View metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk
brought to you by CORE
provided by Journal Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya /...

The Effect of Teaching Writing Using Process-Based Approach and Product-Based Approach on the Quality Of SMA Students' Hortatory Writing

Hendrik Johanis George Frans
Agustinus Ngadiman

Abstract. *This research entitled 'The Effect of Teaching Writing Using Process-Based Approach and Product-Based Approach on the Quality of SMA Students' Hortatory Exposition' had been conducted at SMAN 12 Ambon to see how these two approaches took their effect on the samples. The research underwent three major steps: pre-test, treatment, and post-test. The sample of research was two science classes of grade eleven. These two classes chosen as the samples as their previous year achievement on English had closely similar means. Since the data distribution was normal and homogenous then the research continued by taking parametric statistics to analyse post-test so independent t-test was applied for analysing the post-test to see the effect difference. The analysis on the post-test showed that there was no effect difference on the quality of students' hortatory exposition between the students taught using process-based approach and the students taught using product-based approach. This was caused by students' low skill and unfamiliarity to English and the short duration of experiment.*

Keywords: teaching writing, process-based approach, product-based approach.

Introduction

There is no doubt that writing is the most difficult skill for foreign language learners to master. There are some factors causing difficulty. The difficulty lies in generating and organising ideas into a good English text. In addition, translating the ideas into readable text is also a very complicated activity. Dealing with writing, the students need to pay attention to levels of skills, namely the low level skills, such as: spelling, punctuation, word choice; and the high level skills such as planning and organising. Either teachers or students can easily imagine what will happen to any students dealing with writing if these students have low language proficiency.

As a productive skill, writing plays an important role in English daily use, either in terms of work or in an educational field. Therefore, students cannot avoid their needs to do the writing activity as an integral part of their learning as the present curriculum demands them to do so.

In the English curriculum 2004 of senior high school, which is incorporated now into Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan, the teaching of English is the teaching of skills at which the English teachers

are teaching, facilitating their students to have good skills at all the four skills: listening, speaking, reading and writing. Among these four skills taught and learnt, writing is the most complicated one since students are required to have idea, develop it and eventually write a development of the idea into good organization, coherence and unity.

At schools, students have to write their paragraphs and essays but at a higher academic level, the students are supposed to read and write any piece of academic writing. We might imagine what is going to happen to our students if they are not prepared today. The first emerging question might be: what will they do when they are in universities working out their writing task? When we think about this question we should believe that it is important for the English teachers to put writing in its role as a tool to learning inside and outside the classrooms to help students learn to write.

Unfortunately, there has been a serious problem existing among the students since they cannot produce any piece of either English paragraph or essay. Then it is the responsibility of the teachers to find out the reasons why their students cannot increase in the confines of writing activity. Pondering this problem we might ask some important questions like 'Is it because the approach teachers employ cannot meet students' need to learn writing?' or 'Is there another factor that hinders the students from being able to produce an English essay text?' Towards these questions, some English teachers simply cite that the answer lies among the students, but I do believe that actually the teachers are the persons who should enable their students to be able to write by facilitating any interesting writing activities during the learning process and even after the learning process.

To cope with this matter it is necessary for the teachers to find out the answer to this question to create a more helpful learning situation to facilitate their students to learn to write. Then in this research the writer believed that it was the teaching approach that teachers should think about. When dealing with the teaching approaches teachers encounter the terms of product-based approach, process-based approach, and genre-based approach with their distinctive ways of dealing with writing. The product-based approach means that teachers are simply leading the students to the final product of their essay; on the contrary, the process-based approach emphasizes on the thorough steps taken in the process to produce any English text (Nunan, 1995:86-7).

With its clear difference of the teaching approaches this research was held to employ a thorough teaching of writing using the product-based approach and process-based approach to find out the effects respectively, in the confines of classroom writing where students were self-motivated to learn writing at their own time and convenience.

As the research problems had been stated above the objective of this research was to see whether There is different effect between process-

based approach and product-based approach on the quality of hortatory exposition of SMAN 12 Ambon students.

Research Method

The research was quasi-experimental applying non-randomized pretest-posttest group. This research was based on some critical thoughts as reads below: The research used the intact groups: two science classes of grade eleven were as sample without randomization. This research went through: pretest – treatment – posttest. These two groups received the same steps. The pretest was administered to have students produce hortatory exposition essay without teacher's interference. It was designed to find out students' quality in producing hortatory exposition essay. Then students experienced the treatment differently, one group experienced the learning using the process-based approach while one other experienced the product-based approach. Having finished the treatment these two classes had another test which was called posttest. It was administered to see the effect of the approach, whether those students showed similar effect of the approaches or whether it was different. The writer made decision to find out the results by testing the hypothesis using level of significance of 0.05. Their scores were compared and tested using two different steps as demanded statistically. Pretest was used as prerequisite, then this research employed normality test and homogeneity test to see if the data distribution were normal or not. It was found that the pretest data distribution was normal then the analysis continued by using t-test to see the effect difference by analyzing the posttest results of both classes.

Population and Sample

The population of this study was be the students of SMA Negeri 12 Ambon.

This research did not undergo randomised sampling as it was difficult in the current classroom setting. The reasons were: first, in SMAN 12 Ambon there were six classes of grade eleven: two science classes and four social classes. Second, if the writer randomised the students it may break the school programme. Therefore, this research applied nonrandomised sampling.

This research took intact groups of two science classes of grade eleven. The underlying reason was that these two groups had close mean of previous year's achievement. The mean of Science 1 was 74.74 and science 2 was 73.57. While the other four classes, the social classes had different means that may read as follows: social 1 had 67.44, social 2 had 66.98, social 3 had 69.74 and social 4 had 67.75.

The Results of Analysis

Global Analysis

Pratisto (2004:13) states that t-test is used to test the means of group with another group. This research applied the independent t-test to study the effect difference of the process-based approach and product-based approach by using the data from **table 2** and **table 3**. The data taken for the analysis was the score of post-test. These post-test scores were put into the independent t-test to yield the effect difference of these two approaches.

Table 2
Post-test of Process and Product-based Approach
Group Statistics

	Approach	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Result	Process	20	65.4500	6.16847	1.37931
	Product	20	65.6000	11.98091	2.67901

This table shows the post-test achievement of both classes. It is clear that the process-based and product-based class had twenty students respectively. And the mean of protest seems physically similar as the process class had 65.4500 and the product class had 65.6000, and it seems that the achievement of product-based class is better than the process-based class students.

Because the t_{value} -0.50<t_{table} 2.021 the H0 is accepted. This means that the means of students' result in post test of both process-based class and product-based class was similar, or we might conclude that the quality of hortatory exposition between the students who were taught using process-based approach and the students who were taught using product-based approach was similar, there was no significant difference.

Discrete Item Analysis

In addition to the above global analysis of these two approaches, a discrete analysis was also done to see the effect difference among the five items of assessment.

The data gained were grouped into its classification of item then those items of the post-test were put into SPSS to be analysed using the independent t-test. For this discrete analysis there are two tables to explain the effect difference of the approach applied in the research. Table 4 contains the group statistics: the first part is organisation, the second part is content, the third part is grammar, the fourth part is punctuation, spelling and mechanism, and the fifth part is quality of style of expression.

Table 4
Group Statistics of Post Test

	Approach	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Organisation	Process	20	12.9500	1.35627	.30327
	Product	20	12.8750	2.86023	.63957
Content	Process	20	13.2750	1.72806	.38641
	Product	20	13.1750	2.46702	.55164
Grammar	Process	20	12.8750	1.30661	.29217
	Product	20	13.1750	2.46702	.55164
Mechanics	Process	20	13.2750	1.22984	.27500
	Product	20	13.6000	2.53709	.56731
Expression	Process	20	13.1000	1.33377	.29824
	Product	20	12.9750	2.46809	.55188

This table clearly shows that for the item of organisation, process-based class gained the mean of 12.9500 and the product-based class gained its mean of 12.8750. These two means are not quite different, it is very close. This means that the organisation quality of hortatory exposition of these two classes is similar as indicated by close means.

The content item shows that the process-based class gained the mean of 13.2750, and the product-based class gained its content mean at 13.1750. As to the item of organisation, the content item of these two classes is not different.

The grammar item shows that the process-based class gained the mean of 12.8750, and the product-based class gained its content mean at 13.1750. It looks that grammar item of product-based class is a bit higher since this class received the grammar explanation and exercised during the treatment.

The punctuation, spelling and mechanism item shows that the process-based class gained the mean of 13.2750, and the product-based class gained its content mean at 13.6000. As to the item of organisation, the content item of these two classes is not different.

The quality of style of expression item shows that the process-based class gained the mean of 13.2750, and the product-based class gained its content mean at 12.9750. As to the item of organisation, the content item of these two classes is not different.

The Discusion

Why was the Null Hypothesis Accepted

These two classes actually increased. The pre-test results show the students' pure readiness to write hortatory exposition essay and the post-test results show their increase to write hortatory exposition essay after being taught using process-based approach and product-based approach respectively.

Going through the process conducting teaching-learning process, I could reflect here that there were some underlying problems resulted in similar effect where the null hypothesis was accepted, instead of accepting the work hypothesis, which was proposed in the statement of hypothesis of this research.

This research needs to trace-back why this situation took place. Actually, some readers may blame the researcher but this was and is the result of the research. This reflection dealt with five aspects to ponder towards the matter why thy null hypothesis was accepted.

1. Students
   The students of both classes, process and product-based had close English ability. This was shown by the means of English they had from the first year learning that reads as follows: mean of Science 1 was 74.74 and science 2 was 73.57. These two means showed that the ability among students of these two classes were not significantly different.
2. Teachers
   To control any possible threat coming from teachers' side a thorough control was done. There were two teachers taking part as teachers who taught those two classes separately. They tried out the lesson plan in four pilot classes one week ahead. Having the pilot work they had discussion with the researcher about any possible revision on the lesson plan.
3. Materials & Time
   The materials or topics used for these two classes were similar. These materials could be checked at the appendix of lesson plan. Besides, the time taken for research at both classes was at the same day and this had prevented students from discussing the materials. Somehow, the researcher believed that the time used for the research was still limited.
4. Teaching Design (Lesson Plan)
   The three parts above were controlled, somehow we need to trace back the design of lesson plan that should distinguish the two approaches. The researcher believed that the acceptance of the null hypothesis was influenced by the design of lesson plan. These two lesson plans should be revised for any forthcoming use to distinguish principally these two approaches. This might be the source of the leading toward the acceptance of null hypothesis.

Integrating Finding to the previous Research

Some people English teachers may say that process-based approach is better than product-based approach in terms of helping students learn to write English essay as they argue that this approach put strong emphasis on the process of writing, not on the final product. Some other will disagree as they think that the ignorance to grammar and mechanics might cause overall failure to the writing product.

Process approach to the teaching of English Writing has been advocated in contrast with the traditional product-oriented method/product-based approach of teaching writing, and has been generally accepted and applied by English teachers in their classroom teaching of English writing, though controversy occurs occasionally among researchers concerning which approach is better, the process approach or the product approach.

The controversy occurs mainly because there is not yet a definite and universally accepted definition for the process approach to writing although some features for the approach have been discussed. Graham Stanley in Ho (2006), states that the process approach treats all writing as a creative act which requires time and positive feedback to be done well. In process writing, the teacher moves away from being someone who sets students a writing topic and receives the finished product for correction without any intervention in the writing process itself. Nunan (1991) in Ho clearly states that the process approach focuses on the steps involved in creating a piece of work and the process writing allows for the fact that no text can be perfect, but that a writer will get closer to perfection by producing, reflecting on, discussing and reworking successive drafts of a text.

Process Approach Versus Product Approach needs to be discussed further. Virtually all current composition theorists make a distinction between process-based and product-based writing. James McCrimmon in Ho (2006) sees it as the difference between writing as a way of knowing (process) and writing as a way of telling (product). Whereas the product approach focuses on writing tasks in which the learner imitates, copies and transforms teacher supplied models, the process approach focuses on the steps involved in creating a piece of work. The primary goal of product writing is an error-free coherent text. Process writing allows for the fact that no text can be perfect, but that a writer will get closer to perfection by producing, reflecting on, discussing and reworking successive drafts of a text. Though these theorists differ in their explanations of the distinction between process- and product-oriented writing, there is one important point upon which they all agree: good product depends on good process. This seems that many experts feel strong reluctance to conclude that which approach is superior to the other.

Reading through the findings of previous research this thesis concludes that even the experts do not strictly decide that the process-based approach is better than product-based approach. Ho (2006) states,

that the effectiveness of process-based approach to teach writing is still inconclusive. This means that there are still adaptations made to apply the approach effectively. The place, time and the students themselves are the things the teacher should think about before applying the teaching approach.

Implication of the Finding

The research has been conducted in its strength and weakness. The first strength was that the English teachers became aware that teaching writing is not an easy task to do therefore they need careful plan to conduct writing activities. One other strength that needs to be declared here is that the teachers should carefully plan their writing activity by applying any suitable and interesting approach to help students learn writing at their convenience.

The researcher felt necessary to state that this research itself still has many limitations. This research only experienced nine meetings or at least one month. This is still considered a very short time to study the effect of any certain approach, including studying the effect of teaching writing using process-based approach and product-based approach on the quality of students' hortatory exposition. I think it will be ideal for English teachers to start designing their teaching plan for the whole semester or the whole year to study the effect of these two approaches.

Observing the teaching and learning process of both classes I might come forward with some thoughts as an implication of the research activities. The students were mostly not so enthusiastic to take part in learning English and this had become an underlying and supporting reason they could not reach better achievement in their writing activities. They had strong tendency to write at their own way without conforming their writing to the required approach. The process-based students were supposed to have better organisation and content as they had the chance to have free writing, brainstorming and many other preliminary activities to actually help them learn to design a good essay somehow they could do as little as the product-bases students could do.

For the item of grammar, it once cross teachers' mind that the product-based students should do better as they had chance to study grammar. Starting from the point that these students truly did not care about English they began not to study grammar as sufficiently as possible. This also happened among the process-based students. This situation also occurred to other items. They had problems in putting mechanics in its appropriate way and they were so poor to express their thoughts.

The researcher had tried to read teachers' lesson plans and I found out that mostly those teachers did not assign clearly the technique they were going to apply in their class. This was also contributing to the poor achievement in students' writing. I do believe that the English teachers should have designed their lesson plans before entering the classroom to teach and learn with their students. Teachers' ignorance to designing

carefully designed lesson plans, I believe, had contributed to the students' failure to achieve the level of adequate to good or above it. Therefore, I need to state here that this case had also given unsuccessful impact on students' writing attitude.

The researcher could strongly bring my mind that even though this research was conducted for a month, it was still received as I had gone through necessary plan to design the research conduct. Starting from having discussion with the teachers and discussion on the teaching activities in the pilot class, I strongly believe that this had made this research sufficient to avoid possible threat coming from the teachers. The way the teachers went along with the class in my lesson plans were appreciated as they cooperated well with the plans.

In addition, having two assessors for assessing the students' essay had enabled a fair evaluation of students' works as those assessors were not the teachers who conducted the teaching of writing in both classes. This number of assessors had helped to make the assessment more precise and valid.

Conclusion and Suggestions

Conclusion

The findings show that:

1. The process-based approach and product-based approach had similar effect on the quality on students' hortatory exposition.
2. The research hypothesis is: There is different effect on the quality of students' hortatory writing between the students who taught using process-based approach and those who taught using product-based approach at SMAN 12 Ambon. The data gained were analysed and the final result showed the effect of process-based approach and product-based approach was similar. Therefore, this research rejects the work hypothesis of this research, and accepts that there is no different effect.
3. This research may come to this conclusion and it is supporting the research of Bellina Ho. She suggested that the process-based approach to teaching writing is still inconclusive, meaning that the English teachers may not judge that process-based approach is a better than product-based approach. This research had come to the writer's belief that the appropriate approach to teaching English writing depends on some factors: input of students, material learnt, school policy.

Suggestions

1. This research or any forthcoming researches need to prepare as careful as possible the measures of conducting thorough research, including preparing the teachers' knowledge of the matter pertained.
2. There should be sufficient understanding on the theories of teaching writing strategies in order to be able to conduct better teaching, on writing. Seeing the fact that the students' increase are not passing

through the middle level of assessment the writer would like to suggest the teaching should be conducted more seriously. Planning a thorough writing activity, including translating the approaches, methods, and techniques, through the whole semester is highly recommended.

Bibliography

Bailey, K. M. (2003). Speaking. In D. Nunan, *Practical English Language Teaching* (pp. 47-66). Singapore: MacGraw Hill.

Baroudy, I. (2004). A Procedural Approach to Process Theory of Writing: Pre-Writing Techniques. *The International Journal of Language Society and Culture* , 1-10.

Bernhardt, E. (1991). *Reading Development in a Second Language.* New Jersey: Ablex.

Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language Assessment Principles and Classroom Practices.* New York: Pearson Education.

Chan, S. H., Nadzimah, A., & Tan, H. (2003). Malaysian ESL Academic Writing Skills,: establishing Knowledge Bases, attitudes and Processes. *Studies in Foreign Language Education* , 143-156.

Harmer, J. (2002). *How to Teach English an introduction to the practice of English Language Teaching.* Edinburgh: Pearson Education Limited.

Harmer, J. (2004). *How to Teach Writing.* Essex: Pearson Education Limited.

Heffernan, J. A., & Lincoln, J. E. (1982). *Writing A College Handbook.* New York: WW Norotn & Company Inc.

Ho, B. (2006). Effectiveness of Using the Process approac to Teach Writing in Six Hong Kong Primary Classrooms. *Perspectives* , 1-52.

Nunan, D. (2004). *Language Assessment Principles and Classroom Practices.* New York: Pearson Education Inc.

Nunan, D. (1995). *Language Teaching Methodology.* Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall International.

Oshima, A., & Hogue, A. (1999). *Writing Academic English Third Edition.* New York: Addison Wesley.

Pardiyono. (2007). *Pasti Bisa! Teaching Genre-Based Writing.* Yogyakarta: CV. Andi Offset.

Pratisto, A. (2004). *Cara Mudah Mengatasi MASALAH STATISTIK dan RANCANGAN PERCOBAAN dengan SPSS 12.* Jakarta: PT Elex Media Komputindo.

Roger, G., Phillips, D., & Walters, S. (2005). *Teaching Practice A Handbook for Teachers in Training.* Oxford: Macmillan.

Sarwono, J. (2009). *Panduan Lengkap untuk Belajar Komputasi Statistik Menggunakan SPSS 16.* Yogyakarta: Andi Offset.

Seouw, A. (2002). Teaching Writing Process abd Process Writing. In J. C. Richards, & W. A. Renandya, *Methodology in Language Teaching an Anthology of Current Practices* (pp. 315-320). Cambridge: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.

Shumin, K. (2002). factors to Consider: Developing Adult EFL Students; Speaking Abilities. In J. C. Richards, & W. A. Renandya, *Methodology in Language Teaching an Anthology of Current Practice* (pp. 206-208). Cambridge: The Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.

Sokolik, M. (2003). Writing. In D. Nunan, *Practical ENglish Language Teaching* (pp. 87-106). New York: MacGraw Hill.

Team, T. C. (2005). *Teaching Writing to Adult English Language Learners.* California: The CALEA.

Vahapassi, O. (1982). On the Specification of the Domain of School Writing. In A. C. Purves, & S. Takala, *Eds. International Perspective on the Evaluation of Written Composition* (pp. 256-289). Oxford: Pergamon.

Watkins-Goffman, L., & Diana, G. B. (1990). *Thinking to Write A Composing-Process Approach to Writing.* Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.