IMPROVING THE ABILITY IN STRUCTURE I OF STUDENTS STKIP PGRI JOMBANG THROUGH THE PROCESS-PRODUCT WRITING APPROACH

Chalimah[1]
Afi Ni'amah [1]
[1]Dosen Program studi pendidikan bahasa inggris STKIP PGRI Jombang

Abstract

This study is aimed at one main purpose : improving the ability in structure 1 especially in telling past events through the process-product writing approach. The design of this study belongs to a classroom action research. In this study, classroom action research is used to introduce the process-product writing approach to teach grammar to the students of 2014 B at STKIP PGRI Jombang. This study was started by conducting a preliminary study which was then followed by cycles comprising several procedures include planning the action, implementing the action, observing the action, and analyzing and reflecting on the action. Based on the findings, it can be concluded that the process-product writing approach could improve the students' ability in grammar. 83% of the students could master the process of editing (process writing approach) and 96% of the students are excellent at grammar (product writing approach).

Keywords*: Improving, Structure 1, Process-product approach.*

Abstrak

Studi ini ditujukan pada satu tujuan utama: meningkatkan kemampuan structure 1 khususnya tentang past melalui process-product writing approach. Desain studi ini termasuk penelitian tindakan kelas. Pada studi ini, penelitian tindakan kelas digunakan untuk memperkenalkan process-product writing approach untuk mengajar grammar bagi mahasiswa 2014 B di STKIP PGRI Jombang. Studi ini dimulai dengan melaksanakan preliminary study yang kemudian diikuti dengan siklus yang melibatkan beberapa prosedur termasuk perencanaan tindakan, pelaksanaan tindakan, observasi, analisa, dan refleksi. Berdasarkan temuan, dapat disimpulkan bahwa process-product writing approach bisa meningkatkan kemampuan mahasiswa di grammar. 83% mahasiswa bisa menguasai proses editing (process writing approach) dan 96% mahasiswa sangat baik pada grammar (product writing approach).

Kata Kunci*:Meningkatkan, Structure 1, Process-product approach.*

Introduction

The Teaching of English in the Indonesian Context

English in Indonesia is considered as a foreign language, meaning that it is not used for social (Huda, 2004: 46) as well as official communication (Widiati & Cahyono, 2006: 142). Its being foreign language gives implications to its teaching. Gebhard (2000: 3) states that the objective of the teaching of English as a foreign language is usually to make the students able to pass the entrance examination, not to prepare them to be able to communicate by using English. Besides, in foreign language settings the students do not have chance to apply what they have

---

[1]*Dosen Program studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris STKIP PGRI Jombang. Indonesia*

studied to communicative situation outside the classroom. It is quite often to happen that the English they hear and read in the classroom is the only comprehensible English they have.

The foregoing review of literature shows that practicing teachers are faced with a range of options for grammar instruction in their classrooms. There are, however, many types of difficulties faced by students and teachers with regard to grammar instruction in an EFL context. Identifying such difficulties and being consciously aware of them would help teachers find ways of overcoming them and provide effective grammar instruction. In teaching grammar, these areas have to be considered: grammar as rules, grammar as form, and grammar as resource. A better approach is perhaps to see grammar as one of many resources that we have in language which helps us to communicate. We should see how grammar relates to what we want to say or write, and how we expect others to interpret what our language use and its focus.

The Nature of the Process-Product Writing Approach

The process writing approach is considered as a correction to the previous approach namely product oriented approach (Cahyono, 2001: 6). In product oriented approach the teachers tend to focus on evaluating the students' final products (Widiati, 2004: 69). Moreover, Widiati (2004) argues that this approach does not tell us how the writers themselves experience the genuine process of writing.

Unlike the product oriented approach, the process writing approach focuses on the process a writer participates in when he/she creates meaning (Montague, 1995: 1). This approach relies on the belief that "writing is not a single activity, but one which is recursive" (Widiati & Cahyono, 2006: 141). By recursive it means that to produce a piece of writing, a writer follows some stages that can be performed from the time he/she starts writing up to the time the final product is finished. Their opinion is in line with Raimes (1987, cited in Cahyono, 2001: 6). She states that the process writing approach views "writing as a creative process consisting of a series of stages occurring recursively throughout the process and feeding on one another."

Responding to the old product oriented approach, Brown (2001: 335) asserts that actually there is nothing wrong with the product oriented approach which gives more attention to the grammar of the students' piece of writings.

Shih (1986, cited in Brown, 2001: 335) states that process approach do most of the following:

a. focus on the process of writing that leads to the final written product;

b. help student writers to understand their own composing process;

c. help them to build repertoires of strategies for prewriting, drafting, and rewriting;

d. give students time to write and rewrite;

e. place central importance on the process of revision;

f. let students discover what they want to say as they write;

g. give students feedback throughout the composing process (not just on the final product) as they attempt to bring their expression closer and closer to the intention;

h. encourage feedback from both the instructor and peers;

i. include individual conferences between teacher and student during the process of composition.

Product approach do most of the following:

a. model texts are read, and then features of the genre are highlighted

b. do controlled practice of the highlighted features

c. organize the ideas

d. use the skills, structures and vocabulary they have been taught to produce the product to show what they can do as fluents and competent users of the language

To sum up, the process writing approach does not seem that to create a piece of text follows a linear way. Rather, it follows several steps from the beginning of the writer starts writing his/her ideas up to the time he/she finishes completing the final version of his/her text. If the process writing approach has been finished, it will be followed by the product approach. In the next section, the process-product writing approach is discussed in greater detail.

The Process-Product Writing Approach

The process writing approach which gives more attention to the process of the writer experiences in the process of text making rather than to the final product comprises several stages. However, many writers propose several ideas of the stages themselves. According to Gebhard (2000: 226-230), there are four stages involved in the process of text making-- prewriting, drafting, revising, and editing. Christenson (2002: 41) offers the process writing approach comprises five stages, i.e., prewriting, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing.

Taking into account the schemes of stages in the process of writing proposed by some writers above, it is apparent that in general the process of writing consists of four stages, that is prewriting, drafting, revising, and editing. Consequently, in connection with this study, the process writing stages used are prewriting, drafting, revising, and editing.

The first stage in the process writing approach is prewriting. According to Seow (2001: 316), at this stage a writer stimulates his/her thoughts to generate ideas and collect information for writing. Seow's (2001) opinion is similar to Christenson's (2002: 41). She states that prewriting activity involves everything the writer does before starting the actual task of writing. This activity includes activating schemata, generating ideas, and making plans for approaching the writing task. Smalley, Ruetten, and Kozyrev (2001: 3) affirm that in this prewriting activity the writer thinks about the topic and generates ideas. In general, prewriting stage has something to do with how the writer generates ideas for his/her writing.

There are various techniques that can be used to generate ideas at the prewriting stage. These include brainstorming, free writing, WH-questions plus, and clustering. Brainstorming, according to Smalley, *et al.*, (2001: 4) is "a sudden insight and connection". In brainstorming spontaneity is needed and there is no right or wrong answer (Seow, 2001: 316). Gebhard (2000: 227) says that in brainstorming the writer calls out associations as many as possible of the topic given and at the same time they jot down their ideas.

The next technique is free writing. Its meaning is writing without stopping (Smalley, et al, 2001: 5). It means that the writer writes everything coming to his/her mind without thinking too much about whether the ideas are correct or the grammar is right. One rule should be applied in free writing activity, in that don't stop writing (Calderonello & Edwards, 1986: 25).So when the writer does free writing he/she does not interrupt the flow of the ideas.

Another technique that can be used to generate ideas is WH-questions plus. As the name implies, in using this technique a writer produces *who, why, what, where, when, and how* questions about a certain topic and gives answers to the questions as fully as possible. It means that the writer may create another series of WH-questions to the answers of the first series (Seow, 2001: 316 and Smalley, et al., 2001: 6). WH-questions plus may help the writer to determine what he/she knows and what he/she would like to know about the topic (Calderonello & Edwards, 1986: 26)

The last technique is clustering. According to Smalley, et al. (2001: 6), clustering is a process of making visual maps of the writer's ideas. In using this technique what the writer needs to do is placing a circled key word in a center of a page. Then, from the circled word draw a line and write an idea associated with the word. The writer keeps doing this until he/she cannot think of any more ideas (Gebhard, 2000: 227 and Smalley, *et al.*, 2001: 6).

After finishing the process of generating ideas, the writer comes to the next stage of the process writing approach, namely drafting. Brown (2001: 348) calls this stage and also the revising stage as "the core for process writing". Christenson (2002: 41) and Gebhard (2000: 228) state that drafting is the process of writing the ideas down on paper. In writing the first draft, the writer may not be overly concerned with the grammatical correctness; rather the writer should focus more to get the ideas down on paper (Smalley, *et al.*, 2001: 8).

At the revising stage, the writer takes a second look especially of the content and organization of his/her ideas in his/her drafts to make the writer's intent clearer to the reader(Christenson 2002: 41, Gebhard, 2000: 228 and Seow, 2001: 317). At this stage, the writer may add sentences to connect the ideas, to change the order of the sentences or paragraphs, to substitute another way of saying something or even to throw away the ideas that are not relevant to the topic or that are repetitive (Calderonello & Edwards, 1986: 11 and Smalley, et.al, 2001: 8). In doing revision, Seow (2001: 318) suggests that the writer may work in pairs and read each other's draft. By listening attentively to his/her own draft, the writer will be more conscious of what he/she has written.

The final stage of process writing approach is editing. After paying attention to the content and organization of his/her ideas at the revising stage, at this stage the writer starts thinking about the process of tidying up his/her writing. It means that the writer checks the sentences to make sure that they are grammatically and mechanically correct. Checking the mechanics include checking the spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and word choice or diction (Christenson 2002: 41, Smalley, et al., 2001: 9, and Seow, 2001: 318). A simple checklist may be used to help the writer to do self/peer revision. Seow (2001) provides some examples of the questions that can be utilized to check grammar. The examples are *"Have you used your verbs in the correct tense?", "Have you checked for subject-verb agreement?", and "Have you used all your pronouns correctly?"* Then, to check the mechanics, the writer can employ questions such as *"Have you capitalize all first letter in each sentence?", "Have you spelled all words correctly?", and "Have all sentences been given correct punctuations?"*

In brief, the process writing approach consists of four stages, i.e., prewriting, drafting, revising, and editing. Besides, in the process of text creation the writer deals with different activities in each stage before he/she finishes his/her piece of writing. The most important thing to keep in mind is that "process is not the end; it is a means to the end." (Brown, 2001: 337).

After the process writing approach has been done, the writer goes to the second process namely product writing approach by focusing on the example given by the lecturer and compared it with their writing indidually, check their sentences based on the examples and theory given by the lecturer individually, and as the end result of the learning process, students use their skills, structures, and vocabulary to make better or revision to produce better product in grammatically writing.

Research Method

The design of this study belongs to a classroom action research. According to Koshy (2007: xii),

The main role of action research is to facilitate practitioners to study aspects of practice – whether it is in the context of introducing an innovative idea or in assessing and reflecting on the effectiveness of existing practice, with the view of improving practice.

The design of the research follows a model proposed by Kemmis and McTaggart (2000, cited in Koshy, 2007: 4). They propose that action research comprises four stages, namely planning the action, implementing the action, observing the action, and reflecting on the action.

In this study, the researcher acted as the teacher/lecturer who implemented the process-product writing approach to the students. Meanwhile her collaborator acted as an observer who observed the students' progress during the teaching and learning process. The observation was emphasized on the activities which showed the criteria of success.

This research was conducted at *STKIP PGRI Jombang*. It is located in *Jln Pattimura III/20 Jombang* in class of 2014 B. Time allotment for the teaching of structure 1 is 2 x 100' for each meeting. Those time allotments are used for the regular teaching and learning process in the classroom/in its language laboratory.

The procedures of this research are adapted from a model proposed by Kemmis and McTaggart (2000, cited in Koshy, 2007: 4). A preliminary study was conducted to know the real condition of the lecturers' and the students' problem in the teaching and learning process of English, especially in the teaching and learning process of writing.

In addition to asking the students to write, to make sure the researcher about the problems they have, the researchers also administer questionnaires to the students. The result of the analysis on the students' compositions and questionnaires will be used as a basis for the researcher to prepare the lesson plan.

In the first step the researcher and her collaborative lecturer prepared the strategy, the lesson plan, the instruments, the criteria of success, and the introduction session of the strategy. In the teaching and learning process, the teacher-researcher assigned the students to follow the process-product writing approach which comprised four steps, namely prewriting, drafting, revising, and editing in writing grammatically correct.

At the prewriting stage, the class activity was designed to guide students to generate, select, and order ideas of the topic given. In generating ideas, Wh-questions plus were utilized. At the drafting stage, the students were directed to put down the generated ideas at the prewriting stage into paper without considering grammar excessively. At the revising stage, the students were led to revise their drafts. The revision was made in terms of content and organization. In doing revision, the students were given revising guidelines. At the editing stage, the students edited their revised drafts by using the editing guidelines. The editing process covered grammar, vocabulary and mechanics (spelling, punctuation, and capitalization).

In each stage of the process-product writing approach, the lecturer gave the students examples to make them easier in accomplishing the tasks. Finally, the students had to take a look at the examples of correct writing grammar 1 and made sure that their grammar was definitely correct

Result

Table 1. The Analytic Scoring Rubric for the Students' final compositions

Aspect of writing	Weighting	Score	Final Score	Criteria

Content	30%	5	30	Excellent	Main ideas stated clearly and accurately.
		4	24	Good	Main ideas stated fairly clearly and accurately.
		3	18	Average	Main ideas somewhat unclear and inaccurate.
		2	12	Poor	Main ideas not clear and accurate.
		1	6	Very poor	Main ideas not at all clear and accurate.
Organization	25%	5	25	Excellent	Well organized and perfectly coherent.
		4	20	Good	Fairly well organized and generally coherent.
		3	15	Average	Loosely organized but main ideas clear, logical but incomplete sequencing.
		2	10	Poor	Ideas disconnected, lacks logical sequencing
		1	5	Very poor	No organization, incoherent.
Vocabulary	20%	5	20	Excellent	Very effective choice of words and word forms.
		4	16	Good	Effective choice of words and word forms.
		3	12	Average	Adequate choice of words but some misuse of vocabulary and word forms.
		2	8	Poor	Limited range, confused use of words and word forms.
		1	4	Very poor	Very limited range, very poor knowledge of the words and word forms.
Grammar	20%	5	20	Excellent	No errors, full control of complex structure.
		4	16	Good	Almost no errors, good control of structure.
		3	12	Average	Some errors, fair control of structure.
		2	8	Poor	Many errors, poor control of structure.
		1	4	Very poor	Dominated by errors, no control of

					structure.
Mechanics	5%	5	5	Excellent	Mastery of spelling and punctuation.
		4	4	Good	Few errors in spelling and punctuation.
		3	3	Average	Fair number of spelling and punctuation errors.
		2	2	Poor	Frequent errors in spelling and punctuation.
		1	1	Very poor	No control over spelling and punctuation.

The adaptation is made in terms of giving different weighting to each aspect of writing. The weighting is based on Jacobs *et al* (1981 in Weigle, 2002: 116) scoring profile. Cohen's analytic scoring rubric provides feedback to the students on what aspects of writing they are good or poor. For the lecturer, the rubric supplies information on specific aspects of the students' writing for planning instruction.

The criteria of success play significant roles in this research study. They show the researcher what kind of data should be collected and when to stop the study. Furthermore, they provide the evidence of the strength of the strategy utilized in this study. This action research is considered to be successful if it meets the following criteria.

(1) 80% of the students' final compositions obtain a final score of 70 in the analytic scoring rubric.

Table 2. The Description of the Criteria of Success

No	Criteria of Success	Data	Sources of Data	Instruments	Procedures of Data Collection
1	80% of the students' final compositions obtain a final score of 70 in the analytic scoring rubric.	The students' final products after the implementation of the process-product writing approach	The students' final products	Portfolios	Collecting the students' final products after the implementation of the approach complete

Tompkins (1994, cited in Kalesu, 2005) suggests that the introduction session be started by explaining the process-product approach, describing and demonstrating each stage to make it clearer for the students to follow, and guiding students as they develop several brief compositions to experience the writing process and focus on the correct grammar. The introduction session is done in two meetings. In the first meeting, the students learn the prewriting and the drafting stages. The first round of the implementation of the process-product writing approach in teaching grammar to the students. Then, it will be followed by the discussion and reflection of what have been done in the classroom during the implementation of the approach.

In the implementation of the process-product writing approach, the researcher acted as the practitioners who carried out the teaching and learning process.

(1) Prewriting

The lecturer explained the objectives of the lesson to be achieved by the students. Then, she delivered a number of questions concerning the topic orally to activate the students' background knowledge on the topic discussed. Next, the lecturer gave a model on how to generate, select, and order ideas. She asked them to do prewriting activity on a topic given.

(2) Drafting

The lecturer gave the students a model of how to make a rough draft based on the generated ideas in prewriting stage. Then, she asked the students to write their own rough drafts based on the ordered ideas at the prewriting stage.

(3) Revising

Before asking the students to revise their drafts, the lecturer equipped students with a model of a rough draft and revision guidelines for helping them revise their drafts. She guided them working on step-by-step revision. She first asked the students to check the sample draft whether it contained a topic sentence or not. Then, she asked them to identify all supporting details whether they refered to topic sentence or not. Finally, she asked them to arrange the details logically. After discussing the sample draft, the lecturer asked the students to revise their drafts by using the revising guidelines.

(4) Editing

After telling the students that they were going to edit their revised rough drafts, she gave the students a model of a revised rough draft and editing guidelines. She provided them a model of a revised rough draft and editing guidelines for leading them to work on editing drafts. She asked them to check the sample of a revised draft whether or not the spelling of each word, the capitalization, and the punctuation are correct. After having discussion on the model of revised draft, the lecturer asks the students to do editing activities by employing the editing guidelines. In the product assessment, the students must be able to imitate the correct pattern.

Observing the action is the process of recording and collecting data about any aspects or events referring to the criteria of success that take place in the teaching and learning process. Observation on the implementation of the process-product writing approach takes into account two important aspects: data and data sources and research instruments and procedure of data collection.

Considering the criteria of success, the researcher employed qualitative and quantitative data. Qualitative data are the results of (1) the observation and field notes about any activities of the students which show the criteria of success, (2) questionnaires about the students' responses to the implementation of the process-product writing approach; and (3) portfolios of the students' work at each stage of the process-product writing approach. While quantitative data is obtained from the result of the students' final compositions which are collected after each round of the implementation of the process-product writing approach completed.

To collect the data, there are four kinds of research instruments the researcher develops such as observation checklist, field notes, portfolios, and questionnaire.

The data on the students' progress at each stage of the process-product writing approach which is obtained through observation checklist, field notes, and portfolios will be analyzed qualitatively. It means that the data will be elaborated in words than in numbers. It happens also to the data on the students' response to the implementation of the process writing approach which will be obtained through questionnaire. Then the data on the students' final products will be analyzed by using the analytic scoring rubric determined.

Reflection is intended to evaluate the effect of the action that has been carried out to the students' ability in writing recount texts. For this reason, the result of the data analysis will be

checked against the criteria of success predetermined to draw a conclusion. If all the criteria of success have been fulfilled, the action is stopped and if one of the criteria of success is not yet met, the study is continued to the next cycle by revising and improving the plan. The revision and improvement is focused on the relevant criteria which are not yet met in the first cycle.

In order to know whether or not the implementation of the action plan in cycle 1 was successful, both the researcher and her collaborator did the observation, and then analyzed the data taken from the observation checklist, field notes, and students' final writing. The analysis was focused on the result of the teaching and learning grammar through process-product writing approach.

From the students' side, it was found that most students were active involved in the writing process. It was proved by the result of the observation checklist that total point earned 30 out of 32 possible or 93.75% of the students were actively involved during teaching and learning process. Furthermore, the students felt relax and happy during the process of teaching and learning.

From the lecturer's side, she had good performance in conducting the teaching learning process in the classroom. She did all of the activities that had been planned in all the stages of process-product writing approach well. Consequently, the process of teaching and learning ran smoothly in each stage of the process-product writing approach. In addition, she was also patient in guiding the students through all the stages.

The analysis was concerned with the subjects' competence in every stage of using the process writing approach. The result of the observation on the subjects' improvement in the writing process in cycle 1 could be seen in table below.

No	Stages	Demonstrated Competence	Level of Achievement		
			Good	Fair	Poor
1	Prewriting	Explore, select, and ordering ideas to make an outline	75%	4%	21%
2	Drafting	Write a rough draft as a development of the outline	75%	8%	17%
3	Revising	Rewrite the draft as the lecturer suggested	79%	8%	13%
4	Editing	Identify the mechanical and grammar errors	83%	13%	4%
5	Imitating and Checking	Imitate and recheck based on the basic pattern (focus on grammar only)	83%	14%	3%

The analytical scoring rubric on the subjects' product was adapted from Berhman (2003) as seen in the table below.

Component of writing	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor	
	Pre-test (%)	Cycle 1 (%)	Pre-test (%)	Cycle 1 (%)	Pre-test (%)	Cycle 1 (%)	Pre-test (%)	Cycle 1 (%)
Content	-	79	54	-	-	-	-	-
Organization	-	83	-	-	29	-	-	-
Vocabulary	-	92	-	-	29	-	-	-
Grammar	-	96	-	-	38	-	-	-
Mechanics	-	88	50	-	-	-	-	-

Conclusions

Based on the findings, it can be concluded that the process-product writing approach could improve the students' ability in grammar. 83% of the students could master the process of editing (process approach) and 96% of the students are excellent at grammar (product approach

References

Brown, H.D. 2001. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy.* (2nd Ed). White Plains, NY: Addison Wesley Longman.

Berhman, C.H. 2003. *Ready to Use : Writing Proficiency Lesson & Activities.* San Fransisco: John Wiley & Sons.

Cahyono, B.Y. 2001. *Second Language Writing and Rhetoric: Research Studies in the Indonesian Context.* Malang: State University of Malang Press.

Calderonello, A.H. & Edwards Jr, B.L. 1986. *Roughdrafts: The Process of Writing.* Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Christenson, T.A. 2002. *Supporting Struggling Writers in the Elementary Classroom.* Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Gebhard, J.G. 2000. *Teaching English as a Foreign or Second Language: A Teacher Self-development and Methodology Guide.* Ann Arbor, USA: The University of Michigan Press.

Huda, N. 2004. *Peningkatan Penguasaan Bahasa Inggris untuk Menghadapi Globalisasi [Improving English Mastery to Face Globalization].* Kumpulan Artikel: Lustrum ke-10 Universitas Negeri Malang. Malang: Universitas Negeri Malang.

Kalesu, A. 2005. *Implementing the Process Writing Approach to Develop the Writing Ability of the Third Year Students of SMP 9 Palu.* Unpublished Thesis. Malang: Graduate Program State University of Malang.

Koshy, V. 2007. *Action Research for Improving Practice: A Practical Guide.* London: Paul Chapman Publishing.

Nunan, D. 1999. *Second Language Teaching and Learning.* Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Raimes, A. 1983. *Techniques in Teaching Writing.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Seow, Anthony.2001. The Writing Process and Process Writing. In J.C. Richards & W.A. Renandya,. 2001. *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smalley, R.L., Ruetten, M.K., & Kozyrev, J.R. 2001. *Refining Composition Skills: Rhetoric and Grammar. (5th Ed).* Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Weigle, Sara Cushing. (2002). *Assessing writing.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Widiati, U & Cahyono, B.Y. 2006. The Teaching of EFL Writing in the Indonesian Context: The State of the Art. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, 13(3): 139-150.

Widiati, U. 2004. *Approaches to Teaching Writing in the ESL Context.* Kumpulan Artikel: Lustrum ke-10 Universitas Negeri Malang. Malang: Universitas Negeri Malang.