the early stages, and only being concerned with accurate grammar or mechanics in the final stages. This study supports researchers such as Hedge (2005) who asserts that through a series of stages, the process approach helps learners to become more fluent and accurate writers. Sapkota (2012) who states that not only does the writing process help learners to reconstruct their thinking into written form, but also supplies important clues for improving the coherence of their texts. Writing strategies deal with how students understand their own writing processes and how they adapt their processes to evolving demand. Serravallo (2017) who asserts that monitoring involves controlling the writing process in general aspects of writing, such as content and organization, and in

terms of specific aspects, such as grammar and mechanics and that using a checklist is important at this stage to help learners to guide their thinking and self-assess their own writing. This study results have implications for language teachers especially in identifying and adopting effective methods of tackling problems of writing skills. The language teachers need to be aware of the value of the process based approach to writing skills. Teaching and learning language writing skills using the process approach should be built into training programs for pre-service language teachers and more research should be done for continuous review of process approach to improve its effectiveness.

Conclusion

The study found out that process approach had a significant effect on students writing performance in English language. It was found out that intervention of the process approach to teaching writing skills led to higher scores in the writing test.

Recommendations

Process approach has positive effects on improvement of writing skills therefore; teachers of English language should use it to teach writing skills as a means to make classroom writing tasks more meaningful, enjoyable and relevant in order to improve students writing skills. English language curriculum developers for secondary schools should allocate more time for teaching English language so that teachers can teach writing skills using the process approach.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics Showing Frequencies and Percentages of Techniques used in Process Approach

Activities	Frequency and Percentage				
	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Learners put in small groups	9(56.3%)	6(37.5%)	1(6.2%)	0(0%)	0(0%)
Brainstorming learners ideas	6(37.5%)	10(62.5%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)
Discussion	7(43.8%)	8(50%)	1(6.2%)	0(0%)	0(0%)
Instructor supports learners	8(50%)	7(43.8%)	1(6.2%)	0(0%)	0(0%)
Writing 1 st draft in groups	2(12.5%)	10(62.5%)	4(25%)	0(0%)	0(0%)
Exchanging drafts within groups	1(6.2%)	10(62.5%)	5(31.3%)	0(0%)	0(0%)
Reading each other's work	1(6.2%)	11(68.8%)	4(25%)	0(0%)	0(0%)
Peer feedback and modifying draft	1(6.2%)	9(56.3%)	6(37.5%)	0(0%)	0(0%)
Writing final drafts	3(18.8%)	10(62.5%)	3(18.8%)	0(0%)	0(0%)
Proof reading final draft in groups and making comments	2(12.5%)	10(62.5%)	4(25%)	0(0%)	0(0%)

Source: Field Data (2021)

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics Showing Means and Standard Deviation of Techniques used in Process Approach

Techniques N= 16		Mean	Standard Deviation
Learners put in groups		4.500	.63246
Brainstorming		4.3750	.50000
Discussion		4.3750	.61914
Instructor's support		4.4375	.62915
Writing 1 st draft		3.8750	.61914
Exchanging drafts		3.7500	.57735
Read peer work		3.8125	.54391
Peer feedback		3.6875	.60208
Final draft		4.0000	.63246
Proof read		3.8750	.61914
Grand mean		4.069	
Mean	Variance	Deviation	No. of items
40.6875	16.763	4.09420	10

Source: Field Data (2021)

Table 3. Independent Samples t-test on Students' Process Approach Pre-test scores

Pretest	Process	N	Mean	Std Deviation	Std Error Mean
	Treatment	59	11.4576	1.64340	.21395
	No treatment	55	11.9091	1.81835	.24519

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances				t-test for Equality of means				
	F	Sig	t	df	Sig(2-tailed)	Mean difference	Std difference	
Pretest	Equal Variances Assumed	.315	.576	-1.392	112	.167	-.45146	.3242
	Equal variances Not Assumed			-.387	108.809	.168	-.45146	.3254

Table 4. Independent Samples t-test on Students' Process Approach Post test

Posttest	Process	N	Mean	Std Deviation	Std Error Mean
	Treatment	121	14.5785	1.97801	.17982
	No treatment	111	11.7027	1.84634	.17529

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances				t-test for Equality of means			
	F	Sig	t	df	Sig(2-tailed)	Mean difference	Std difference
Posttest	Equal Variances Assumed	.170	.681	11.418	230	.000	2.87581
	Equal variances Not Assumed			11.452	229.925	.000	2.87581

Table 5. Analysis of Variance of Post Test in Process Approach

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Between groups	480.089	3	160.030	43.262	.000
Within groups	843.389	228	3.699		
Total	1323.478	231			

Table 6. Tukey HSD Post –Hoc Multiple Comparisons Test Results of Process Post-test

(I) Group	(J) Group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig
C1	C2	2.82712*	.000
	C3	.09486	.993
	C4	3.01998*	.000
C2	C1	-2.82712*	.000
	C3	-2.73226*	.000
	C4	.19286	.952
C3	C1	-.09486	.993
	C2	2.73226*	.000
	C4	2.92512*	.000
C4	C1	-3.01998*	.000
	C2	-.19286	.952
	C3	-2.92512*	.000

*The mean difference is significant at $p < 0.05$ level.

References

- Annamalai, N. (2016). Exploring the writing approaches in the facebook environment. *Teaching English with Technology*, 16 (1), 71-87.
- Atkinson, D. (2003). L2 Writing in the post. *Process era: Introduction Journal of Second Language Writing* 12, 3-15.
- Badger, R., & White, G. (2000). A process-genre approach to teaching writing. *ELT Journal*, 54 (2), 656-661.
- Borgard, J.S., & Mackin, M. (2015). *Writing is magic using mentor text to develop the writers craft*. CA: Teacher Created Materials Publishing.
- Bouhey, C. (1997). Learning to write by writing to learn. *ELT Journal* 51(2), 126-134.
- Brown., H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (2nd Ed). New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Chow, T. (2007). The effects of the process-genre approach to writing instruction on the expository essays of ESL students in Malaysian secondary school. Unpublished dissertation, University Sains Malaysia, Penang.
- Cooper, C., & Odell. L. (1977). Evaluating writing: Describing, Measuring, Judging. Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English, 1977,33-39. ED 143020. Retrieved from <http://www.learner.org/channel/workshops/writing>.
- Coutts, C.E. (2015). Learning and Teaching Assessment cycle, in planning for Effective Assessment, presentation made on behalf of OHC school improvement project. Hawar: Bahrain.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches*. (5th Ed.). USA: Sage.
- Escobar, A., & Evans, R. (2014). Mentor texts and the coding of academic writing structures. A functional approach. *Colombian Journal for teachers of English*, 21(2) 94-111
- Flateby, T., & Metzger. A. (2007). CLAQWA: Cognitive Level and Quality Writing Assessment System. Retrieved from [http:// usfuebz.usf.edu/assessment/index.shtml](http://usfuebz.usf.edu/assessment/index.shtml).
- Fujieda, Y. (2006). A brief history sketch of second language writing studies: A retrospective. *Kyoai Daigaku*, 6, 59-72.
- Gallagher, K. (2011). *Write like this: teaching real-world writing through modeling and mentor texts*. Portland: Stenhouse Publishers.
- Graham, S., & Sandmel, K. (2011). The process writing approach: A meta-analysis. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 104 (6), 396-407.
- Hedge, T. (2005). *Writing*. Oxford. UK: Oxford University Press
- Hoogeveen, M., & Van Geldreven, A. (2013). What works in writing with peer response? A review of intervention studies with children and adolescents. *Educational Psychology Review*, 25 (4) 473-502. <http://www.elimu.net>.
- Kane, C. M. (2012). Investigating the impact of a mentor text inquiry approach to narrative writing instruction on attitude self-efficacy and writing processes of fourth grade students in an urban elementary school-unpublished doctoral thesis, San Diego state University San Diego, Argentina.
- Kenya Institute of Education. (2006). *Secondary Education Teachers handbook*. Nairobi: K.I.E.
- Leavy, P. (2017). *Research Design: Quantitative, Qualitative, Mixed Methods, Arts-Based and Community-Based Participatory Research Approaches*. New York, London: The Guilford Press.
- Magut, Z. C. (2000). An Investigation into the use of Process Approach by Teachers of English for Effective Teaching of Writing Skills in Kenyan Secondary Schools. A study of Uasin Gishu District (unpublished master's thesis) Moi University, Eldoret, Kenya.
- Matsuda, P. K. (2003). Second language writing in the twentieth century: A situated history perspective. In B Kroll (Ed) *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp 15-34). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Murray, D. (1972). Teaching writing as a process not a product. *The Leaflet*, p. 11-14.
- Nunan, D. (1991). *Language teaching methodology: A textbook for teachers*. Edinburgh, Harlow, England: Longman.
- O'brien, T. (2004). Writing in a foreign language: Teaching and learning. *Language Teaching*, 37: 1-28.
- Odima, L .E. (2015). Effect of teaching an acquisition of English language writing skills in primary schools in Busia County, Kenya. Doctoral dissertation, Kenyatta University, Kenya.
- Onozawa, C. (2010). A study of the process writing Approach: A suggestion for an eclectic writing approach. *Research Note*, pp. 153-163.
- Palpanadan, S., Ismail, F., & Salam, R. (2015). Role of model essays in developing students' writing skills in Malaysian schools: *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6 (2), 56-61

- Pytash, K. E., & Morgan, D.N. (2014) Preparing Pre-service teachers to become teachers of writing. *English Education*, 47 (1) 6-37.
- Raimes, A. (1983). *Techniques in teaching writing*. NY: Oxford University Press.
- Reid, J. M. (1993). *Teaching ESL Writing*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Reid, J.M. (2001). The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages. In R. Cater & D. Nunan (Ed), *Writing* (p. 23-33). Cambridge: CUP.
- Reppen, R. (1995). A genre-based approach to content writing instruction. *TESOL Journal*, 4 (2), 32-35.
- Rollison, P. (2005). Using peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *ELT Journal*, 23-30.
- Saeidi, M., & Sahebkhair, F. (2011). The effect of model essays on accuracy and complexity of EFL learner's writing performance. *Middle- Ernst. Journal of Scientific Research*, 10 (1), 130-137.
- Saptoka, A (2012). Developing students writing skill through peer and teacher correction: An action research. *Journal of NELTS*, 17(1-2, 70 – 80).
- Sarhadi, T. (2015). The effect of Product/ process oriented approach to teaching and learning writing skill on university student performance. *International Journal of Language and Applied Linguistics*, 1 (2), 7-12.
- Serravala, J. (2017). *The writing strategies book. Your everything guide to developing skilled writers*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Shin, & Crandall, A. (2014). *Teaching young learners English. From theory to practice*. Boston, MA: National Geographic Learning.
- Silva, T. (1990). Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom. In B. Kross (Ed.) *Second language composition instruction developments, issues and directions in ESL* (pp.11-23) Cambridge: CUP.
- Singh, A. (2013). Effects of infusing Socratic questions in mind maps on the development of ESL students' writing skills. Retrieved <http://ethesis.Upm.edu.my/id/eprint/8223>.
- Sutikno, M. K. (2008). Responding to students writing. *Journal Pendidikan Penabur*, 10(7) 51-59.: The writing centre approach. *The English Teacher*, 35, 1-14.
- Torghabeh, R.A., Hashemi, M.R., & Ahmadi, H. S. (2010). Writing through literature: A novel approach to EFL writing instruction. *Iranian EFL Journal*, 6/4, 7-23.
- Tribble, C. (1990). *Writing*: Oxford: OUP.
- Zamel, V. (1982). Writing: The process of discovering meaning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 16 (2), 195-209.
- Zeng, D. (2005). *The process-oriented Approach to ESL/EFL writing instruction and Research*, CELEA Journal Vol. 28, (5), South East Missouri. State University.