# Reading, Responding, and Writing Model to Teach Writing Hortatory Exposition Text in Bahasa Indonesian

**Asep Nurjamin[a*], Yustika Nur Fajriah[b], Lucky Rahayu Nurjamin[c],**
[a,b,c]Institut Pendidikan Indonesia Garut, Email: [a*]asep5nurjamin@gmail.com

The senior high school students' ability in writing Bahasa Indonesia, especially writing hortatory exposition text, is still categorised as low. In accordance with the solution for the issue, Genre-based approach (GBA) in terms of reading, responding and writing (2RW) model would be applied. A mixed-method in terms of quasi-experiment and descriptive study related to content analysis was employed. Quasi-experimental was utilised to examine the effectiveness of 2RW usage in teaching writing hortatory exposition text. Hence, the qualitative research design in the form of descriptive analysis was utilised to analyse the students' writing improvement instigated by the use of the 2RW model in three different school locations; rural, half, and urban areas. Moreover, this study reveals that 1) the 2RW model is categorised as effective model in teaching writing hortatory exposition text since the students' score is growing in a post-test, 2) based on the learning output, 2RW is more effectively used in urban area since the highest scores are gained in that site and 3) the genre shows the improvements of students' capacity used in their texts involving generic structure and linguistic features of hortatory exposition (see Gerot & Wignel, 1994; Derewianka, 1997; Emilia, 2011).

**Key words:** *Reading, responding, writing (2RW), Genre-based approach, hortatory exposition text.*

## Introduction

Writing is categorised as a hard skill to master since Westwood (2008), Lindastorm (2007), dan Sturm and Kopenhapper (2000) stated that writing is the complex skill that needs three aspects; cognitive, linguistics, and psychomotor. Indisputably, a number of studies in Indonesia find students have great difficulty in writing. Ristianingsih (2012) found two difficulties caught by Indonesian students; intrinsic and extrinsic factors. As the main concern, the intrinsic factor,

Nurjamin & Fajriah (2014) revealed that 73% of Indonesian senior high schoolers major difficulty is in choosing and developing the idea into a written form.

Choosing and developing the idea, particularly expressing the idea, are the common problem that is faced by students. It is supported by Alwasilah (2007), Richard dan Renandya (2013), Heong (2013), and Alwasilah and Alwasilah (2013) that expressing the idea into written form is relatively trickier than presenting an idea orally especially since the difficulties in writing are not only on how to express the idea but also how readers understand the idea. This means the writer needs to put the target reader who may have different background knowledge into account.

Concerning the phenomenon above, some difficulties are triggered by many factors, one of them is the learning model given to the students in supporting choosing and developing their ideas. In relation to this, the Genre-based approach (GBA) has become a trend in teaching writing in many countries. For instance, GBA has been effectively utilised in one of the universities in Vietnam (Luu, 2011) and Thailand (Payaprom, 2012), in one senior high school in Saudi Arabia (Elashri, 2013), and one junior high school in Indonesia (Ramadhani, 2014).

In this study, GBA has been built to become the *Reading, Responding, and Writing* (2RW) model. This model is assumed as an alternative model to overcome the problem in writing. In this teaching model, the students are guided to have reading activity, and then they are invited to response the text they read in terms of giving an opinion, critic, or suggestion which is followed by writing or expressing their response into written form as the goal of this model.

One genre that is prevalently utilised to express ideas or responses is hortatory exposition. This text is categorised as Genre which provides the language acquisition process by involving such ability; giving a strong opinion, criticising, evaluating and persuading (Knapp & Watkins, 2005; Alwasilah dan Alwasilah, 2013). By this text, students are directed to respond to one phenomenon that happened. Students' response is led to be connected to their background knowledge which is based on the evidence and ended by suggestion as to the solution to the issue.

In response, the application of the model is quite categorised as new to be used in Bahasa Indonesia teaching and learning process. Thus, following the explanation above, this study was experimented with the effectiveness of Reading, Responding, and Writing (2RW) model in writing hortatory exposition text of Bahasa Indonesia in Senior High School Level.

**Method**

Both quantitative and qualitative method was utilised in the in the form of this case study to gain the data. More specifically, quasi-experimental design was used to examine whether 2RW is effective to teach hortatory exposition in Bahasa Indonesia. Additionally, a case study was

chosen to investigate the improvement resulted from 2RW model in students' hortatory exposition. This study is categorised as a case study since the study took place in a natural setting (see Creswell, 2010), the data were analysed in descriptive approach (see Grimes and Shchulz, 2002), and the study was conducted in a small case (see Bogdan & Biklen, 1992).

In this study, 40 students served as the sample. Moreover, six students served as the focus participants which were purposively selected based on the level of achievement in the pre-test result.

To collect the data, observation, tests, and semi-structured interview was undertaken in this study. In observation, the data was collected through field-notes and a observation checklist in which the researcher acted as a participant-observer. Additionally, the tests were done twice; in either pre-test and post-test. In the tests, students were asked to construct a written hortatory exposition in Bahasa Indonesia with the theme of 'the centralisation of Indonesian education'. The semi-structured interview was undertaken to support the findings gained in the students' text.

Moreover, the data in this study were analysed using dependent t-test (SPSS) and genre analysis as adapted from Butt, Fahey, Feez, Spinks, and Yallop (2000), and Emilia (2011). Dependent t-test functioned to examine the effectiveness of 2RW statistically; meanwhile, genre analysis functioned to analyse the improvement of students in writing a hortatory exposition in terms of three aspects; social function, text organisation, and lexicogrammatical features of the text.

**Findings and Discussions**
*The effectiveness of 2RW model in teaching students' writing of hortatory exposition text in Bahasa Indonesia*

As the first findings, the data gained in this study show that GBA is effective to be used in teaching students' written text of hortatory exposition in Bahasa Indonesia. It is in line with the result of the statistical calculation using the t-test formula. Below is the visualisation of the data showing that GBA is effective to teach students' writing of hortatory exposition in Bahasa Indonesia.

Paired Samples Statistics

| | | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pair 1 | Pretest | 71.2375 | 40 | 4.88192 | .77190 |
| | Posttest | 79.5875 | 40 | 5.33360 | .84332 |

Paired Samples Test

| | Paired Differences | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | | T | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
| | Mean | | | Lower | Upper | | | |
| Pair 1 Pretest Posttest | -8.350000 | 5.415088 | .856200 | -10.081833 | -6.618177 | -9.7522 | 399 | .0000 |

From the tables above, it is shown that the values of pre-test and post-test is different. Specifically, the result shows that $t_{observed}$= -9.752 is lower than the critical value meaning that it lies out of the accepted area of $H_0$ ; therefore, $H_0$ is rejected and $H_a$ is accepted. By this, it can be concluded that there is a difference in the students' writing performance between their pre-test and post-test scores. Therefore, this hypothesis testing shows that genre-based approach is effective in teaching written hortatory exposition of Bahasa Indonesia.

Moreover, the details of the students' improvement in writing hortatory exposition will be discussed in the next section.

***The improvement of students' written text of hortatory exposition in Bahasa Indonesia***

| | AG (high achiever) | RH (high achiever) | MA (med-achiever) | DT (med-achiever) | SN (low achiever) | ZT (low achiever) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Pre-Post | Pre-Post | Pre-Post | Pre-Post | Pre-Post | Pre-Post |
| Social purpose | √-√ | √-√ | -√ | -√ | -√ | -√ |
| Text organization | | | | | | |
| 1. Thesis statement | √-√ | -√ | √-√ | -√ | -√ | -√ |
| 2. Arguments | √-√ | √-√ | √-√ | √-√ | √-√ | √-√ |
| 3. Suggestions | √-√ | √-√ | √-√ | √-√ | -√ | -√ |
| Linguistic features | | | | | | |
| 1. Lexical chain | √-√ | √-√ | √-√ | √-√ | √-√ | √-√ |
| 2. Passive voice | -√ | -√ | -√ | -√ | -√ | -√ |
| 3. Impersonal statement | -√ | √-√ | -√ | -√ | -√ | -√ |
| 4. Conjunction | √-√ | √-√ | √-√ | √-√ | √-√ | √-√ |
| 5. Mental process | √-√ | √-√ | √-√ | √-√ | √-√ | √-√ |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6. Modality | √-√ | √-√ | √-√ | √-√ | √-√ | √-√ |
| 7. Experts'opinion | -√ | -√ | -√ | -√ | -√ | -√ |
| 8. Evaluating statement | -√ | -√ | -√ | -√ | -√ | -√ |
| 9. General noun | √-√ | √-√ | √-√ | √-√ | √-√ | √-√ |

The data gained in this study indicate that there is a significant improvement, as shown in the students' hortatory exposition texts. First, students can illustrate the social function of their writing; to persuade audiences to do something. Secondly, students are also able to organise their text as indicated by the use of either thesis statements, arguments and suggestions. Thirdly, the improvement is confirmed by the lexicogrammatical features in their composition involving passive voice, conjunction, impersonal statements, experts' opinions, modality, etc. The further explanation about the improvement is provided below.

a. Social function

Related to this aspect, all six respondents were successful able to demonstrate the social function of the text with the topic '*sentralisasi pendidikan dalam kurikulum 2013* (educational centralisation in K-13)'. Two students wrote that they persuaded readers to support this system, while the others considered it in a different way of thinking. As an example, the first sight, AG clearly stated that the policymakers should obliterate this system because it could obstruct the teachers' creativity to design the classroom. In the last stage of his writing, he said, '*maka dari itu para pembuat kebijakan pendidikan sebaiknya menghentikan sistem sentralisasi karena itu jelas dapat mematikan kreatifitas guru dalam mengajar*'(policymakers should stop the centralisation system since it can subdue teachers' creativity in teaching). On the contrary, RH also could illustrate the social function of her text with her idea relating to the topic; to persuade readers to support this centralisation system as cited in her text, '*para guru sebaiknya mendukung penuh atas sistem sentralisasi ini karena mereka sangat terbantu untuk dapat mencapai target pengajaran* (every teacher should highly support the centralisation system since they were favoured in achieving the learning target)'.

b. Text organisation

The development of students' ability is reflected by the organisation of the texts in the post-test. As an instance, MA as a medium achiever, could not organise the text in the pre-test. More specifically, there are no thesis statements and strong arguments in her text. In contrast, her post-test shows a significant improvement in the way in which she wrote the thesis statements and the content supporting her argument. One example of her argument is '*adanya sentralisasi pendidikan justru bertentangan dengan nilai demokrasi yang selama ini kita junjung karena setiap daerah tidak mempunyai wewenang untuk menentukan komponen komponen apa yang menurut mereka cocok dan layak ada dalam kurikulum sekolah* (the centralisation contradicts the democratic values which are highly respected since not every remote area specifically has

a right to decide the specific needed components for being applied in curriculum (Ginanjar, 2012). It is far different from her argument in the pre-test stating that '*sentralisasi pendidikan akan merugikan pihak sekolah sekolah terutama yang berada di daerah'* (the educational centralisation will be detrimental to the school located in a remote area). Another evidence is about the recommendationto the last stage in the hortatory exposition. DT successfully wrote a suggestion in the last part of his writing; '*maka dari itu sentralisasi pendidikan harus segera dihentikan* (hence, the centralisation should be stopped)' Previously, he mentioned the suggestion in the first part of his writing without stating the issue as well as the thesis statement.

c. Linguistic Features

The data in this study reflect that students had advancement in putting the lexicogrammatical aspects in their hortatory exposition texts. As an illustration, a low achiever (SN) could show the enrichment of lexical chains related to the topic (syllabus, curriculum, teacher, autonomy, school, learning material, minimum criteria). This furtherance results because in the text produced in the pre-test, she only could mention three lexical chains (school, teacher, student). Additionally, another linguistic feature (passive voice) is also used by all participants in the post-test. As a specimen, ZT as a low achiever could compose three passive clauses in his text. One of them is '*kreatifitas para guru dapat diaktualisasikan dari bagaimana mereka mendesain pengajaran yang beragam* (the teachers' creativity can be actualised from the variance of their instructional designs)' Other elements like impersonal statements, modals, experts' opinions, material processes, and mental processes are also shown in the students' final texts. In other words, reading, responding and writing technique are able to help students in understanding the lexicogrammatical features of the test; in this case, hortatory exposition.

**Conclusion**

The main conclusion is that Reading, Responding, and Writing technique is effective for students in constructing hortatory exposition. It is reflected by the fulfilment of the criteria as a good hortatory exposition. As an additional conclusion, the ability to have effective reading and responding influences the process of writing. 2) Based on the learning output, 2RW is more effectively used in urban areas since this is where the highest scores are gained in that site and 3) the genre shows the improvements of students' capacity used in their texts involving generic structure and linguistic features of hortatory exposition (see Gerot & Wignel, 1994; Derewianka, 1997; Emilia, 2011).

# REFERENCES

Alwasilah, C. (2007). *Pokoknya Menulis*. Bandung: PT. Kiblat Buku Utama.

Boot, D., Fahey, R., Feez, S., & Sue Spinks, C. Y. (2000). *Using Functional Grammar.* Sydney: Macquarie.

Cresswell, J. W. (2010). *Educational Research.* New Jersey: Prantice Hall.

Caruso, D. and Weideborner, S. (1987). Reading, Responding, and Writing. New York: ST. Martin's Press.

Derewianka, B. (2004). *Exploring How Texts Work.* Victoria: McPherso'n printing group.

Derewianka, B. (2011). *A New Grammar Companion For Teachers*. New South Wales: PETA

Derewianka, B., & Jones, P. (2012). *Teaching Language in Context.* Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Elashri, I. (2013). *The Effect of GBA on Teaching Writing on EFL Secondary*. Manshoura University.

Emilia, E. (2011). *Pendekatan Genre Based Dalam Pengajaran Bahasa Inggris: Petunjuk Bagi Guru.* Bandung: Rizqi Press.

Feez, S. (1998a). *Text-based Syllabus Design.* Sydney: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research.

Gerot, L., & Wignell, P. (1994). *Making Sense of Functional Grammar.* Sidney: Gerd Stabler.

Harmer, J. (2007a). *The Practice of English Language Teaching.* Malaysia: Pearson Education.

Hyland, K. (2004). *Genre and Second Language Writing.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Luu, T. (2011). *Teaching Writing through GBA*. BELT Journal, Porto Alegre, V2.N2.p 121-136.

Knapp, P., & Watkins, M. (2005). *Genre, Text, and Grammar.* Sydney: UNSW Press Book.

McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (1989). *Research in Education.* London: Harpler Collins Publisher.

Nurjamin, L. R. & Fajriah, Y. N. (2014). *Students' Barrier in Writing of Analytical Exposition Text.* Harbon, Lesley (Ed.). Collaborative Research-Based Learning and Teaching to Foster Teacher Professional Development. Jakarta: Universitas Negeri Jakarta.

Payaprom, S. (2012). *The Impact of GBA on English Language: Teaching in an EFLTertiary Context*. (Thesis). (University of Wolonggong, Thailand).

Ramadhani, P. A. (2014). *Teaching Writing Multimodal Recount Text using GBA.* (S2 Thesis Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia).

Ristianingsih.(2012). Students' Problem in Writing. (S1, Thesis) STKIP Garut.

Tarigan, Henry Guntur. (2008). *Menulis Sebagai Suatu Keterampilan Berbahasa*. Bandung: Angkasa.

Thai, M. D. (2009). *Text-based language teaching.* St Cecil Hills: Mazmania Press.

Westwood, Peter S. (2008). *What Teacher need to know about Reading and writing difficulties*. Australia: ACER Press.