

Implementing the Process Writing Approach to Teach Paragraph Writing at Birzeit University

Tagreed B. Abed

Department of Languages and Translation, Birzeit University, Birzeit, Ramallah, Palestine

Abstract—The Process Writing Approach focuses on the process of writing rather than the product. The purpose of the research was to explore the effectiveness of the Process Writing Approach in developing EFL students' paragraph writing skill at Birzeit University/ Palestine. After reviewing previous literature on the topic, the researcher decided to utilize this approach in intermediate English (1201) in the first semester 2021/2022. Participants were randomly placed in an experimental group and a control group. A pre/posttest quasi-experimental approach was employed. Experimental procedures of teaching paragraphs lasted 8 weeks, and paragraphs were evaluated at the beginning and the end of the study. The data obtained from the pre/post writing tests were analyzed descriptively by running a t-test to calculate the differences between the mean scores of the two groups. The post-test findings revealed statistically significant differences in favor of the experimental group. Accordingly, employing the Process Writing Approach proved to be extremely helpful in developing paragraph writing of EFL students. The study recommended adopting the same approach to develop intermediate-level students' writing and utilizing it in teaching essays and various genres as well.

Index Terms—paragraph writing, Process Writing Approach (PWA)

I. INTRODUCTION

Writing is one of the four- macro language skills: listening, speaking, reading and writing. Writing has always been seen as an important skill in English language acquisition because it reinforces grammatical structures and vocabulary that educators strive to teach their students (Cole & Feng, 2015). Jabali (2018) assumed that if writing was considered as means of communication since used widely via the internet, then the written form of communication would be more commonly used than the verbal one.

Through writing, individuals can express their ideas and thoughts to convey a message and accomplish a purpose. According to Pratama (2015), individuals can tell about ideas, feelings, events, and objects to others, and pouring ideas and thought into writing should take into consideration the grammar rule regarding correct spelling.

Mehr (2017) considered writing as a “thinking process which involves generating ideas, composing these ideas in sentences and paragraphs, and finally revising the ideas and paragraphs composed. Good writing also requires knowledge of grammatical rules, lexical devices, and logical ties” (p. 2).

AL-Haj (2015) viewed writing as a productive language process that requires special attention to transform and convey thoughts into written messages accurately and effectively. Besides, "Writing proficiency requires cognition of the orthographic system of a language structure and writing conventions” (p. 2).

Educational researchers believe that writing is very difficult to master compared with other skills. According to Zhao (2015), writing is the least language skill used by the majority of people in their native language, and “Even in the most ‘advanced’ societies a significant percentage of the adult population writes with difficulty” (p. 70). Rekibi (2016) viewed writing a foreign language as one of the most challenging skills, which makes it a very difficult duty for almost all EFL students. Rekibi argued that learners encounter difficulties with language use, vocabulary, structure, paraphrasing, and mechanics like spelling, punctuation, etc.

Isleem (2012) pointed out that educationalists agree that L1 or L2 writing is the most challenging skill master. Bacha (2002) stated that in higher learning institutions where English is the medium of instruction, students face problems mainly in writing and cannot cope with the institution’s literacy expectations.

Mokhamar (2016) said that English is an international language, not only the language of communication and science, but it is also one of the vital academic qualifications that learners ensure among others. Jabali (2018) maintained that many English language learners come from various backgrounds, with diverse language levels and learning experiences, methodologies, insights, attitudes and conceptions about the writing skill. Therefore, they do not achieve the aspirations and hopes of instructors both communicatively and linguistically.

Cole and Feng (2015) are in the same line with Jabali (2018). They claimed that writing is the last acquired domain of learning English due to several reasons. Students who learn English as a second language do not have the same background knowledge as native English speakers, which make it more difficult for them to write with meaning. They also feel frustrated because they have limited vocabulary and cannot use gestures to express their ideas in writing as they do when speaking.

Mokhamar (2016) mentioned that since writing is required for academic achievement and pursuing higher studies, it is necessary for all university students to write fluently and expressively. Piršl et al. (2011) believed that writing has become the key to survival in many fields of study. It is a factor that decides the students' ability to master seminar papers, reports and exams and determines students' success at university. Therefore, it is unquestionably certain that writing is the biggest challenge students struggle to overcome.

Hammad (2014) claimed that writing difficulties could refer to teaching writing in isolation without being linked to contextual clues or real situations. Students reported that in spite of recognizing grammatical rules, vocabulary and cohesive devices, they cannot apply them in real communication. It was inferred that language teaching/learning aimed mainly at acquiring items rather than using it in real communication.

Wirantaka (2016) maintained that EFL students might have difficulty in terms of vocabulary, grammar, and sentence structure. Adas and Bakir (2013) also noticed that most of the students face problems in communicating ideas effectively as they lack "the adequate stock of English vocabulary and creativity in writing" (p. 254). They concluded that since writing is the biggest challenge for many students, many associations do much effort to improve students' learning English. Hussein (2015) indicated that since writing is a productive skill, performing a writing task requires using syntactic, lexical, and rhetorical knowledge. Harmer (2001) stated that writing should not merely be dealt with as a productive skill, but as a process, that comprises pre-writing, writing, and post-writing.

In Palestine, writing is one of "the most difficult language areas that many EFL students suffer from" (Ikhilail, 2017, p. 7). This might refer to the traditional language teaching methods, or the product rather than the process approach, where writing is presented as an isolated skill and students are required to write about a topic suggested by the teacher. Teachers show a sample text, and students are expected to produce a similar one. The "product of writing should be same as the model" (Nabhan, 2016, p. 4). In the writing classes, topics are assigned without any prewriting discussion, which causes difficulty in composing appropriate ideas and delivering well-organized and good-quality texts (Maraqa, 2021).

Many teachers raise complaints regarding students' low level in writing (Al-Ghussain, 2001). From her experience as an instructor of English at university, the current researcher noticed that EFL students consider writing the most difficult and complicated language skill and find it difficult to produce a piece of writing. This reinforces the fact that teachers at schools teach writing as a product and a testing tool. Students are asked to produce a text about a certain topic, and teachers mark it focusing on writing mechanics like grammar, spelling and punctuation rather than involving students in the writing process.

The researcher's decision behind choosing paragraph writing is due to two reasons. First, it is the basic component of academic essay writing taught to EFL students in advanced courses. Therefore, learning how to structure paragraphs is badly required to be able to compose well-structured, coherent and cohesive essays (Rustipa, 2017). In contrast, "lack of paragraph writing skills culminates into a farrago of ideas scattered haphazardly in the essay" (Kwasi, 2015, p. 145). Through writing paragraphs, students will be able to write about functions like description, cause/effect, comparison/contrast, explanation, reports and different genres that will be required in different disciplines at tertiary levels.

Secondly, there is a consensus among EFL colleagues at Birzeit University (BZU) that students cannot compose good-structured paragraphs. Khalil (2019) argued that since providing feedback is very demanding regarding effort and time, some university teachers in Palestine mark students' written assignments without giving any feedback for improving their writing. Many teachers "simply give a letter grade and/or underline some of the errors without further explanation" (p. 3).

As far as the researcher could tell, no study has been conducted on this issue in Palestine. Believing that it is very important for Palestinian EFL learners to convey a message and express their ideas perfectly in writing, the researcher hoped the Process Writing Approach (PWA) would be a good technique to develop students' paragraph writing performance. Hussein (2015) confirmed that effective instruction, proper teaching approaches and scaffolding foster EFL students' writing skill decrease their writing problems, and help accomplish their writing tasks successfully. However, Muluneh (2018) argued that there is "a consensus among teachers that paragraph writing skills remain poor even if students are instructed how to write it. The method of instruction is partly responsible for students' success or failure in writing and teachers need to try adopting active learning techniques" (p. 2).

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Paragraph Structure

Dokchandra (2018) stated that a well-written paragraph is an indicator of students' basic writing ability that determines their academic success. Producing an effective paragraph requires writing a good topic sentence and providing supporting sentences that include details and related examples to develop the main point of the paragraph.

Alsmari (2019) stated that a paragraph is one writing unit consisting of a topic sentence that expresses one main idea, five to eight supporting statements that discuss the main idea, and a concluding sentence that reaffirms the key concept of the paragraph. Similarly, Rustipa (2016) pointed out that a paragraph is the core unit of an essay and both are equivalent in that they consist of an introduction, body and conclusion. The introduction of the paragraph comprises the

topic sentence, which formulates the subject of the paragraph and states the main idea; the supporting sentences form the body, and the last sentence concludes the paragraph.

In the same line, Wirantaka (2016) explained that a good-quality paragraph is characterized by three elements: Unity, which refers to the only idea represented by the topic sentence and developed by appropriate supporting sentences; coherence is the use of linking and transitional words and phrases to connect sentences logically; adequate development, which is achieved by writing supporting sentences that provide readers with full information, evidence and details that develop the main idea. A good and coherent paragraph helps readers understand the content, and proper supporting sentences develop and reflect the main idea. Besides, cohesion is necessary to link ideas among paragraphs and "shows the readers the unity of the paragraph" (p. 35).

Mokhamar (2016) defined a paragraph as coherent related sentences tackling one topic. It consists of components like a topic sentence, unity, coherence, and adequate development that overlap to compose an effective paragraph. Not only do sentences need to start with capital letter and end with a period, but also the vocabulary must be logically used to express a clear and meaningful idea or opinion.

B. A Process vs. Product Writing

Hanapi (2019) defined the PWA as learning how to write by writing; it focuses on the process of writing rather than the product. Its core principle is that all children, no matter what their age, can write, and the focus is on producing relevant and engaging content and learning writing genres.

For Alodwan and Ibnian (June, 2014), the PWA focuses on the learner's message and purpose of interaction, which is of much importance. The learner's role is recognized as an "initiator, not a mere responder or a mimicker of other people's intentions and expressions" (p. 154).

The PWA involves some steps recommended by researchers. Four writing approaches were developed and refined by time: the Schmidt model, the Van Galen, the Hayes and Flower, and the Hayes model. For Flower and Hayes (1981), the PWA covers four points: The act of writing that encompasses thinking processes; the interconnection of these processes; composing, which is goal-oriented steered by the writer's thinking process, and creating sub-goals and changing main goals when needed. The stages of these approaches have been presented in almost similar ways. However, they are different from the Flower and Hayes' in that "the subcomponents of the main stages of the process are instead posited as separate stages: prewriting, drafting, editing, revising, and publishing" (cited in Bayat, 2014, p. 1134).

Coffin et al. (2003) mentioned that the writing process includes eight stages: Pre-writing, planning, drafting, reflecting, peer or tutor reviewing, revising, and editing/proofreading (cited in Nabhan, 2016). Harmer (2004) recommended four similar elements for teaching process writing: Planning, drafting, editing (reflecting and revising), and final version (p. 5).

Mart ínez et al. (2020) viewed the PWA as a combination of tasks starting from developing and organizing ideas to forming the tentative draft. This is followed by revising and editing to improve the text before writing the final version. The PWA is beneficial for both students and teachers. Students can divide the writing task into steps to help them produce good quality drafts and can also help them assess their progress after each stage. Teachers can teach one stage at a time to enable learners to write gradually and develop analytical skills while focusing on specific points in the different processes. Teachers can correct and mark each process instead of marking the whole version and provide essential feedback to improve students' writing.

However, the product approach focuses on sentence-level without dealing with strategies and processes that involve learners in the writing process. This approach requires producing "an error-free draft by following a fixed pattern" (Mehr, 2017, p. 159). Unlike the PWA, the product approach comprises four stages: familiarization, controlled writing, guided writing, and free writing (Khalil, 2019; Wahdan & Buragohain, 2019).

The product approach emphasizes the final product and entails 3 stages: model texts, controlled practice, and organizing ideas. In contrast, the PWA promotes creativity as it activates learners' previous knowledge and encourages them to create their own ideas. The PWA also helps the learners to develop analytical skills necessary for everyone. However, "analyzing the features is not an easy task especially for the low proficiency learners" (Jee & Aziz, April, 2021, p. 885).

One major weakness of the product approach should be mentioned in this context. Since the product approach focuses on the final piece of writing which will be published and graded, teachers might not provide immediate feedback during students' writing. Therefore, "any problems that occur during the process of writing will be ignored as long as the students are able to produce the final product" (Al-Sawalha, 2014, p. 42).

To wrap up, the researcher found that the PWA could be the best approach to develop EFL students' writing performance. This is achieved through guiding learners in the writing process and helping incorporate mental and decision-making activity to compose the required task (Situngkir, 2019). Table 1 explains the steps of PWA created by Mart ínez et al. (2020, p. 52).

TABLE 1
PROCESS-WRITING STEPS

Planning	Planning has to do with prewriting, by outlining and brainstorming ideas. This stage tends to be fundamental to the writing process, as students struggle to think about ideas that may connect to what they want to write. Among the many strategies that can be used in this stage, Bae (2011) suggests: brainstorming, listing, clustering, free writing, reading, skimming, and scanning. Mistakes do not receive attention in this part since the intention is to gather as many ideas as possible. Furthermore, failure at this stage may result in a lack of ideas in the other steps of the process and additional writing time.
Drafting	Drafting puts ideas together in a coherent fashion. This may, as well, be one of the most challenging stages for students since it is not commonly natural for them to transform outlined thoughts into sentences. Here, students concentrate on getting ideas on paper without worrying about grammatical and mechanical errors (Bae, 2005).
Revising	This stage focuses on assessing the text's alignment and overall cohesion. Students pay close attention to the content and organization of the whole text, looking for cohesion and avoiding engaging in specific internal errors found throughout the text. The teacher can also guide the students to questions related to assignment-specific guidelines.
Editing	In the editing part, students dedicate time to the mistakes found in the text. By addressing grammar, word choice, connectors, punctuation, and spelling, students pursue writing accuracy.
Publishing	Some experts suggest one last stage called "publishing," in which students share what they have written or in the academic world, they may submit it for scholarly publication (Laksmy; as cited in Aziz, 2015). Other authors call it "sharing" (Bae, 2005) and think of it as an opportunity for students to communicate and negotiate on text's mechanics.

Planning requires outlining ideas and bringing them into note form. This is necessary for organizing and classifying the ideas gathered in brainstorming to help writers put them into correct order and keep connection between the ideas (Wirantaka, July, 2016).

Drafting is the first production stage. Writers can put, modify, add, or delete irrelevant sentences. Here, the content is emphasized without having to revise the vocabulary and grammar (Wirantaka, July, 2016). In drafting, "students develop the meaning using ideas in pre-writing strategies, narrow down the broad focus, and remove or add information" (Nabhan, 2016, p. 6). Students write ideas, organize them logically, add supporting sentences and details to develop the topic, taking into consideration the audience and purpose of writing (Wahdan & Buragohain, 2019).

Revising is the core of the writing process. Students try to improve their writing drafts and reevaluate their compositions based on the feedback they receive (Wahdan & Buragohain). For Alodwan and Ibnian (June, 2014), revision is viewed as "looking at organization, main points, support for main ideas, examples, and connections between ideas" (p. 155); it is a "recursive process and can occur at any point in the writing process" (p. 156). Students check if the ideas are well organized, sequenced, developed and presented (Wirantaka, July, 2016).

In editing and proofreading, students pay attention to writing mechanics, including formatting, checking language accuracy, and "polishing the text" (Nabhan, 2016, p. 6). They correct mistakes like spelling, capitalization, sentence structure, and verb tenses.

Publishing is the last phase of the writing process after revising and editing. Alodwan and Ibnian (June, 2014), stated different ways for publishing students' writing. Products can be published in classroom newspapers and magazines, on walls and in halls, or read aloud to the class. Wahdan and Buragohain (2019) suggested that reading classmates' writings to give and receive feedback has positive effects on their writing.

III. RELATED STUDIES

Many previous studies examined the effectiveness of PWA in improving students' writing performance. Novia and Saptarina (2021) investigated whether there was a significant difference in learners' descriptive paragraph performance between the students who practiced using the PWA and those who did not. Students were divided into an experimental and control groups; they were given five topics and asked to write a paragraph about one descriptive issue as a pretest and one as a posttest. The written test was evaluated by two inter-raters using a descriptive writing rubric. To calculate the data, a paired sample t-test and independent-sample t-test were used. Analysis showed that p value (0.008) was lower than α value (0.05), which showed a significant increase in students' paragraph achievement due to implementing the PWA. The researchers confirmed that the "PWA can be used as an alternative strategy to encourage students to develop their writing abilities" (p. 6).

Martínez et al. (2020) conducted an action research to explore the effectiveness of the PWA for developing paragraph writing skills. Four lessons were taught to 25 low intermediate (-B1) adult students. Four research tools - a rubric, a pre/posttest, an observation chart, and an online survey completed by a sample of 12 students -were used to evaluate the PWA. Results revealed significant increase in students' grades in the final writing tasks, which demonstrated the effectiveness of the PWA in developing students' writing. However, students' noticeable errors revealed that students' writing performance generally depends on their language proficiency.

Jee and Aziz (2021) conducted an action research employing pre/posttests at a high school in Malaysia to explore the effect of PWA on enhancing learners' argumentative essay writing. They claimed that traditional methods involve teaching and spoon-feeding the low- proficiency learners. In contrast, PWA is more student-centered learning, where

the teacher acts as a facilitator, and learners are "more independent and confident to complete the task given without relying on the teacher" (p. 838). Results revealed a slight improvement in the posttest scores, which proved the effectiveness of PWA.

Dokchandra (2018) carried out a ten-week quasi-experimental study to explore the effect of the PWA on students' writing performance and opinions about it. The study employed a pre/posttest one group design on 55 EFL students in an overcrowded class at a Thai university. To evaluate students' progress, two academic essays were composed at the beginning and end of the treatment, and a questionnaire was used to find out the participants' opinions about PWA. A paired sample t-test was used to calculate mean score differences, and descriptive statistics were used to analyze the questionnaire data. The results showed that PWA had a significant effect ($p < .05$) on the students' writing, and students expressed very positive opinions towards the PWA. The study recommended using the PWA in EFL writing class.

Mehr (2017) investigated the effect of using the product vs. the PWA on developing Iranian EFL writing performance, fluency and accuracy, and discourse markers, and learners' attitude towards the writing skill. After receiving the treatment, the findings revealed a significant effect of the PWA on EFL students' writing performance and demonstrated positive effect on their attitude toward writing. The study recommended integrating the PWA in syllabus design.

Nabhan (2016) examined the impact of the PWA on developing students' writing skill in the English Education Department / Indonesia. The quantitative quasi-experimental design was employed and the PWA was taught to the experimental group. The t-test analysis showed that the PWA had a significant impact on improving students' writing skill.

In his article, Al-Sawalha (2014) explained the advantages of PWA in developing the writing skill compared to the traditional product and genre-oriented approaches. EFL and literature students in the Department of English Language at Jerash University/ Jordan admitted that they cannot produce a piece of writing fluently in spite of spending several years studying basic writing courses. "Apart from introducing them to the various stages and activities of producing a good piece of writing, the process itself has the potential to increase the Jordanian EFL student's enjoyment of the writing process" (p. 44).

Bayat (2014) explored the effect of the PWA on students' writing at Akdeniz University, Turkey. A pre/posttest control group quasi-experimental design was implemented on first-year students. Following the treatment, the experimental group got a higher mean score in the posttest than that of the control group. The study revealed that the PWA had a significant effect on students' writing success.

Alodwan and Ibnian (June, 2014) studied the effect of the PWA on developing university students' essay writing skills at the World Islamic Sciences and Education University/ Amman. Two English 101 sections, one experimental and one control, participated in the study. The PWA was applied to the experimental group. The quasi-experimental design was used and a pre/post test was administered to both groups. The experimental group composed better essays than the control group; students applied the stage of pre-writing to explore, link and generate new ideas and the stages of pre-writing, drafting, revising, editing and publishing helped improve students' ideas and writing mechanics. Therefore, the results indicated that the PWA positively affected students' essay writing skills.

Based on this view, and believing that writing is not only important in language classes, but also in all disciplines, the current researcher decided to employ the PWA strategy to facilitate and develop students' writing skill rather than focusing on the product. Teaching the paragraph structure aims at developing learners' basic writing and drawing their attention that writing "requires thinking to produce ideas, words and sentences (Muntaha, 2018, p. 1).

IV. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This study attempted to answer the main question:

What is the effectiveness of the PWA in developing paragraph-writing performance of ENGC 1201 students?

To answer the main question, the researcher sought to answer these sub-questions:

- 1- Are there statistically significant differences in the mean scores between the pre/post writing test of ENGC 1201 experimental group due to PWA?
- 2- Are there any statistically significant differences between the writing posttest mean scores of the experimental group and the control group due to the PWA?

A. *Hypotheses of the Study*

Two hypotheses were put forward to answer the research questions:

H1: There are no statistically significant differences ($p < .05$) between the mean scores of the experimental group's pre/post paragraph writing test.

H2: There are no statistically significant differences ($p < .05$) between the mean scores of the post- paragraph writing test of both groups in favor of the experimental group.

B. *Significance the Study*

The study is expected to:

- enable teachers to get rid of the traditional product writing and replace it with the PWA for developing EFL students' paragraph writing.
- draw students' attention to the importance of writing in all disciplines, mainly at higher- level education.
- enlighten English language educators and designers to consider integrating the PWA in teaching writing at high schools and tertiary education.

V. METHODOLOGY

A. Research Design

This is a quasi-experimental design consisting of two groups randomly assigned as one control and another experimental group. The participants in both groups were placed by the Registrar Office based on their test scores in the University Placement Test. The PWA was implemented in the experimental group, while the traditional method was followed in the control group. Data collection instrument was the students' paragraphs.

(a). Setting and Sample of the Study

The study was conducted on intermediate ENGC 1201 in the Department of Languages and Translation at BZU/ Palestine during the first semester of the academic year 2021/2022. The population comprised (1618) male and female students. Two sections participated in the study; each consisted of 31 students; one served as an experimental group and the other as control group. However, one student from the each group dropped the course, and so both were excluded from the research (Table 2).

TABLE 2
PARTICIPANTS OF THE STUDY

Group	Number of participants
Experimental group	30
Control group	30

(b). English 1201

This course integrates the four language skills. As clarified in the outline, ENGC 1201 helps students understand sentences and frequently used expressions related to different areas; communicate in simple and routine tasks requiring simple and direct exchange of information on familiar and routine matters; describe background, immediate environment, interests or activities; and write simple paragraphs accurately.

B. Variables of the Study

The independent variable: The PWA - aimed at developing ENGC 1201 paragraph writing.

The dependent variable: The performance of the experimental group in paragraph writing.

C. Instruments of the Study

A pre/posttest consisted of writing two paragraphs, one before and one after the PWA treatment, and a rubric for marking the paragraphs.

D. Content and Face Validity of the Instruments

The pre/posttest paragraph topics and outlines were adapted from previous ENGC 1201 exam papers used in the Department of Languages and Translation, and so was the rubric for marking the paragraphs. The writing topic of the posttest was comparable to that of the pretest; they both were analyzed by the instructors to check content and face validity. The content validity was achieved and proved that the paragraphs were set to measure the learners' PWA skills; the content and language of the rubric were also appropriate and clear for the study sample. From the instructors' experience of teaching writing and giving similar topics, they assured that the topics were feasible and practical, which accomplished the face validity.

E. Reliability of the Rubric

The researcher scored the paragraphs using an analytical writing rubric (Appendix A). The rubric was proved valid and reliable and had been used to mark students' paragraphs by experts in teaching English in the Department of Languages and Translation at BZU.

For the current study, the researcher and another rater, who were familiar with the rubric and scoring system, participated in scoring the paragraphs. They scored a random number of papers independently and showed correlation and consistency between their scores, which proved the reliability of the rubric (0.85) as determined through Alpha Cronbach.

VI. PROCEDURES

Students in both groups were first informed of the objectives of the research. They were asked to write a diagnostic paragraph - describing the place where they live, focusing on the positive and negative points. The researcher did not explain the PWA or paragraph structure since the purpose was eliciting samples of students' authentic paragraphs. The paragraphs were marked using the writing rubric, which was explained and distributed to the participants to help them write clear and precise paragraphs. Shabani and Panahi (2021) argued that, "Employing rubrics in the realm of writing assessment helps learners understand raters' and teachers' expectations better, judge and revise their own work more successfully, promote self-assessment of their learning, and improve the quality of their writing task" (p. 5).

Through the first unit which lasted four weeks, the researcher explained the PWA to the participants in the experimental group, focusing on brainstorming / planning, drafting, revising, editing and publishing/ sharing. The components of the paragraph were also stressed: Topic sentence, supporting sentences and concluding sentence. After practicing writing paragraphs in pairs and groups, individual students were asked to write academic paragraphs on a variety of topics as planned in the curriculum. Then they were asked to write a paragraph describing a festival or an event they have attended applying what they have learned. Again, paragraphs were marked using the same rubric to measure students' progress.

Data Analysis

After scoring the paragraphs, independent paired sample test was used to calculate the results, and t-test was used to analyze the data and verify the research hypotheses.

VII. RESULTS

A. Statistical Analysis of the Pre-Test Results of Both Groups

To ensure that both groups were equivalent in their writing level before teaching the PWA, a pre-test was given. SPSS was used to analyze the data and find if there were any differences between the two groups. The mean score of the control group is 2.07 with a standard deviation of 0.64, while the mean score of the experimental group is 1.97 and the standard deviation is 0.60.

TABLE 3
STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF THE PRE-TEST RESULTS OF BOTH GROUPS DIFFERENCE SCORES CALCULATIONS

Control Group	Experimental Group	T-value Calculation
N1: 30 $df1 = N - 1 = 30 - 1 = 29$ M1: 2.07 SS1: 11.87 $s21 = SS1/(N - 1) = 11.87/(30-1) = 0.41$	N2: 30 $df2 = N - 1 = 30 - 1 = 29$ M2: 1.97 SS2: 10.47 $s22 = SS2/(N - 1) = 10.47/(30-1) = 0.36$	$s2p = ((df1/(df1 + df2)) * s21) + ((df2/(df2 + df2)) * s22) = ((29/58) * 0.41) + ((29/58) * 0.36) = 0.39$ $s2M1 = s2p/N1 = 0.39/30 = 0.01$ $s2M2 = s2p/N2 = 0.39/30 = 0.01$ $t = (M1 - M2)/\sqrt{(s2M1 + s2M2)} = 0.1/\sqrt{0.03} = 0.62$

Table 3 shows that the t-value is 0.62 and the p-value is .27. Therefore, the result is not significant at $p < .05$. This means that both groups were equivalent and there were no significant differences in their pretest results.

B. Statistical Analysis of the Pre/Post- Test of the Control Group

Table 4 shows the statistical analysis of the pre/post-test of the control group. The mean score of the post-test is 2.48 and standard deviation is .85, while the mean score of the pre-test is 2.07 with a standard deviation of 0.64.

TABLE 4
STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF THE PRE/POST TEST OF THE CONTROL GROUP: DIFFERENCE SCORES CALCULATIONS

Pretest	Posttest	T-value Calculation
N1: 30 $df1 = N - 1 = 30 - 1 = 29$ M1: 2.07 SS1: 11.87 $s21 = SS1/(N - 1) = 11.87/(30-1) = 0.41$	N2: 30 $df2 = N - 1 = 30 - 1 = 29$ M2: 2.48 SS2: 21.24 $s22 = SS2/(N - 1) = 21.24/(30-1) = 0.73$	$s2p = ((df1/(df1 + df2)) * s21) + ((df2/(df2 + df2)) * s22) = ((29/58) * 0.41) + ((29/58) * 0.73) = 0.57$ $s2M1 = s2p/N1 = 0.57/30 = 0.02$ $s2M2 = s2p/N2 = 0.57/30 = 0.02$ $t = (M1 - M2)/\sqrt{(s2M1 + s2M2)} = -0.42/\sqrt{0.04} = -2.14$

T-test Analysis shows that the t-value is -2.14 and the p-value is .01846. Therefore, the result is significant at $p < .05$, which means there were significant differences in the pre/post results of the control group. This indicates that students' writing improved through the course.

To answer the first sub- question, if there were any significant differences in the experimental group's results before and after the PWA treatment, the paired sample t-test was used. Analysis shows that the mean score of the pretest was 1.97 and the standard deviation was 0.60. However, the mean score of the posttest was 2.93 with a standard deviation of 0.76 (Table 5).

TABLE 5
STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF THE PRE/POST TEST OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP: DIFFERENCE SCORES CALCULATIONS

Pretest	Posttest	T-value Calculation
Treatment 1 N1: 30 $df1 = N - 1 = 30 - 1 = 29$ M1: 1.97 SS1: 10.47 $s21 = SS1/(N - 1) = 10.47/(30-1) = 0.36$	N2: 30 $df2 = N - 1 = 30 - 1 = 29$ M2: 2.93 SS2: 16.87 $s22 = SS2/(N - 1) = 16.87/(30-1) = 0.58$	T-value Calculation $s2p = ((df1/(df1 + df2)) * s21) + ((df2/(df2 + df2)) * s22) = ((29/58) * 0.36) + ((29/58) * 0.58) = 0.47$ $s2M1 = s2p/N1 = 0.47/30 = 0.02$ $s2M2 = s2p/N2 = 0.47/30 = 0.02$ $t = (M1 - M2)/\sqrt{(s2M1 + s2M2)} = -0.97/\sqrt{0.03} = -5.45$

Table 5 shows that the t-value is -5.45; the p-value is < .00001. Therefore, the result is significant at $p < .05$. It can be concluded that there were significant differences in the experimental group’s paragraph writing due to the PWA. So the first hypothesis which says “There are no statistically significant differences ($p < .05$) between the mean scores of the experimental group in the pre/ posttest paragraph writing” was rejected.

To answer the second sub-question and investigate if there were any statistically significant differences between the posttest results of both groups due to the PWA, statistical analysis was done. After eight sessions of applying the PWA treatment to the experimental group, the posttest paragraph was given to both groups. T-test was used to analyze the gathered data and testify if the treatment had an impact on developing students’ paragraph writing (Table 6).

TABLE 6
STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF THE POST-TEST RESULTS OF BOTH GROUPS: DIFFERENCE SCORES CALCULATIONS

Control Group	Experimental Group	T-value Calculation
N1: 30 $df1 = N - 1 = 30 - 1 = 29$ M1: 2.48 SS1: 21.24 $s21 = SS1/(N - 1) = 21.24/(30-1) = 0.73$	N2: 30 $df2 = N - 1 = 30 - 1 = 29$ M2: 2.93 SS2: 16.87 $s22 = SS2/(N - 1) = 16.87/(30-1) = 0.58$	$2p = ((df1/(df1 + df2)) * s21) + ((df2/(df2 + df2)) * s22) = ((29/58) * 0.73) + ((29/58) * 0.58) = 0.66$ $s2M1 = s2p/N1 = 0.66/30 = 0.02$ $s2M2 = s2p/N2 = 0.66/30 = 0.02$ $t = (M1 - M2)/\sqrt{(s2M1 + s2M2)} = -0.45/\sqrt{0.04} = -2.15$

Table 6 shows that the t-value is -2.15; the p-value is .017864, and so the result is significant at $p < .05$. This illustrated significant differences between the post- test results of both groups in favor of the experimental group. Therefore, the second research hypothesis H2 that says “There are no statistically significant differences ($p < .05$) between the mean scores of both groups in the post- paragraph writing test in favor of the experimental group” was rejected. This answers the main research question and proves the effectiveness of the PWA in developing paragraph-writing performance of ENG1201 students.

VIII. DISCUSSION

The previous data show there were no significant differences in the mean scores of the pretest between both groups before the treatment. However, analysis revealed that the mean score of experimental group’s posttest was higher than that of the control group. Therefore, it was proved that using the PWA had a significant influence on enhancing students’ paragraph writing. Implementing various PWA phases helped students brainstorm and organize their ideas, get feedback after each phase, edit their paragraphs focusing on grammar and writing mechanics, and finally publish their paragraphs as planned by the researcher.

The results of this research are consistent with previous studies. Researchers (Bayat, 2014; Alodwan & Ibnian, June, 2014; Nabhan, 2016; Mehr, 2017; Mart ínez et al., 2020; Novia & Saptarina, 2021) found that the PWA enhanced students’ paragraph and essay writing. Based on their findings, they recommended using the PWA, “which allows the written product to be checked and evaluated during the writing process, on students’ writing success and anxiety” (Bayat, 2014, p. 1133).

IX. CONCLUSION

Since writing is an essential and significant skill required in all fields of study, it should be emphasized in language classrooms. Based on the data analysis of the current research, the pretest scores confirm that ENG1201 had problems with paragraph development; they were unable to compose well-structured paragraphs. However, after applying the treatment of PWA, students’ writing improved; they were able to produce paragraphs with good, coherent structure, and paying attention to writing mechanics and punctuation marks. Therefore, it is recommended that EFL instructors at BZU utilize the PWA for its relevancy in helping students construct good paragraphs. PWA “could help students develop confidence and establish fluency before they are concerned with a finished product” (Alodwan & Ibnian, June, 2014, p. 161).

X. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on findings of the study, the following are recommended:

- 1- Emphasizing the importance of writing, especially in higher education institutions.
- 2-Teaching writing as a process rather than a product.
- 3- Implementing the PWA and emphasizing the effectiveness of providing feedback in all its phases.
- 4- Implementing the PWA in teaching essay writing and other genres.
- 5- Investigating the effectiveness of PWA in developing students' essay writing in higher ENGC levels at BZU.

XI. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

- The study was confined to employing the PWA for developing students' paragraph writing.
- The study was confined to teaching 8 lessons, 50 minutes each, to students enrolled in ENGC 1201 at BZU in the first semester 2021/2022.

APPENDIX. ANALYTICAL WRITING RUBRIC

Criteria	4	3	2	1	Points
Main/Topic Idea Sentence	Main/Topic idea sentence is clear, correctly placed, and is restated in the closing sentence.	Main/Topic idea sentence is either unclear or incorrectly placed, and is restated in the closing sentence.	Main/Topic idea sentence is unclear and incorrectly placed, and is restated in the closing sentence.	Main/Topic idea sentence is unclear and incorrectly placed, and is not restated in the closing sentence.	—
Supporting Detail Sentence(s)	Paragraph(s) have three or more supporting detail sentences that relate back to the main idea.	Paragraph(s) have two supporting detail sentences that relate back to the main idea.	Paragraph(s) have one supporting detail sentence that relate back to the main idea.	Paragraph(s) have no supporting detail sentences that relate back to the main idea.	—
Elaborating Detail Sentence(s)	Each supporting detail sentence has three or more elaborating detail sentences.	Each supporting detail sentence has at least two elaborating detail sentences.	Each supporting detail sentence has one elaborating detail sentence.	Each supporting detail sentence has no elaborating detail sentence.	—
Legibility	Legible handwriting, typing, or printing.	Marginally legible handwriting, typing, or printing.	Writing is not legible in places.	Writing is not legible.	—
Mechanics and Grammar	Paragraph has no errors in punctuation, capitalization, and spelling.	Paragraph has one or two punctuation, capitalization, and spelling errors.	Paragraph has three to five punctuation, capitalization, and spelling errors.	Paragraph has six or more punctuation, capitalization, and spelling errors.	—
				Total---->	—

Paragraph Writing Rubric - Bishop Walsh School
<http://bishopwalsh.org/assets/files/Senior->

REFERENCES

- [1] Adas, D., & Bakir, A. (2013). Writing difficulties and new solutions: blended learning as an approach to improve writing abilities. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3(9), 254-266.
- [2] AL-Ghussain, R. (2001). *Factual oral communication techniques in teaching English for Gazan 10th Grade students*. Unpublished thesis. Faculty of Education, AL-Azhar University, Gaza.
- [3] Al-Haj, Iman, A. M. (2015). *The effectiveness of using facebook on developing paragraph writing skills among Al-Aqsa University English majors*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Al-Azhar University-Gaza, Palestine.
- [4] Alsmari, N. A. (2019). Fostering EFL students' saragraph writing using Edmodo. *English Language Teaching*, 12(10), 44-54.
- [5] Alodwan, T., & Ibranian, S.S. (June, 2014). The effect of using the process approach to writing on developing university students' essay writing skills in EFL. In *International Journal of Linguistics and Communication*, 2(2), pp. 147-163.
- [6] Al-Sawalha, A. M. (June, 2014). Potential advantages of process writing for students English language and literature at Jerash University in Jordan. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSSELL)*, 2(6), 41-46. ISSN 2347-3134 Retrieved June, 2022 from <https://www.arcjournals.org/pdfs/ijsell/v2-i6/6.pdf> PDF file
- [7] Bacha, N. N. (Sep., 2002). Developing learners' academic writing skills in higher education: A study for educational reform. *Language and Education*, 16(3), DOI: 10.1080/09500780208666826
- [8] Bayat, N. (2014). The effect of the process writing approach on writing success and anxiety. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 14(3), 1133-1141. DOI: 10.12738/estp.2014.3.1720
- [9] Cole, J., & Feng, G. (2015). Effective strategies for improving writing skills of elementary English language learners. *Chinese American Educational Research and Development Association Annual Conference*, April 15-16, 2015 in Chicago, IL Retrieved December, 21 from <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Effective-Strategies-for-Improving-Writing>.

- [10] Dokchandra, D. (2018). The effects of process writing approach on performance of an overcrowded EFL writing class at a university in Thailand. *KnE Social Sciences*, 3(4), 191–206. <https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v3i4.1931>
- [11] Hammad, E.A. (2014). Palestinian university students' problems with EFL essay writing in an instructional setting. *Journal of Second and Multiple Language Acquisition – JSMULA*, 2(1), 1-21. ISSN: 2147-9747.
- [12] Hanapi, H. (July, 2019). *Students' writing skill through clustering techniques*. Retrieved July, 2021 from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/334599748>
- [13] Harmer, J. (2001). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. 3rd ed. Pearson Education Limited.
- [14] Harmer, J. (2004). *How to Teach Writing*. London: Longman
- [15] Hussein, H. E. (June, 2015). The effect of a proposed strategy-based writing model on EFL learners' writing skills. *International Journal of English Language Teaching*, 3(4), 98-224.
- [16] Ikhlaail, S.Y. (2017). *The Effectiveness of Utilizing Interactive Task-based Activities to Teach English Writing in Virtual Classes*. Unpublished Master's thesis. Hebron University/Palestine.
- [17] Isleem, H. A. (2012). *A suggested Program Based on Individualized Activities for Developing Palestinian Sixth Graders' Writing Skills*. Unpublished thesis. The Islamic University- Gaza.
- [18] Jabali, O. (2018). *Students' attitudes towards EFL university writing: A case study at An-Najah National University, Palestine*. *Heliyon* 4 (2018). doi: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2018. e00896
- [19] Jee, S., V., & Aziz, A. (April, 2021). The application of the process-based writing approach in composing an argumentative essay: A case study of a Suburban secondary school of Mukah District in Sarawak. *Creative Education*, 12(4), 880-896. doi: 10.4236/ce.2021.124064. Retrieved December 2021 from <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/The-Application-of-the-Process>.
- [20] Khalil, Z. M. (2019). *The Impact of Utilizing Automated Essay Scoring Software on Developing Palestinian Undergraduate Students' Writing Competencies*. Unpublished Master's thesis. Hebron University, Palestine.
- [21] Kwasi, S.A. (2015). Investigating paragraph writing skills among polytechnic students: The case of Kumasi Polytechnic. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 3(3), 145-153. doi: 10.11648/j.ijll.20150303.16
- [22] Maraqa, M. H. (2021). *The Impact of Using L1 and L2 in the Prewriting Discussion Stage on Students' Writing Performance and Attitudes*. Unpublished thesis. Hebron University /Palestine.
- [23] Martínez, J., López-Díaz, A., & Pérez, E. (2020). Using process writing in the teaching of English as a foreign language. *Revista Caribeña de Investigación Educativa (RECIE)*, 4(1), 49-61. <https://doi.org/10.32541/recie.2020.v4i1.pp49-61> Retrieved December, 2021 from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED603410.pdf> PDF file
- [24] Mehr, H.S. (2017). The Impact of product and process approach on Iranian EFL learners' writing ability and their attitudes toward writing skill. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 7(2), 158-166.
- [25] Mokhamar, N.W. (2016). *The Impact of Integrating Reading and Writing Skills on Palestine Technical College Students' Paragraph Writing and Attitudes*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. The Islamic University–Gaza
- [26] Muluneh, T. K. (2018). Improving students' paragraph writing skill through task-based approach. *Arts Social Sci J* 9:3 DOI: 10.4172/2151-6200.1000351
- [27] Muntaha, M. (June, 2018). *Examining the effect of instagram captions as media on teaching writing skill for EFL learners*. Retrieved August, 2022 from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/328340900>
- [28] Nabhan, S. (June, 2016). The process approach to improve students' writing ability in English Education Department University of PGRI ADI BUANA, Surabaya. *Jembatan Merah*, 13, *Jurnal Pengajaran Bahasa dan Sastra* ISSN: 1907-1779 Retrieved December, 2021 from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/316823668>
- [29] Novia, F., & Saptarina, E. (2021). Using process writing approach (PWA) to teach writing descriptive text. *Linguists: Journal of Linguistics and Language Teaching*, 7(1), 1-9. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.29300/ling.v7i1.4075>
- [30] Piršl, D., Piršl, T., & Kesic, D. (2011). *Writing Skills at University Level*. DOI: 10.5550/sgja.110701.en.069P
- [31] Pratama, A. (2015). Improving student writing skill using mind mapping technique. *A classroom action research on the seventh grade of SMP N 2 Gondangrejo, Karanganyar in the school year of 2014/2015*. Retrieved June, 2021 from https://www.mindmeister.com/generic_files/get_file/8071966?filetyp... PDF file
- [32] Rekibi, K. (2016). *Improving Students' Writing Skill through Extensive Reading Case Study: Third Year LMD English Students at Biskra University*. Master's dissertation, Mohamed Kheider University of Biskra, Algeria
- [33] Rustipa, K. (Feb, 2016). The structure and adequate development of English as a foreign language learners' paragraphs: A case study. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 6(2), 133-139.
- [34] Shabani, E.A., & Panahi, J. (2020). Examining consistency among different rubrics for assessing writing. *Lang Test Asia*, 10(12). Available at <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-020-00111-4>
- [35] Situngkir, D. A. (2019). The application of process approach in enhancing paragraph writing skills of SMA Negeri 1 Lembang. *Acuity: Journal of English Language Pedagogy, Literature and Culture*, 4(2), 94-127. Available at <https://doi.org/10.35974/acuity.v4i2.1043>
- [36] Wahdan, R., & Buragohain, D. (September, 2019). Integrating the writing process approach into EFL writing instruction in Saudi Arabia. *International Journal of English Language Teaching*, 7(6), pp.1-14.
- [37] Wirantaka, A. (July, 2016). Paragraph writing of academic texts in an EFL context paragraph writing of academic texts in an EFL context. *Journal of Foreign Language Teaching & Learning*, 1(2), 34-45.
- [38] Zhao, L. L. (2015). On writing strategies of enhancing students writing skills. *Higher Education of Social Science*, 9(6), 70-74. Available from: URL: <http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/hess/article/view/8069> DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/8069>



Tagreed B. Abed is from Birzeit /Palestine. She was born in Jerusalem.

- PhD degree in Curriculum and Instruction (TEFL) from Ain Shams University/Egypt (2015).
- Master's degree in TEFL from Birzeit University (BZU) /Palestine (2002)

Tagreed B. Abed is an Assistant Professor at Birzeit University (BZU)/Palestine. She has been teaching at BZU since 2002. She teaches English, teaching methodology and practicum courses in the Department of Languages and Translation and Faculty of Education at BZU. She was the director of the Palestine and Arabic Studies Program (PAS) at BZU.

Dr. Abed has published papers on different issues related to ELT and participated in many national and international workshops and conferences. Her principal research interests are teaching methods and teacher education.