

# THE EFFECT OF *TALK FOR WRITING* IN TEACHING WRITING A HORTATORY EXPOSITION TEXT TOWARD STUDENTS' WRITING ACHIEVEMENT AT SMAN 1 PADANG

Ziamalina<sup>1</sup>, Yenni Rozimela<sup>2</sup>, Refnaldi<sup>3</sup>  
English Department  
FBS State University of Padang  
email: hannalast17@gmail.com

## Abstrak

Tujuan penelitian ini adalah untuk melihat pengaruh penggunaan *Talk for Writing* dalam pengajaran menulis *hortatory exposition text* terhadap hasil menulis siswa kelas XI SMAN 1 Padang. Jenis penelitian ini adalah eksperimen dengan populasinya yaitu kelas XI IPA SMAN 1 Padang tahun pelajaran 2012/2013. Sampel penelitiannya yaitu kelas XI IPA 3 sebagai kelas kontrol dan kelas XI IPA 6 sebagai kelas eksperimen. Instrumen yang digunakan adalah *writing essay test*. Nilai tes dianalisa dengan hasil *t-hitung* (1.17) lebih kecil dari nilai *t-tabel* (1.679). Sehingga disimpulkan bahwa penggunaan *Talk for Writing* tidak memberikan dampak yang signifikan terhadap hasil menulis siswa.

Key words: Teaching writing, *Talk for Writing*, Writing achievement.

## A. Introduction

The secondary school of Indonesian curriculum (Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan) expects the students to be able to communicate with English in spoken and in written form. As a result, Genre-based approach is thought to be appropriate in teaching English recently because there are two cycles of learning in this approach to come to a sufficient capability in English i.e. oral and written cycles. The written cycle, a learner should go through four phases of activities. The four phases are planning, drafting, revising, and editing. They are thought to have involved all the students' potential in achieving sufficient writing ability. At the end of the written cycle, a learner is expected to have the skill to express his/her ideas into written form.

However, the ability in expressing ideas into written form for foreign learners is still low. This assumption was based on the result of preliminary study at XI IPA 2 and XI IPA 5 SMA Negeri 1 Padang, from 23 papers of students' writing

---

<sup>1</sup> Student of English Language Teaching Program of FBS UNP graduated on September 2013

<sup>2</sup> Advisor, Lecturer in Faculty of Languages and Arts, State University of Padang

<sup>3</sup> Co-Advisor, Lecturer in Faculty of Languages and Arts, State University of Padang

an analytical exposition text which was used as preliminary data found that there was 78,26 % students got score lower than 70. The causes of that problem were indicated from students' side and teacher's side. The causes from students' side: (1) the students were lack of ideas; (2) they were unable to organize their ideas and compose it from sentences into paragraph; (3) they also confuse about sentence orders, and lack of vocabularies. Furthermore, the causes from the teacher's side was the used of conventional writing strategy.

Based on the problem and causes of the problem above, *Talk for Writing* was introduced as one of the solutions in increasing students' writing skill. Corbett (2008:3) mentions that it uses talk activities to support writing. Moreover, *Talk for Writing* was developed around certain key strategies, they are (a) *Book-talk*, the extended opportunity to use *talk* to explore students' personal and collective response to a text as a reader; (b) *Writer-talk*, the articulation of the thinking and creative process involved in all stages of the act of writing (talk helps students to think and behave like a writer); (c) *Learning and Remembering Text*, the opportunity to learn and repeat of oral text, building students' confidence to develop them through telling the ideas and then extending that development into writing, later creating 'new' text orally as a preparation and rehearsal for writing (Corbett, 2008:6).

Related to writing, many experts propose the concept of writing in different ways, but the ideas refer to the same concept. Kimbell-Lopez (1999:12) mentions that writing is a way to understand what we are thinking. Besides, Brown (2001:335) assumes that writing is simply the graphic representation of speaking. Moreover, Nunan (2003:88) says that thinking about how to express ideas, and organizing them into statements and paragraph is writing. Additionally, Nation (2009:113) defines that writing is a useful activity that can be prepared for by work in the other skills of listening, speaking and reading. Based on that point of view, it can be said that writing is the representation of speaking, inventing something to write, think about the topic and organizing it into statements.

There are some ways in inventing ideas; one of them is through talking activities such as discussing, negotiating meaning with others and sharing knowledge. This step can be done orally. It means that through talking and sharing activities the writer can generate their ideas. Weigle (2002:15) says that writing is basically a reflection of spoken language. As the other productive skill, speaking takes the biggest influence in writing, as Donald Rubin (in Weissberg, 2009:4) makes a case for talk as a key element in learning to be literate.

Based on the explanation above, it can be concluded that writing is a mental work of inventing ideas, thinking about how to express them, and organizing them into sentences and paragraphs. There are some ways in inventing ideas; one of them is through talking activity, those activities supports writing.

In teaching English for senior high school students, it must be based on curriculum. The recent Indonesian curriculum which is used at school as the guideline to conduct teaching and learning of English is the curriculum of KTSP

or *Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan*. The curriculum has four skills; they are listening, speaking, writing, and writing. Each competence standard of each skill is provided with basic competencies.

The purpose of teaching writing is based on the basic competence. The basic competence of writing for the second semester of the second year students are: (12.1) express meaning in short functional written text using a variety of written language accurately, fluently and acceptable in the context of daily life, and (12.2) express meaning and rhetorical of written text accurately, fluently, and acceptable in daily context to gain knowledge in narrative, spoof, and hortatory exposition text (Depdiknas: 2006).

There are two kinds of exposition text, analytical and hortatory. Hortatory is written to persuade the writers. It is about the matter which the writers believe as the important thing. Hortatory exposition was accomplished with certain recommendation which should or should not be done. Gerot and Wignell (1994:209) supports that the social function of hortatory exposition text is to persuade the reader that something should or should not be the case. Hartono (2005:6) also says that hortatory exposition text is a factual genre which social function is to persuade reader or listener that something should or should not be the case.

*Talk for Writing* is a set of talking strategies in developing students' writing skill. Palmer (2003:16) mentions that *talk for writing* is one of the processes in cross curricular writing where the students are given opportunities to hear the appropriate forms of language and to articulate those forms for themselves. Moreover, on his booklet, Corbett (2008:2) introduced *Talk for Writing* as an approach in teaching writing through series of workshops in the South West, East and East Midlands regions in 2007/8. He defines that *Talk for Writing* is "the developmental exploration, through talk, of the thinking and creative processes involved in being a writer." It means that in the process of writing, talking is a creative process of thinking and developing ideas to support writing. Moreover, *Talk for Writing* was developed around certain key strategies, they are (a) *Book-talk*, the extended opportunity to use *talk* to explore students' personal and collective response to a text as a reader; (b) *Writer-talk*, the articulation of the thinking and creative process involved in all stages of the act of writing (talk helps students to think and behave like a writer); (c) *Learning and Remembering Text*, the opportunity to learn and repeat of oral text, building students' confidence to develop them through telling the ideas and then extending that development into writing, later creating 'new' text orally as a preparation and rehearsal for writing (Corbett, 2008:6). Further, Weissberg (2009:9) believes that by using spoken language to discuss with others, the writers are bootstrapping themselves toward higher levels of writing skill.

There are several procedures of using *Talk for Writing* in class. Corbert (2008:5) mentions that there are several procedures for teaching writing by using *Talk for Writing*. (1) The teacher explains the concept of *Talk for Writing*. (2) The

teacher shows the students a media (video or picture) to build knowledge. (3) Teacher gives a model of hortatory exposition text. (4) The teacher asks students to read the text aloud. (5) The teacher asks students to analyze the text by having whole class talking activities (Book-Talk and Writer-Talk) to familiarize with the text structures. (6) The teacher guide the students to the new topic by having Learning and remembering text (imitation, innovation, and invention).

Based on the explanation above, the purpose of this research was to find out whether teaching writing a hortatory exposition text to senior high school students by using *Talk for Writing* give significant result toward student's writing achievement or not. This research applied in second grade students who learn hortatory exposition text at January-June semester academic year 2012/2013.

## **B. The Research Method**

The design of this research was *Experimental Research* because it tested the effect of *Talk for Writing* in teaching writing a hortatory exposition text toward students' writing achievement. It was Quasi-Experimental research, this design was used because if randomly assigns the students to classes, it would disrupt classroom learning.

This research used *Posttest-only Design* because this research only sees whether there is an effect of the treatment in experimental group or not, and the posttest score then compared with the control group to see the effect. The population of this research was the second grade students of XI IPA at SMAN 1 Padang and the sample were 56 students who registered in two classes were XI IPA 3 as control class and XI IPA 6 as experimental class. The instrumentation of this research was essay writing test which consist of one topic followed by the description of situation that help the students to figure out their position as writer and who are the target reader, and the time around 90 minutes.

The researcher used *content validity* to measure validity and *inter-rater reliability* to measure the reliability of the test. The procedure of this research is the experimental class was taught by using *Talk for Writing* in whilst-teaching. Meanwhile, control class was taught by using conventional writing.

## **C. Discussions**

The recapitulation of the students' posttest scores in the experimental and control class.

**Table 1. Recapitulation of the Students' Posttest Scores in Both Experimental and Control class**

	Experimental class	Control class
<b>Number of students</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>23</b>
Mean	74	69.73
Standard Deviation	12.7	12.3
Variance	160.957	152.111
Max	95	90
Min	50	50
Sum	1776	1604
	$t_{value} = 1.17$	
	$t_{table} = 1.679$	
	$P_{value} = 0.125$	

From the table above, the mean scores of the experimental class were 74 while the mean scores of the control class were 69.7. It can be said that both classes are different. However, the *t-test* analysis found that the result of P-Value (0.125) was greater than 0.05, or the *t-value* (1.17) is lower than *t-table* (1.679). The findings showed that 33.3% students in experimental group get scores below 60, and 43.5% students in control group. The difference was around 10%, it means that students' writing ability in both group was not significantly different. That is why the analysis of students writing test score did not give significant result.

The unexpected result of this study was caused by the meeting in this research was fewer than 12 meetings, and the researcher could not treat the students maximally. However, the data indicate that the two groups have different writing ability as reflected by the mean of scores. The experimental group was taught by using *Talk for Writing* in teaching writing a hortatory exposition text, while control group was taught by conventional writing. This affirms that *Talk for Writing* in whilst-writing, based on Corbett action research (2008), can help students to gain more ideas and information related to the topic. It is relevant with Chen's research (2011), he found that students had more opportunities to practice, they could develop a more sophisticated understanding of argumentation by using talk and writing as learning tools to negotiate their ideas with peers. However, the result of data analysis by using *t-test* showed that the differences of scores between control and experimental groups were not significantly different.

Generally, the ideas of the students were well developed in their essay. However, their language control still poor; consequently, their essay was not coherence and unite. It still found many ideas in one paragraph. Nation (2009:119) mentions that learners' difficulty in writing is in putting their ideas

into written form. The lack of fluency in turning ideas to text is caused by the difference between the writing systems of the learners' first language and foreign language.

There were found a couple of weaknesses after conducting the research. The main weakness was in scoring students' writing test. The students' writing was analyzed by three facet of scoring: rhetorical, main idea/ opinion, and language control. It is expected that there are three scores for each students given by each raters. However, even though there were two raters involving in scoring the test, but the researcher only get single score. It was caused by misunderstanding between the raters and the researcher who did not give rater training before assessing students' essay. This situation made the researcher could not able to analyze how well the students in expressing ideas, write in good rhetorical features, and analyzed their language control.

Besides, in the implementation of the strategy, this research time was not effective because it began a month before final semester examination, so that the meeting was fewer than 12 meetings, this condition affect the result of the research. Then, it seemed to influence the students' motivation because they had to learn hortatory exposition text again. Besides, they had to prepare drama performance as final project at the end of semester, so that they were not interested in writing and mostly focused on drama performance. So, the result might not be as good as expected. Moreover, fewer students participated during talking activities. Only few of students shared their ideas and argued the opinion given by friends and teacher. It was the same with those in the control group. This may be due to the fact that the researcher was not their real teacher. This also could have affected the results.

#### **D. Conclusions and Suggestions**

Based on research findings, it can be conclude that teaching writing a hortatory exposition text by using *Talk for Writing* does not give significant result toward students' writing achievement at the second grade of SMAN 1 Padang registered in 2012/2013 academic year. From that result, it was caused by a couple of problems. First, the research time was not effective to conduct a research because it began a month before school final semester examination. It seemed to influences students' motivation because they had to learn 'again' about hortatory exposition text. Second, there were fewer students were participated during learning process. This may be due to the fact that the researcher was not their real teacher. The last, even though there were two raters involving in scoring the test, but the researcher only get single score. This situation made the researcher could not able to analyze students' writing in detail.

Based on the research findings, discussions, and limitation of the research, the researcher gives numbers of suggestions: (1) For the next researchers, it is expected to have more meetings to apply *Talk for Writing* in order to get the data

and to see the improvement of students' writing achievement maximally. Furthermore, try to apply *Talk for Writing* not only for teaching hortatory exposition text, but also for teaching analytical exposition and other kinds of text. To get maximal research finding, try to do research at the beginning of school learning process. Thus, the research will be optimal and the students' not lack of interest and motivation because of reviewing the lesson. Besides, train the raters before assessing students' writing by using scoring rubric, so that the data will get more detail. (2) For the teacher or the researcher, it is suggested to communicate the new strategy clearly to the students in order to create effective teaching and learning process. Besides, motivate them to participate in learning process actively to get effective result, and manage the class by having well preparation before teaching.

**Note:** This article is created based on writer thesis with Advisor I Dra. Yenni Rozimela, M.Ed, Ph.d and Advisor II Dr. Refnaldi, M.Litt.

### **Bibliography**

- Brown, H. D. 2001. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy, Second Edition*. New York: Longman.
- Corbett, Pie. 2008. *Talk for Writing*. UK: Department for Children, School, and Families.
- Creswell, John W. 2012. *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. Boston: Pearson.
- Depdiknas. 2006. *Kurikulum 2006: Standar Kompetensi Mata Pelajaran Bahasa Inggris Sekolah Menengah Pertama*. Jakarta: Pusat Kurikulum Balitbang Depdiknas.
- Gerot, L. and Wignell, P. 1994. *Making sense of Functional Grammar*. Australia: Gerd Stabler, AEE Publishers.
- Hartono, Rudi. 2005. *Genres of texts*. Published article: English Department Faculty of Language and Art, Semarang State University.
- Kimbell-Lopez, Kimberly. 1999. *Connecting with Traditional Literature*. Needham Heights: Allyn&Bacon.
- Nation, I. S. P. 2009. *Teaching ESL/EFL Reading and Writing*. New York: Routledge.

Nunan, David. 2003. *Practical English Language Teaching*. New York: McGrawHill.

Palmer, Sue. 2003. *How to teach writing across the curriculum at key stage 1*. New York: David Fulton Publisher.

Seliger, Herbert W & Elana Shohamy. 1989. *Second Language Research Methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Weigle, Sara Cushing. 2002. *Assessing Writing*. UK: Cambridge University Press.

Weisberg, Robert. 2009. *Connecting Speaking & Writing in Second Language Writing Instruction*. Michigan: Michigan Press.

