

## COMBINING PRODUCT AND PROCESS-BASED APPROACHES TO TEACHING WRITING DISCUSSION TEXTS

Vina Agustiana

Department of English Education, University of Kuningan, Indonesia.  
Email: v.agustiana08@gmail.com

APA Citation: Agustiana, V. (2016). Combining product and process based-approaches to teaching writing discussion texts. *English Review*, 4(2), 195-208

Received: 06-01-2016

Accepted: 07-03-2016

Published: 01-06-2016

**Abstract:** This study examines the activities of teaching-learning writing discussion texts when product and process-based approach combination is implemented in EFL writing classroom, the effects of applying the writing approach on EFL students' writing skill, and the students' attitude toward the implementation of writing approach in the classroom. It uses a mixed-methods through applying an embedded design by involving 24 second-grade students of a private university in West Java, Indonesia. There were four instruments used, namely field notes, videotapes, students' tests (pre-test and post-test), and questionnaires. The findings show that the students were actively involved in class when the teacher applied the writing approach in writing classroom. There was also the improvement in the students' writing skill based on the result taken from the students' tests since the level of significance (two-tailed) in paired t-test is less than the alpha ( $0.000 < 0.05$ ). Qualitatively, the improvements were also found in generic features, textual language, and syntactical language aspects. In addition, the students showed highly positive attitude (4.35 average score) toward the implementation of the approach in the classroom.

**Keywords:** *writing, writing skill, discussion texts, product and process-based approach combination*

### INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, students may begin to realize the significance of writing by becoming aware that writing takes particular conventional forms in different contexts. However, based on the researcher's experience, the students found it difficult to compose their writing logically. Lack of understanding on how to write a good written product is the major problem the students encountered. This problem has led to an interest to investigate how to improve the students' writing skill.

Writing plays an important role as a mean of communication. Nunan (1999) states that in fact, the similar range of broad functions are served by written language and spoken language; it is used to get things done, to provide

information and to entertain.

Furthermore, the graphic representation of spoken language is a written language (Brown, 2001). It is in line with Meyers (2005, p. 2) that "writing is speaking to others on paper or a computer screen". Additionally, Patel and Jain (2008) imply that linguistic behavior, which presents sounds of language in visual symbols, refers to writing. Therefore, it is obvious that writing is an activity to express the ideas, thoughts, and feelings into the written language.

Writing skill is one of productive skills, which is not fully attained only through the talent, but it will be improved by doing practice. In line with this, Patel & Jain (2008) imply writing is a skill, which must be taught and

practiced since it is an essential feature of language learning because of presenting a very good means of fixing vocabulary, spelling, and sentence pattern. When we write, we are producing language (Harmer, 2007a). Additionally, Ur (1999) claims that differ from speaking skill which is acquired intuitively, the writing skill is in most cases deliberately taught and learned. In addition, Meyers (2005, p. 2) says, "writing is partly a talent, but it's mostly a skill, and like any skill, it improves with practice". Hence writing skill is one of productive skills that require practice to create a good and clear written product.

The writing complexity appears when students start to write. They do not know what they should write at first whereas the students are expected to be able to present their ideas well in the written form. According to National Writing Project (2003), the complexity of writing causes teaching writing is very challenging task for English teachers in education field. Besides, this complexity may affect the students' attitude on writing. Considering the problems encountered by students, Harmer (2007a) suggests that the teachers find appropriate methods and methodological beliefs to lead the teaching practice. In addition, if there are appropriate methods, it will be possible to change the students' attitude in writing, that writing can be an interesting, easy, and enjoyable activity.

Over the last 20 years, product and process based approaches have dominated much of the teaching of writing in EFL/ESL classrooms (Hasan and Akhand, 2010). Considering that both approaches have their own strengths and weaknesses, teachers are not able to apply only one approach in classroom. It may be possible that while in some classes, the product-based

approach might prove successful, and the process based approach might be useful for another.

The product based approach and process based approach can be differentiated each from the other on the basis of their emphasis. The distinction can be summed up in this way: "the process writing represents a shift in emphasis in teaching writing from the product of writing activities (the finished text) to ways in which text can be developed" (Hasan and Ahkand, 2010, p. 80). In addition, Nunan (2000) clearly states that the product approach focuses on writing tasks in which the learner imitates, copies and transforms models of correct language while the process approach focuses on the steps involved in creating a piece of work. The product-based approach emphasizes mechanical aspects of writing, such as focusing on grammatical and syntactical structures and imitating models. This approach is primarily concerned the correctness and form of the final product, and "highlights the learner's final piece of work instead of how it is produced" (Hasan and Ahkand, 2010, p. 81). However, this approach fails to recognize that the ideas are created and formulated during the process of writing.

On the other hand, "the process based approach emphasizes how the writing emerges as the result of a distinct process which advances through several stages until the writing is complete" (Harmer, 2007a, p. 326). The teacher guides the students during the writing process, but initially the teacher does not emphasize correctness and the final product. Instead of worrying about form, the students concentrate on writing. Therefore, the product of writing will improve with the discovery involved in composing.

There are some previous studies concerning the process-based approach to teaching writing (Mashori, 2007, Ngadiman, 2012, Diliberto, 2013; Holmes, 2014), the combination of product based approach and process based approaches to teaching writing (Gabrielatos, 2002; Hasan and Akhand, 2010), and the use of process based approach and genre approach (Foo, 2007). Given the fact that there are no studies existing in Indonesian about the use of the product and process based approach combination to teaching writing at undergraduates' level and focusing on discussion text, this study is conducted to explore the implementation of product and process based approach combination to teaching writing discussion texts in Indonesian context at undergraduates' level.

The present study concerns three main purposes. The first is to describe the teaching-learning writing activities when the product and process based approach combination is implemented in EFL writing classroom. The second is to investigate the effects of applying product and process based approach combination on EFL students' writing skill. The third is to describe the students' attitude toward the implementation of product and process based approach combination in EFL writing classroom.

There are five reasons to combine these approaches. First, since in early stage of product-based approach the students are encouraged to mimic a model text (Gabrielatos, 2002); it leads the students to organize the structure of

the text (generic features). Meanwhile, the process-based approach does not focus on this. Second, the product-based approach also helps the students to practice the linguistic features of the text (Hasan & Akhand, 2010) while the process-based approach does not provide this stage. Third, the process-based approach helps the students to organize their ideas in three stages, namely brainstorming, planning, and mind-mapping (Ngadiman, 2012) whereas the product based approach only provides one stage of organizing the ideas.

Fourth, the process based approach provides many stages of writing to develop the quality of students' written product (Coffin, C., Curry, M. J., Goodman, S., Hewings, A., Lillis, T. M. S., & Joan., 2003) while the product based approach only provides one stage of writing the final product. Fifth, the students get feedback of their written product from their peers (Tribble, 1996) and the teacher (Sun & Feng, 2009) in the process based approach. Considering the strengths and the weaknesses of the product and process based approaches, therefore, a combination of two approaches is necessary to maximize the writing product.

The stages of the combination of product and process based approach is shown in Table 1. According to Table 1, there are 10 stages of product and process based approaches combination. The implementation of the combination may take place in six meetings.

Table 1 *Stages of product and process based approach combination*

Stage	Product Approach	Process Approach	Meeting
1.	Modeling		First
2.	Practicing	-	
3.	Organizing the ideas.	Brainstorming.	

4.		Planning / Structuring.	Second
5.		Mind mapping.	
6.	-	Writing the first draft.	Third
7.	-	Peer-Feedback.	
8.	-	Editing.	Fourth
9.	Writing the written product.	Writing the final draft.	Fifth
10.	-	Evaluation and teachers' feedback.	Sixth

This study uses discussion texts as the teaching material. Thai (2009) distinguishes this text based on purpose, text structure, and linguistic features. Discussion text aims to present both sides of an issue before coming to a conclusion. The structures are statement of the issue (outlining the issue), series of arguments (against and for), and concluding statement (summing up both sides and recommendation). The linguistic features of discussion text are modality, emotive language, generic participants, specific participants, thinking verbs, action verbs, and complex sentences.

**METHOD**

With regard the research objectives, this study uses a mixed methods research. "Mixed methods research is an approach to inquiry involving collecting both quantitative and qualitative data, integrating two forms of data and using distinct design that may involve philosophical assumptions and theoretical frameworks" (Creswell, 2014, p. 4). "This is a new approach as it aims to put quantitative and qualitative data together" (Malik & Hamied, 2014, p. 266). By mixing the data, this study presents the better understanding of the problem than by using either data set one by one.

This study applied an embedded design to answer different questions, which need different types of data to

answer (Malik & Hamied, 2014). The researcher collected both the quantitative and qualitative data simultaneously during the study. This study is qualitative in terms of collection and analysis of observation data (field notes and videotapes). Meanwhile, it is quantitative in dealing with test scores and responses to questionnaire. There were four sources of evidence, namely observations (field notes), audiovisual materials (videotapes), tests (pre-test and post-test), and questionnaires. Data collection was conducted in fourteen meetings which were divided into three stages, namely preliminary stage, teaching-learning writing stage (phase 1 and phase 2), and closing stage. They began at April, 16<sup>th</sup> 2015 to May, 25<sup>th</sup> 2015.

The first data source were field notes. Field notes were primary data to explore the teaching-learning writing activities during the implementation of product and process based approach combination in teaching writing. In this case, the researcher played a role as a participant observer who involved in activities at the research site (Creswell, 2012). The teacher noted the activities during the process of teaching learning writing after leaving the setting.

The second were audiovisual materials. Audiovisual materials consist of images or sounds that researchers collect to help them understand the central phenomenon under study (Creswell, 2012). Videotapes were used

as the audiovisual materials in this study. Videotapes were used to gain the description of classroom activity during the observation. To keep the accuracy and authenticity of videotapes used, the researcher asked a camera operator to video the teaching-learning writing activities. The video making took place for fourteen meetings.

The third were students' tests. The tests were used to find the effect of the use of the product and process based approach combination in EFL writing classroom on the students' writing skill. In this study, the tests consisted of pre-test and post-test. In each test, the students were expected to create a discussion text with the topic given.

The fourth were questionnaires which aimed to describe the students' attitude toward the implementation of product and process based approach combination in EFL writing classroom. A set of closed-ended questionnaires was used. All students were asked to choose one choice in the questionnaires that best describe their feeling toward the items. The questionnaires were in Likert-Scale form. It consisted of 25 items, which belonged to two major themes, namely the general attitude toward the product and process based approach combination, and the attitude toward each steps of product-and-process based approach combination. The first theme consisted of five categories, namely motivation, effectiveness, learning situation in the class, comparison with other approach, and the ease of the step. The second theme consisted of 10 categories, namely modeling, practicing, brainstorming, planning, mind mapping, writing the first draft, peer-feedback, editing, writing the second draft, and evaluation and teacher's feedback. The items were analyzed by three aspects, namely affective, behavioral, and

cognitive views (Oskamp & Schultz, 2005). Considering the importance of questionnaire items, a pilot study was conducted to maintain the validity of the data. All the items in questionnaire were tried out with five EFL students who were not involved in the study, "for suggestions and advice, particularly regarding whether the questions were ambiguous, vague, or confusing" (see Emilia, 2005, p. 84).

In analyzing the data obtained, the researcher used qualitative and quantitative data analysis according to the types of data gathered. The field notes and videotapes were analyzed qualitatively. Meanwhile, the students tests were analyzed statistically and qualitatively. In addition, the questionnaires were analyzed with descriptive statistically.

There were some steps the researcher conducted to analyze the qualitative data, namely:

- (1) Watching the videotapes and reading the field notes;
- (2) Comparing the activities taken from the videotapes with the field notes;
- (3) Comparing the evidences of videotapes and field notes with lesson plans;
- (4) Identifying the teaching-learning writing activities in every stage of teaching writing;
- (5) Identifying the changes of the students' attitude and the students' writing skill in every meeting; and
- (6) Presenting the evidences of every activity of each meeting into a written form.

With regard the validity of the study, the students' tests including pre-test and post-test were scored by two raters. The first rater was the researcher, and the second rater was a writing lecturer in that university. In order to have the same perception in assessing

the students' tests, the researcher had explained the writing scoring rubric assessment used in the study for the second rater before they assessed the students' tests. Afterwards, the pre-test of the first rater was calculated with the pre-test of the second rater to find the final scores of the students' pre-test. Furthermore, the post-test of the first rater was calculated with the post-test of the second rater to find the final scores of the students' post-test.

The scores would be calculated to examine the effect of the product and process based approach combination on the students' writing skill. This aimed to test the null hypothesis of the study which stated that the product and process based approach does not affect the students' writing skill. There were several steps to test the hypothesis, namely normal distribution test, homogeneity of variance test, and comparing means. To avoid the error in

calculating the data, data taken from the test were analyzed by SPSS 20.0 for Windows.

The third data sources, questionnaires, were analyzed by descriptive statistics. Descriptive statistics is used to summarize data (Hatch & Farhady, 1982). Before being calculated, the sets of closed-ended questionnaires were sorted. If the whole items were not filled, the data were not taken, avoiding the invalid data. The questionnaire used the five-point Likert-Scale. The scales were Strongly Agree (5), Agree (4), Uncertain (3), Disagree (2), and Strongly Disagree (1). The scores were calculated by using Microsoft office excels in order to simplify their tabulation. The scores were analyzed based on five level of the students' attitude, namely highly positive, positive, normal, negative, and highly negative as attached in Table 2.

Table 2. *The categorization of students' attitude level*

Students' Attitude Level	Range of Score
	Item Level
Highly Positive	4.201-5.0
Positive	3.401-4.20
Normal	2.601-3.40
Negative	1.801-2.60
Highly Negative	1.00-1.80

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### *The process of teaching-learning writing activities*

The teaching-learning writing by using the product and process based approach combination took place in twelve meetings. During these activities, there were seven points to highlight.

First, since the students had not been taught writing by using this approach, they were curious to apply this approach in learning writing. It was indicated in the preliminary stage that when the teacher overviewed the

schedule of the teaching-learning writing, they asked the students to describe the activities in all stages since they were not familiar with the stages.

Second, during the implementation of the product and process based approach combination there was a different toward the students' attitude toward this writing approach. In phase 1, the teacher used her best effort to stimulate the students to speak at class through proposing the questions related to the teaching writing and their experience at every pre-activity

in every meeting. This effort worked. The students were actively involved in all activities of the teaching-learning writing. Besides, they were not also afraid to convey their ideas toward the topic.

Third, the students were able to work in group discussion and in peer-discussion as indicated in modeling stage, practicing stage, generating ideas through brainstorming stage, and editing stage. In modeling stage and practicing stage, the students were expected to identify the genre of the model text, and practice some of linguistic features found in the text. These stages allowed the students to have a discussion with their peers. Thus, the peer-discussion appeared in these stages. Besides, the generating ideas through brainstorming stage aimed to help the students to generate their ideas on the topic. Since this study applied the group brainstorming, the students were expected to share their ideas with their peers (peer-discussion). In addition, there was also the peer-discussion in editing stage since this stage consisted of clarifying session. In clarifying session, the students clarified the feedback from their peers and discussed the errors found in the text with them.

Fourth, the students also were able to work individually in some stages, namely in generating ideas through planning stage, generating ideas through mind-mapping stage, writing the first draft stage, peer-feedback stage, and writing the final draft stage. In these stages, the students were expected to use their own knowledge and ability to do all activities in every stage. The students planned and mapped their ideas individually in order to apply these ideas in writing the first draft. Afterwards, the students were also expected to assess and give feedback

toward their friends' text individually by using the guidelines provided by the teacher. Lastly, the students were also expected to use their writing skill in writing a discussion text in writing the final draft. Regarding to the purposes, the students were expected to work individually in these stages.

Next, the relationship between the teacher and the students became closer since there was a lively interaction between the students and the teacher during the evaluation and teacher's feedback stage. Considering the purpose of this stage which stated that the teacher were expected to assess and give feedback toward the students' text, the teacher gave more time to the students to discuss their text with the teacher. Being assessed, the students were pleased getting the teacher's feedback. As indicated in this stage, the students who had no time to discuss their text with the teacher showed their disappointment.

Then, in writing the text, most students conducted only one generating ideas stage (mind-mapping in common) and made a plan. A student always made his plan in Indonesian while the other students made their plan in English. According to the excerpt, the students made the plan to avoid the error, which probably appeared in their draft; and to maintain the handwriting, which probably affected the presentation.

The seventh point was that there was the improvement in the students' writing skill. Each stage of the product and process based approach combination affected each writing aspect. Firstly, regarding the modeling stage, the teacher provided a model text which was good in terms of genre. This was effective to help the students improve the generic features aspect. Secondly, regarding the practicing stage, this stage

was effective to help the students improve the textual language and syntactical language aspects since the students practiced to make sentences using linguistic features used in the text. Thirdly, since the students generated their ideas in group brainstorming, the students were able to enrich their ideas related to a topic given for discussion. Next, the students were able to organize their ideas through planning and mind-mapping. And then, through peer-feedback, the students were able to find the errors in their first draft regarding the textual language, syntactical language, and spelling aspects. Besides, the students were also able to apply the self-assessment toward their draft using the peer-assessment guidelines. Afterwards, editing stage and writing the second draft stage helped the students to improve their first draft based on the peer-feedback. Lastly, evaluation and teacher's feedback helped the students to improve their knowledge on writing since the teacher evaluated and gave feedback toward the students' final draft.

*The effects of the implementation of product and process based approach combination on the students' writing skill*

With regard the second research objective, the result of the students' pre-test and post-test data analysis are used. This aims to find the effects of the product and process based approach combination on the students' writing skill whether it affects or does not affect the students' writing skill.

Data from the students' tests were analyzed statistically and qualitatively to examine the improvement in the students' writing skill. Statistically, there were three different tests conducted, namely normal distribution test, homogeneity of variance test, and comparing means test. The normal distribution test used the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Statistic, the homogeneity of variance test used the Levene Statistic, and comparing means test used the paired t-test. Qualitatively, there were some improvements found in students' discussion texts.

The first test was the normal distribution test. It aims to find whether the data was normally distributed. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov Statistic was applied in this study. The result of the normal distribution test was shown in Table 3.

Table 3 *The result of the normal distribution test*

Tests of Normality			
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>		
	Statistic	df	Sig.
PreTest	,141	24	,200*
PostTest	,144	24	,200*

\*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

The level of significance as the result of the normal distribution test was compared with the alpha level. The alpha level was 0.05. Table 3 showed that the pre-test's level of significance in normal distribution test was 0.20. Since the pre-test's level of significance was

higher than the alpha ( $0.20 > 0.05$ ), the data of the students' pre-test was normally distributed.

Regarding the data taken from the post-test, Table 3 showed that the post-test's level of significance in normal distribution test was 0.20. Since the post-



test's level of significance was higher than the alpha ( $0.20 > 0.05$ ), the data of the students' post-test was normally distributed. The result of normal distribution test showed that the data taken from the students' pre-test and post-test were normally distributed. Thus, the hypothesis testing would use the parametric statistics, namely t-test.

The second test was the homogeneity of variance test. It aims to find whether the data is homogenous. The homogeneity of variance test used in the study was the Levene Statistic. The result of the homogeneity of variance test was shown in Table 4.

Table 4. *The result of homogeneity of variances test*

Test of Homogeneity of Variances			
Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
1,484	5	12	,266

The level of significance as the result of the homogeneity of variances test was compared with the alpha level. The alpha level was 0.05. Table 4 showed that the level of significance was 0.266. Since the level of significance in homogeneity of variances test was higher than the alpha ( $0.266 > 0.05$ ), the students' score of pre-test and post-test were homogenous.

The third test was the comparing means test. It aims to test the hypotheses of the study. Since the means compared were the mean score of the students' pre-test and post-test, the hypotheses testing

was analyzed by using the paired t-test. There were two hypotheses of the study, namely:

- $H_0$ : The product and process based approach combination does not affect the students' writing skill.
- $H_1$ : The product and process based approach combination affects the students' writing skill.

The level of significance as the result of the paired t-test was compared with the alpha level. The alpha level was 0.05. The result of the paired t-test was shown in Table 5.

Table 5 *The result of the paired t-test*

		Paired Samples Test							
		Paired Differences					T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference					
				Lower	Upper				
Pair 1	PreTest - PostTest	-12,625	3,921	,800	-14,281	-10,969	-15,774	23	,000

Table 5 showed that the level of significance (2-tailed) was 0.000. Since the level of significance in paired t-test was less than the alpha ( $0.000 < 0.05$ ),  $H_0$  was rejected. Therefore,  $H_1$ , which stated that the product and process based approach combination does affects the

students' writing skill, was accepted. It indicates that there was the improvement of the students' writing skills before and after the students given the treatment. Thus, statistically, the effect of applying product and process based approach combination in the

writing classroom was improving the students' writing skill in writing the discussion text.

Qualitatively, the effect of applying product and process based approach combination also appeared in the students' written product. Two students' text, a pre-test and a post-test, were analyzed. The student' pre-test entitled *Should we follow the West*, and the student' post-test entitled *Should we marry someone who supplies us money than someone whom we love?* They belonged to Ye who was a high achiever student. There was the improvement in some aspects of students' discussion text between pre-test and post-test. There were some improvements found especially in three aspects, namely generic features, textual language, and syntactical language aspects.

Regarding the generic features aspect, the improvement appeared in three criteria, namely genre, structure, and vocabulary criteria. Firstly, both texts presented the aim of the text, which presented two points of view of the issue (genre criterion). However, there was a difference between pretest and posttest regarding the elaboration of the arguments. Since, in modeling stage (stage 1), the teacher presented a good discussion text as model text to the students which aimed to help the students make a good discussion text, the students were able to present a more depth elaboration of the arguments. In pre-test, the writer presented the positive side and negative side of *"following the West"* (arguments for). However, the writer did not presented the arguments of *"not follow the West"* (arguments against). On the other hand, in post-test, the writer presented the positive side and negative side of both arguments for (*marrying someone who supplies us money*) and arguments against (*marrying someone*

*whom we love*). Thus, it indicated that there was the improvement in genre criterion since the writer presented two sides of both the arguments for and arguments against.

Secondly, both texts were well organized, logical, and consisted of issues, series of arguments, and conclusion as well as recommendation (structure criterion). The arguments were also supported by elaborations, which strengthened the arguments. However, in pre-test, the writer presented the arguments in a bulleted list. Thus, it influenced the presentation of the text. On the other hand, posttest was different, in which the writer presented the arguments in a paragraph form. The writer changed her presentation after the teacher had given oral feedback to her in Evaluation and teacher's feedback stage (stage 10 in phase 1).

Thirdly, regarding the vocabulary criterion, in pre-test, it was found that there were some inappropriate vocabularies used in the text which influenced the readability of the text. For instance, the writer wrote *"the existing"* which should be *"the existance"*. Furthermore, she also wrote the word she intended in Indonesian by writing *"keberadaan"* after the incorrect word. Besides, the writer used the inappropriate word *"increasing country"* which supposed to be *"developing country"*. In addition, she wrote the word she aimed to in Indonesian by writing *"negara maju"* after the inappropriate word. The using of words written in Indonesian in the text might indicate that the writer did not sure of the vocabulary choice. On the other hand, in post-test, the writer seemed more confident of the vocabulary choice since there was no word written in Indonesian. The inappropriate words appeared in post-test also was less than in pre-test. Thus, it

indicated that there was the improvement in vocabulary criterion.

Regarding the textual language aspect, the improvements were shown in cohesion criterion. The text in pre-test was lack of connectives used. Thus, it influenced the cohesiveness of the text. On the other hand, in post-test, since the connectives had been learnt in practicing stage (stage 2) in phase 2, the writer was able to apply some connectives to maintain the cohesiveness of the text. It indicated that the practicing stage had been improved the students' writing skill especially in cohesion criterion.

Considering the syntactical language aspect, the improvements were found in two criteria, namely clause pattern and punctuation. Firstly, there were some errors in clause pattern found in pre-test. For instance, the writer wrote "*Their culture especially in music it can inspire our musicians.*" as a clause. It was found that there were two subjects in a clause, namely *their culture* and *it*. On the other hand, in post-test, the writer could maintain the clause pattern even in a complex sentence. The writer wrote "*Some of them choose to marry someone who supplies them money while they do not love their partner or they will only marry someone whom they love and they love each other*".

Secondly, there was the improvement in punctuation criterion. As indicated in pre-test, the writer did not put a "*comma*" before coordinating conjunction, which connected more than two words. However, after the writer had learnt the use of "*comma*" in coordinating conjunction in practicing stage (stage 2) in phase 1, she was able to put it in the correct order.

Regarding the result of the comparing means test and the findings taken from the students' discussion text between pre-test and post-test, the

product and process based approach combination affects the students' writing skill especially in generic features, textual language, and syntactical language aspects. Therefore, the combination of product and process based approaches is an effective approach in improving the students' writing skill.

#### *The students' attitudes toward the implementation of product and process based approach combination in EFL writing classroom*

This section describes the students' attitude toward the implementation of the product and process based approach combination in EFL writing classroom. It presents the overall attitude as well as the top three and the bottom three. The data were taken from the questionnaires.

It is found that the average score of 25 items in the questionnaire was 4.35; therefore, it is assumed that the students showed the highly positive attitude toward the treatment. It was in line with the teaching-learning activity that the students were pleased with the implementation of product and process based approach combination in writing classroom.

The top three items were the item 24, 23, and 18. These items belonged to the second theme of the questionnaire, namely the attitude toward the implementation of each step of product and process based approach combination in writing classroom. Since the students showed the highly positive attitude toward these three items which belonged to the second theme of the questionnaire, it indicated that the students appreciated more to the technical area.

The first item of the top three was item 24. It stated that the students were fond of getting teacher's feedback in

writing classroom. The average score of this item was 4.67. Therefore, the students showed highly positive attitude toward this item. It was in line with the students' attitude in evaluation and teacher's feedback (stage 10) that the students were pleased getting the teacher's feedback toward their text.

The second item of the top three was item 23. It stated that writing the final draft (stage 9) in writing classroom allow them to correct the errors found in their first draft in order to make it better. The average score of this item was 4.63. Thus, the students showed a highly positive attitude toward the stage 9. It was also indicated in the teaching-learning writing activity that individually, the students wrote their final draft through recreated their first draft of discussion text, which had been assessed by their peers. As the result, the students' final drafts were better than their first draft in some aspects.

The last item of the top three was item 18. It stated that writing the first draft (stage 6) allowed the students to make a text based on their own knowledge. The average score of this item was 4.63. Therefore, the students showed a highly positive attitude toward stage 6. It was also in line with the findings which stated that in writing the first draft, the student focused on their work, and conducted the one of the generating ideas stages (mind-mapping in common) and a plan before they write their first draft of discussion text. It indicated that the students used their best effort to make the first draft of discussion text.

Apart from the top three items, there was also the bottom three items found. They were item 2, 10, and 19. The item 2 belonged to the theme 1, which concerned about the general attitude toward the implementation of product

and process based approach combination in writing classroom, while the item 10 and item 19 belonged to theme 2, which concerned about the attitude toward the implementation of each step of product and process based approach combination in writing classroom.

The first item of the bottom three was item 2. It stated that the students would involve themselves in the writing classroom which applying the product and process based approach combination. The average score of this item was 3.96. Thus, the students showed the positive attitude toward this item. It was in line with the findings as stated in Section 4.1.5 that the students were curious to apply this approach in learning writing by using the combination of the process and product based approach.

The second item of the bottom three was item 10. It stated that the students preferred to use model text before they started to learn writing. The average score of this item was 4.02. Therefore, the students showed the positive attitude toward this item. It indicated that model text gave the beneficial to the students to write a text. It was in line with the findings, which showed that through modeling (stage 1), the students were able to identify the genre of the text (social function, generic structure, and linguistic features). It was also supported by the findings, which showed that there was a significant improvement in the students writing skill after they used the product, and process based approach combination in learning writing.

The third item of the bottom three was item 19. It stated that the students were fond of giving feedback to their friend's text in writing classroom. The average score of this item was 4.13. Therefore, the students showed the

positive attitude toward this item. It was in line with the findings in Section 4.1.5 which showed that during peer-feedback (stage 7) the students focused on assessing their friend's text and gave feedback on it.

Based on the findings, the lowest rank in the questionnaire item has 3.96 average score, which showed the positive attitude toward the treatment. Therefore, it is assumed that no student showing the negative attitude toward the use of the product and process based approach combination in teaching writing. Since the findings show that the average score of the students' attitude was 4.35, the students' attitude toward the implementation of the product and process based approach combination was at highly positive level.

## CONCLUSION

According to the findings from those three aspects, the product and process based approach combination to teaching writing discussion text is an effective approach to teaching writing in improving the students' writing skill. It was in line with Kim and Kim (2005, p. 7-8) that "we needed to mixed the careful control of language for learner (as in product), and the creative use of language by the learner (as in process) to improve the situation". Furthermore, "both process and product approaches are significant in teaching writing in EFL/ESL context" (Hasan and Ahkand, 2010, p. 84). In product-based approach, it is important for a student to engage in imitating, copying, and transforming models of the correct language (Nunan, 2000). Besides, the process-based approach is beneficial to help the students generate their ideas and organize them in a systematic way, which helps the students to write fluently. Thus, the combination of the

product and process based approaches to teaching writing discussion text is beneficial as a collaborative approach to improve the students' writing skill.

Regarding the findings, this study has the potential contribution to the theory and educational practice. Theoretically, this study enriches the literature on teaching writing in Indonesian EFL context since there is no study existing in Indonesian about the use of the product and process based approach combination to teaching writing at undergraduates' level. Practically, the English writing teachers/lectures may implement the product and process based approach combination in their writing classroom since this approach is beneficial to improve the students' writing skill.

## REFERENCES

- Alwasilah, A. C. & Susana, S. (2007). *Pokoknya menulis: Cara baru menulis dengan metode kolaborasi*. Bandung: Kiblat Buku Utama.
- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles*. San Fransisco: Addison Wesley Longman Inc.
- Coffin, C., Curry, M. J., Goodman, S., Hewings, A., Lillis, T. M. S., & Joan. (2003). *Teaching academic writing*. London: Routledge.
- Cresswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research, 4<sup>th</sup> Ed.*. Boston: Pearson.
- Cresswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mix methods approaches*. New Delhi: Sage.
- Diliberto, J. A. (2013). Teaching writing: A process approach. *63<sup>rd</sup> Conference on Exeptional Children*.
- Emilia, E. (2005). *A critical genre-based approach to teaching academic writing in a tertiary EFL context in Indonesia*. Unpublished Paper in Melbourne University.
- Foo, T. C. V. (2007). *The effects of the process-genre approach to writing instruction on the expository essays of ESL students in a*

- Malaysian secondary school. Unpublished paper.
- Gabrielatos, C. (2002). EFL Writing: Product and process. Retrieved from <http://www.gabrielatos.com/Writing.pdf> [25 Aug-14, 10:10 a.m.].
- Harmer, J. (2007a). *The practice of english language teaching*. Kuala Lumpur: Pearson Education Limited.
- Hasan, M. K., & Akhand, M. M. (2010). Approaches to writing in EFL/ESL context: balancing product and process in writing class at tertiary level. *Journal of NELTA*, 15, 1-2.
- Hatch, E., & Farhady, H. (1982). *Research design and statistics for applied linguistics*. London: Newbury House Publishers, INC.
- Hernowo. (2004). *Quantum writing*. Bandung: Mizan Learning Centre.
- Holmes, N. (2014). *The use of a process-oriented approach to facilitate the planning and production stages of writing for adult students of English as a foreign or second language*. Unpublished Paper.
- Kim, Y., & Kim, J. (2005). Teaching Korean university writing class: Balancing the process and the genre approach. *Asian EFL Journal Online*, 7(2), 69-90. Retrieved from [http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/June\\_05\\_yk&jk.php](http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/June_05_yk&jk.php) [25 Jan- 2014, 09.16 a.m.].
- Malik, R. S., & Hamied, F. A. (2014). *Research methods*. Bandung: UPI Press.
- Mashori, G. M. (2007). *Teaching the writing of English: Exploring the impact of process approach on the undergraduate students of Shah Abdul Latif University Khairpur*. Unpublished Paper.
- Meyers, A. (2005). *Gateway to academic writing: Effective sentence, paragraph, and essay*. USA: Longman.
- National Writing Project. (2003). *National writing project 30 ideas for teaching writing*. Berkeley: University of California.
- Ngadiman, A. (2012). Effects of process oriented approach to teaching writing to English department students. *Magister Scientiae Journal*, 31.
- Nunan, D. (1991). *Language teaching methodology: A textbook for teachers*. England: Longman.
- Nunan, D. (1999). *Second language teaching & learning*. Boston: Heinle Cengage Learning.
- Oskamp, S., & Schultz, P. W. (2005). *Attitudes and opinion, 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Patel, D. M., & Jain, P. M. (2008). *English language teaching: Methods, tools and technique*. Jaipur: Sunrise Publishers and Distributors.
- Sun, C. and Feng, G. (2009). Process approach to teaching writing applied in different teaching models. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 2(1).
- Thai, M. D. (2009). *Text-based language teaching*. Melbourne: Mazmania Press.
- Tribble, C. (1996). *Writing*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ur, P. (1999). *A course in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.