

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1. Background of Study

Writing is a complex task which requires the integration and application of multiple sub-skills operating at different processing (Cooker, 2007). Complex task means a complicated work which is difficult to understand. It is because writing involves many processes to produce a product of writing. Hidi and Boscolo (2006), these processes are classified as cognitive, meta-cognitive and linguistic processes which turn writing into a demanding type of task. Because of its complexity, many students have difficulty in writing which in turn leads them consider themselves as unsuccessful writers.

The Curriculum of Educational Stratified Level (Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan: KTSP) of Senior High School states that students of senior high school are expected to be able to write various genres such as narrative, descriptive, argumentative and expository writing (Depdiknas: 2006).

Unfortunately, Based on a research done by an undergraduate student (Marta, 2003), many students are less competent in writing. She has conducted a research entitled *The Students' Ability in Creating a Writing Composition* and the result showed that among 40 students, there were only 11 students (27. 9%) that could get good score in writing while the other 29 students (72. 5%) were unable to write well. It can be concluded that writing is one of the complicated skills for students. It was found out that teaching English hasn't been satisfied especially in

writing skill. The weakness of teaching writing is caused by many factors; one of them is the appropriate of methods used.

Silva (1993) concludes from his literature review in the area of L2 writing that although L1 and L2 writing show similarities in a broad sense, L2 composing is more constrained, more difficult, and less effective. L2 writers do less planning, have more difficulty with goal setting, organization, and generating ideas. Their texts are less fluent, less accurate, and less effective. This difference shows that L2 learners cannot effectively deal with the complex requirements of the writing process. Especially in EFL context, writing seems more challenging to the learners, who already feel the burden of expressing themselves in a foreign language, as they cannot interact with the language outside the school.

Graham and Harris (2005) assert that the most direct way to deal with this problem is to systematically teach children the tools they need to carry out the planning, revising, and other writing processes essential for effective writing. Graham and his colleagues developed instructional models to meet the needs of struggling writers and they put forward self-control strategy training model in 1985. Later they developed their model as self-instructional strategy training. Later they developed their model as self-instructional strategy training in 1987, and then self-regulated strategy development (SRSD) in 1992. Self-Regulated Strategy Development (SRSD) is a flexible instructional model used to teach writing strategies and a variety of self-regulation techniques (e.g., goal 4 setting, progress monitoring, self-instructions, self-statements) (Graham and Harris,2005).

Since 1992, this model has been tested in over 40 instructional writing studies as well as in other academic areas (Graham and Harris 2005).

“PLEASE” strategy is one of the strategies suggested to be taught through SRSD model. The “PLEASE” strategy was developed to address specific difficulties in paragraph writing which are mostly related to prewriting planning, composition, and paragraph revision. The “PLEASE” is a strategy that provides learners with a road map for writing a paragraph. It reminds learners to carry out several steps for writing paragraphs (Graham and Harris, 2007). The first step of the “PLEASE” strategy, “P”, stands for the action “PICK”. At this step students learn to Pick their topic, Pick their audience and, Pick the type of the paragraph. The second letter, “L”, refers to “LIST”. Students are taught various techniques for idea generation about the topic before starting to write. The third step of the strategy, “E”, represents “EVALUATE” for ongoing evaluation of the process. At this stage, students are taught to check if their list is complete and how they can organize their notes. The forth step, “A”, reminds students “ACTIVATE” their paragraph with a topic sentence. Students are taught how to write a precise and effective introductory sentence. The fifth step, “S”, cues students to SUPPLY supporting ideas for their paragraphs based on the list that they have generated for the second step. The final letter, “E”, reminds students to END with a concluding sentence and EVALUATE their work (Graham and Harris 2007)

The other strategy is PMI, it stands for 'Plus/Minus/Interesting'. PMI was codified by Edward de Bono. This strategy encourages students to extend their thinking by making an effort to find the positive points (P), negative points (M)

and interesting points (I) of an idea, concept, view or product. It can be used at the beginning, during or after a lesson or activity. It helps students to see both sides of an argument, view things from a different point of view, think broadly about an idea and make informed decisions.

P-M-I works well for composition and analysis, but can also be powerful as a tool for character education experiences. These devices can teach students how to make healthy decisions regarding diet, behavior or misbehavior, exercise, drug abuse, smoking, peer pressure, and sexual behavior (Wormeli, 2005). The teacher can begin the class by applying PMI to frame their prior knowledge and the result of discussion. Finally, they can write by emphasizing both positive and negative point of view. Yet, the success of students' writing achievement does not only depend on the teaching strategies used, but also depend on students' self efficacy. (Multon, Brown, and Lent 1991) said that Self efficacy related to academic outcomes ( $r = .38$ ) and accounted for approximately 14% of variance. Effects were stronger for high school and college students than for elementary students. Effect sizes also depended on characteristics of studies, such as the type of self efficacy and performance measure used. Strong effects were obtained by researchers who compared specific efficacy judgments with cognitive skills measure of performance or classroom based indexes such as grades with global, standard achievement tests. Effect sizes also were stronger in studies in which researchers developed highly concordance performance indexes and administered them at the same time.

Bandura (1997) describe a required, non-majors' physics course where the effects of different teaching methods on the classroom climate and self-efficacy were measured. The students' response indicated that a question and answer format, inquiry-based lab activities and conceptual (rather than quantitative) problems had a significant effect on creating a positive climate in the classroom.

Based on the gap between the expectation and the reality and also the explanation of some theories above, there is an interest to conduct a research on the effect of the teaching strategies and students' self efficacy on the students' achievement in writing.

## **1.2. The Problems of the Study**

The problems of the study are formulated as follows:

1. Do PLEASE and PMI strategies significantly affect students' achievement in writing argumentative?
2. Does students' self efficacy significantly affect students' achievement in writing argumentative?
3. Do PLEASE and PMI strategies and self efficacy have an interaction effect on the students' achievement in argumentative writing?

## **1.3. The Objectives of the Study**

In line with the research problem formulated above, the objectives of the study are described as follows:

1. To find out whether PLEASE and PMI strategies significantly affect students' achievement in writing argumentative.
2. To find out whether personality significantly affect students' achievement in writing argumentative.
3. To investigate whether PLEASE and PMI strategies and self efficacy have significantly interactive effect on the students' achievement in argumentative writing.

#### **1.4. The Scope of the Study**

The teaching techniques studied here are limited to PLEASE and PMI strategies on students' achievement in writing argumentative. There are the stages of the writing process, namely prewriting, drafting, revising, editing and proofreading, publishing and presenting. This study is limited to the writing process stage of prewriting. This study is also limited to the affect of students' self efficacy on students' writing achievement. There are 5 writing genres, namely expository, narrative, descriptive, persuasive, and argumentative writing and this study is limited to argumentative writing.

#### **1.5. The Significances of the Study**

The findings of the study are expected to be useful theoretically and practically.

Theoretically:

1. To enrich the science specifically related to English teaching strategy in University level
2. To be the input for the teachers and educational institutions in considering the dynamic students' needs,
3. To give a lot of positive contribution to the improvement of teachers professionalism and the educational institutions and other researchers who want to discover an in-depth research as the follow –up of the result of applying the teaching techniques.

Practically:

1. To assist the English teachers in their attempts to improve students' argumentative writing,
2. To help the students to meet the curriculum standard and to be more enjoyable when argumentative writing process,
3. For the English teachers as one of alternative techniques when teaching argumentative writing.