

## DEVELOPING STUDENTS' WRITING ABILITY OF STAIN KEDIRI THROUGH SCAFFOLDING STRATEGY IN THE PROCESS OF WRITING

Ary Setya Budhi Ningrum  
*STAIN Kediri, East Java*

**Abstract:** The aim of this study was to develop the students' writing ability by using scaffolding strategy in the process of writing at State College for Islamic Studies (STAIN) Kediri. This study employed a Classroom Action Research (CAR) as its methodology. All of students that belong to class A writing 2 academic year 2010/2011 were taken as the subjects of this study. There were three criteria of success offered to be achieved in this study. The implementation of scaffolding strategy in the process of writing showed that the students' writing ability improved significantly and the students were enthusiastic and motivated in the teaching and learning process.

**Keywords:** scaffolding strategy, writing process, Classroom action research

In the context of English as a Foreign Language (EFL), it has been widely claimed by most Indonesian learners across different levels of education that writing is a difficult skill to be learned. Hence, it is not surprising that a lot of studies have investigated efforts to help the learners develop their writing skill. Sriemulyaningsih (2010), for example, conducted her study to enhance the elementary school students' proficiency in writing. At the level of junior high school, some researchers such as Agustiningsih (2005), Astuti (2004), Eksan (2004), Kalesu (2005), Mochtar (2004), Suryadi (2006), and Sutikno (2004) have devoted their studies to help the junior high school students to improve their writing ability. Similarly at the level of senior high school, some studies were conducted by, for instance, Miftah (2009), Nirwani (2007), and Wilujeng (2005) to assist the students in developing their writing skill as well. Likewise, at the university level, Attamim (2007), Mukminatien, (1991), Sabarun (2006), and Widiati (2005), for instance, had also conducted their studies to aid students in gaining better skills in writing.

Writing is one of the basic language skills that should be mastered by English department students. By mastering this skill, they are expected to be able to express their feelings, thoughts, and ideas in written form. Writing, however, is considered as the most difficult skill to be mastered. In EFL context, it is believed that developing writing skills is more complicated than developing other language skills (Muth'im, 2010; Widiati and Cahyono, 2006; Richards,

1990). It is so because in writing a single piece of written communication requires the writer's ability to use not only his linguistic competence but also his communicative competence (Mukminatien, 1997).

Writing needs time, thought, and many conscious choices to move from one first conception to public document. Writing can be extremely frustrating as writers try to turn vague ideas into a full statement that they want it to mean a completed statement, they may doubt that they have anything to say, but they will find that they are frequently mistaken. Besides, according to Dixon and Denise (1983) conveying meaning through writing requires more effort than recognizing meaning through other skills. Deciding what to say, a writer must follow the conventions of writing that will make the message understandable to others.

Therefore, most of the students always face some problems in writing. The most serious problems arise when the students try to transform a native language sentence word for word into a foreign language equivalent (Allan & Valette, 1997). Moreover, Kharma (1986) asserts that such a student suffers not only from ignorance of the rhetorical principles that underlie English discourse, but also from a deficiency in the following areas: (a) the ability to write the long sentences that require various coordinating and sub-ordinating tools, and (b) knowledge of the meaning and proper use of linking devices, especially those needed to establish inter-sentential relationship. Research done by Riyanto (2001) also provides the evidence that the students' writing ability is still far from the target expected and the most of the students' problems in writing are due to some factors: the lack of vocabulary, lack of understanding of English grammar, and the lack of practice.

The students of English Study Program of State College for Islamic Studies (STAIN) Kediri also faced the problems above. In this program, writing is one of the basic obligatory courses and the facts prove that students' writing achievements are not satisfactory. Most students have complaints and still find difficulties in writing. They still have poor ability to write in English. They had no skill in exploring ideas for writing, selecting relevant ideas for writing, and ordering ideas to make an outline of their topic, writing a rough draft, which focus on content and meaning, as a development of their outline, revising draft for content clarity of meaning, and editing draft for mechanical concerns.

The problems faced by the students above are not solely caused by the inability of the students in writing, but also caused by the inappropriate strategy used by the teacher in teaching and learning writing. Based on the preliminary study conducted in writing class of STAIN Kediri, the practice of teaching writing is a product-oriented approach, in which the teacher just waits for the students' product without guiding them how to finish the writing process. The teacher just demands the product or result of students' writing which must be correct, accurate and coherent.

Based on the unsatisfactory condition of teaching and learning writing above, the researcher wants to find a solution to overcome the problems through an appropriate strategy that can guide students as much as possible in the writing process. The strategy that the researcher wants to implement is a scaffolding in the writing process. The writing process refers to everything a

writer does from the moment he or she starts thinking about what to write until the final copy is completed (Goffman & Berkowitz, 1990). Meanwhile, scaffolding is a practice based on Vygotsky's concept of assisted learning (Slavin, 1994). It is a strategy in which a student at the beginning of learning is given a great deal of support by modeled and coached to perform a specific task in each stage of process of writing; gradually, this support is taken away to allow students to try their independence. Scaffolding strategy in the process of writing is an alternative strategy to improve the low motivated students' ability in writing. The scaffolding or support given to the students in the writing process varies based on the students' level and their needs.

In the light of theoretical review above, the researcher believes that the quality of the students' writing will improve rapidly by employing scaffolding strategy in process of writing approach. It is so since this strategy enables to equip the students with early and continued writing experience from the initial to the final stages of writing. Thus, the researcher wants to carry out the scaffolding strategy in the process of writing to improve the students' ability of STAIN Kediri in writing a contrast and comparison essay.

## **RESEARCH PROBLEM**

Based on the background above, the problem in this study is formulated as follows: "How is the students' ability in writing a contrast and comparison essay improved by using the scaffolding strategy in the writing process?" This main problem is specified as follows:

1. To what extent is the students' activeness on the process of teaching writing using scaffolding strategy in writing process?
2. To what extent is the improvement of the students' ability in the writing process stages (such as getting the ideas, making an outline, rough drafts, revised drafts, and edited drafts)?
3. To what extent is the success of the students' product in components of writing (content, organization, and grammar)?

## **REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

### **The Scaffolding Strategy**

Scaffolding is a practice based on Vygotsky's concept of assisted learning (Slavin, 1994:231). The Vygotsky's concept of scaffolding is similar with Bruner's scaffolding concept. Bruner (in Arends, 2001:335) states that scaffolding is the process in which a learner is helped to master a particular problem beyond his or her own capacity through the assistance (scaffolding) of a teacher or more accomplished person. According to Fitzgerald and Graves (2005:6), "Scaffolding is a temporary and supportive structure that helps a student or group of students accomplish a task they could not accomplish-or accomplish as well-without the scaffold". Scaffolded instruction is a concept that has grown out of research on how individuals learn.

The concept of support in scaffolded instruction is much broader than the modeling and teaching of strategies and skills; this is only one part of the scaffolding process. Providing support takes place in a number of ways:

- the way in which the selections are organized in a theme,

- the amount of prior knowledge activation that is provided,
- the way in which the literature is read by the students, and
- the types of responses students are encouraged to make.

It is a strategy in which a student at the beginning of learning is given a great deal of support by modeled and coached to perform a specific task in each stage of process of writing; gradually, this support is taken away to allow students to try their independence. If the students are unable to achieve independence, the teacher brings back the support system to help students experience success until they are able to achieve independence. This means that the scaffolding or support given to the students in the writing process varies based on the students' level and their needs.

The scaffolding has at least eight characteristics (McKenzie, 2010). First, scaffolding provides clear directions. This strategy offers step-by step directions to explain just what students must do in order to meet the expectation for the learning activity. Next, scaffolding clarifies purpose. It means that the scaffolded lesson aspires to meaning and worth. Each time of acting, it is in service to the thought process, the discovery of meaning and the development of insight. Third, scaffolding keeps students on task. It means that this strategy more than a matter of clear direction, but it provides a pathway or route for the learner's learning experience. Fourth, scaffolding offers assessment to clarify expectations. From the very start, scaffolded lessons provide examples of quality work done by others. Right from the beginning, students are shown rubrics and standards that define excellence. Fifth, scaffolding points students to worthy sources. Here the teacher provides the sources that have been selected by him, so the students will get the best sources. As consequence the students can reach the learning expectation. Sixth, scaffolding reduces uncertainty, surprise and disappointment. The operating design concept for scaffolded lesson is the "Teflon lesson" – no stick, no burn and no trouble. Teachers are expected to test each and every step in the lesson to see what might possibly go wrong. Once the lesson is ready for trial with students, the lesson is refined at least one more time based on the new insight gained by watching students actually try the activities. Seventh, scaffolding delivers efficiency. And the last is scaffolding creates momentum.

### **Scaffolding Strategy in the Process of Writing**

The appropriate model of the scaffolding strategy in the process of writing encompasses five major stages. First, the prewriting stage in which there are three strategies implemented namely, question-answer, clustering, and modeling. Second is the drafting stage. The scaffolding strategies in the drafting stage are modeling and the discussion about the model of a text. Third is the revising stage. The scaffolding strategies in the revising stage are by having one by one conference between teacher-student and by giving them revising guidelines. Fourth is the editing stage in which the scaffolding strategies implemented are by giving editing guidelines and doing peer-editing activity. Fifth, the publishing stage in which the scaffolding strategies implemented is displaying the final draft on the cardboard.

## **Previous Studies**

Concerning with teaching method in writing class, especially the use of the scaffolding strategy in the process of writing, Katilie (2003) has proved that the scaffolding strategy in the process of writing can improve the junior high school students' ability of SLTP Negeri 3 Tolitoli in writing descriptive paragraphs. Another study carried out by Ningrum (2007) revealed that using the scaffolding strategy in the process of writing enable to improve the students' writing ability of STAIN Tulungagung in writing expository essay as well as the students' motivation during the implementation of the strategy.

## **METHODS**

The design of this research was Classroom Action Research, since this research dealt with the teaching learning strategy to improve students' writing skill. Kemmis and Mc Taggart (1998) state that action research is trying out ideas in practice as a means of improvement and as a means of increasing knowledge about curriculum, teaching and learning. Furthermore, Sukidin (2002) states that the purpose of classroom action research is to improve the teaching learning process. In addition, Mc Niff (1998) explains that action research is seen as a way of characterizing a loose set of activities that are designed to improve the quality of education.

This research began by conducting a preliminary study which was intended to get the real condition about the teacher and students' problems in the process of teaching and learning. Based on the observation and interview, it was found that: (1) the strategy used by the teacher doesn't attract the students' interest in writing; (2) the students were not motivated to follow the writing class; and (3) the students of State College for Islamic Studies (STAIN) Kediri had a poor ability in writing a contrast and comparison essay in English.

This research was conducted in a form of cycles through some steps: (1) planning action, (2) implementing of action, (3) observing of action, and (4) analysis and reflecting.

### **Planning**

In the planning step, the researcher with the collaborative lecturer prepared the suitable model of lesson plan using scaffolding strategy in the process of writing, materials and media, observation checklist and criteria of success.

### ***Preparing the Lesson Plan***

The lesson plan contains the objectives that were expected to be achieved by the students and also the procedure of presenting the lesson in each meeting. In designing the lesson plan, the researcher discussed it with the collaborative lecturer.

The steps of teaching learning were designed as follows:

#### (1) Introduction

There were two points to be introduced in this session. First was the strategy that was applied in the classroom. Secondly was the theory about the organization of a contrast and comparison essay.

(2) Prewriting

In this stage, there were three activities implemented namely modeling, a discussion about the model of a text, and brainstorming ideas.

In modeling, there was an example essay to the students to be discussed and analyzed. In discussing and analyzing the example essay, there were some guiding questions focused on the organization of the example essay.

In brainstorming ideas, the teacher delivered warming up questions to lead the students to the topic of the lesson. It aimed at activating the students' background knowledge on the topic, so they were able to explore, selecting and, ordering the ideas. Then the teacher asked the students to find their friends who had the same topic and shared the information about the topic. Furthermore, the researcher required the students to do library research and browse Internet related to the topic. It was done to give them more information about the topic they had chosen.

(3) Drafting

The scaffolding activities in the drafting stage were making outline based on the information they got, then developing the outline into essay. Finishing making the outline they consulted their outline to the teacher to have some suggestions and comments by having one by one conference between teacher-student. Based on the teacher's feedback they revised their outline. Then they wrote a rough draft as a development of their outline. In writing their rough draft, the teacher encouraged them to write in double space in order to make it easier for revision and insertion later.

(4) Revising

In this stage, the students were expected to be able to revise their rough draft about the content of their essay. The scaffolding activities in the revising stage were by doing peer-correction and by giving them revising guidelines. Peer revising activity was done by exchanging their draft to each other. In doing peer-revising, the students were guided by a revising guideline. After having peer revising, the students revised their drafts as their friends suggested.

(5) Editing

In this stage, the students were expected to be able to edit their revised draft related to the correctness of grammar. There were two activities done by the students in this stage. First, they proofread their own draft using the editing guidelines. Next, they also exchanged their revised draft with their friends and read their partners' paper silently using the second editing guidelines.

Having done with the editing stage, the students submitted their final draft to the teacher to be bundled into bound book. Besides, the students also collected all of their works such as the outline, the rough draft, the revised draft, and edited draft as a portfolio.

### ***Preparing Instructional Materials and Media***

In selecting the instructional material and media, the researcher did discussion with the collaborative lecturer. The instructional materials were a contrast and comparison essay as a model and the questions related to the model essay as a facilitator to examine the organization of the essay.

We also prepared the revising guideline sheet for the students to check the organization of their essay after they finished their first draft. Moreover, we also prepared the editing guideline sheet for them to recheck their grammatical errors.

### ***Preparing the Instrument for Observation***

There were three instrument used in the study. They were observation checklist, the students' improvement sheet, and field notes. The observation checklist was used to check the students' activities when the model strategy applied. The students' improvements sheet was used to analyze the improvement of the students in each stage of writing process. Field notes were utilized as a means to note all facts, dealing with the implementation of the actions which couldn't be put in the observation checklist.

### ***Preparing the Criteria of Success***

The criteria of success were designed to assess the students' ability in producing a contrast and comparison essay through the stages of the writing process by scaffolding strategy. There were three criteria of success offered in this study. Hence, this study would be considered successful:

- (1) If most of students or at least 75% students were actively involved during the teaching and learning process.

The students' activities were analyzed through the result of observation checklist for students and the result of field notes. If the result showed that most of students were not active involved in the writing process, then the criterion was not met. However, if most of students or at least 75% students were actively in the writing process, then the criterion was met.

- (2) If most of the students or at least 75% of the students achieved good level at demonstrated competence in each stage of the process of writing.

This criterion was analyzed through the students' improvement in the process of writing observation sheet.

- (3) If most of the students or at least 75% of the students' writing products already achieve the good level of all the aspect (content, organization, grammar) in the scoring guide.

The result of the test will be analyzed using the analytical method.

### ***Implementing the Action***

There were two cycles had been implemented in this study. The first cycle was conducted in six meetings. The second cycle was conducted in three meetings. Each meeting was lasted for 90 minutes.

### ***Observation***

During this phase, the researcher became the teacher in class and the collaborator did monitoring the implementation of the action as previously planned and collecting the data. The data collection dealt with the students' activities and improvements while the scaffolding strategy in the process of writing was applied.

## Reflection

In this phase, the researcher and the collaborator analyzed the data collected from the instruments used and made reflection whether the scaffolding strategy in the process of writing implemented was appropriate and worked effectively to solve the problem corresponding to improve the students' ability in writing a contrast and comparison essay at STAIN Kediri.

In this phase, we did data analysis on the criteria of success that had been set up. There were three criteria of success and we analyzed them one by one.

### Blueprint of Data Analysis

No.	Criteria of Success	Data Sources	Instrument
1.	at least 75% of the students were actively in the writing process	The students' interaction among peers and teacher in teaching learning process	observation checklist
2.	at least 75% of the students achieved good level at demonstrated competence in each stage of the process of writing.	The record of students' competence in every stage process of writing	the process writing checklist and field notes
3.	at least 75% of the students' writing products already achieve the good level of all the aspect (content, organization, grammar)	The students' final writing draft	Scoring guide

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

This study was managed in two cycles. The first cycles was conducted in six meetings. Meanwhile, the second cycle was carried out in three meetings. The implementation of action plan and research findings was presented in each cycle.

### Cycle I

The detailed actions implemented in cycle I were depicted in the table below.

Meeting	Activity	Notes
1	Introducing the scaffolding strategy in the writing process	Actually this meeting was planned to cover two topics that was introducing the scaffolding strategy in the writing process and giving the theory of the organization of the contrast and comparison essay. However, in fact, this meeting only covered one topic discussion that was introducing the scaffolding strategy in the writing process since all of the students never knew before about that strategy and they delivered so many questions to get more explanation in detail about it. As a consequence, the time was up before the researcher gave explanation about the organization of a contrast and comparison



- 2 Giving the theory of the organization of the contrast and comparison essay
- essay. The theory about the organization of a contrast and comparison essay was continued on the next day.
- This activity should be done in the last meeting, but as the time was up last week during the teaching learning process, so the introduction activity was continued in the second meeting. As a consequence, the researcher and the collaborative lecturer did revision on the lesson plan since actually the second meeting was the time for prewriting stage.
- The researcher opened the class by delivering some questions to dig up the students' background knowledge about the contrast and comparison essay. First, the researcher asked them whether they knew what a contrast and comparison essay is and what the purpose of writing it. Some of the students gave various answers in different words, but actually they were in the same meaning.
- Having successfully activated the students' background knowledge, the researcher did review about the organization of essay generally. Then, she explained the organization of a contrast and comparison essay specifically by highlighting the characteristic of a contrast and comparison essay in their thesis statement, body, and conclusion.
- 3 Prewriting stage
- In the prewriting stage there were three activities implemented namely a modeling, a discussion about the model essay, and brainstorming ideas.
- The activities of modeling and a discussion about the model essay were done to make the students familiar with rhetorical of a contrast and comparison essay. In modeling activity, the lecturer distributed an example of contrast and comparison essay to the students entitled '*A Walk on Sunday Afternoon*'. The example essay was about the condition of two cities. They were Texas in USA and Morelia in Mexico. Then the activity was continued by having a discussion about the model essay. The discussion focused on analyzing the example essay through some guiding questions to be answered by the students. This is done to make the students familiar with the organization of the contrast and comparison essay.
- In brainstorming ideas the researcher delivered warming up questions to lead the students to

4	Drafting stage	<p>the topic of the lesson. It was aimed at activating the students' background knowledge on the topic, so they will be able to explore, selecting and, ordering the ideas. The topic for writing is free topic.</p> <p>In this stage, the students have one by one conference with the teacher for consulting their outline.</p> <p>After all of the students had consulted their outline, the researcher asked them to develop it into a rough draft. Further, she encouraged the students to write their rough draft in double spaces to make it easier for revisions and insertion later.</p>
5	Revising stage	<p>In this stage, the students were expected to be able to revise their rough draft about the content and the organization of their essay. The scaffolding activities in the revising stage were by doing peer-correction using the revising guidelines. Peer revising activity was done by exchanging their draft with each other. In doing peer-revising, the students were guided by a revising guideline provided by the teacher.</p>
6	Editing stage	<p>In this stage, the students were expected to be able to edit their draft for correctness in spelling, punctuation, grammar and capitalization. There were two activities done by the students in this stage. First, they proofread their own draft using the editing guidelines. Next, they also exchanged their revised draft with their friends and read their partners' paper silently using the second editing guidelines adopted from Betty Azar.</p> <p>Having done with the editing stage, the students submitted all of their works such as the outline, the rough draft, the revised draft, and edited draft as a portfolio.</p>

---

In order to know whether or not the implementation of the action plan in Cycle I 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' product writing (outline, rough draft, revised draft, and edited draft). The analysis was focused on the result of the teaching and learning process, the students' progress in the each stage of the writing process and the subjects' learning result in writing. The findings were described as follows:

#### ***Analysis on the Result of the Teaching and Learning Process***

The analysis of the results of the teaching and learning process was done based on the data collected from the observation checklist and the field notes. The analysis was concerned with the students' activities in every stage of writing

process using scaffolding strategy in the classroom. The result showed that most of the students were active involved in the writing process. It was proved by the result of the observation checklist that total point earned 82 out of 88 possible or 93.2% of the students were actively involved during teaching and learning process. Furthermore, the students felt more relax and happy during the process of teaching and learning when the researcher played on music from MP3.

### ***Analysis on the Subjects' Improvement in the Writing Process***

The analysis of the subjects' improvement in the writing process was done based on the data collected from the students' portfolios that consist of outline, a rough draft, revised draft, edited draft, and final draft. The analysis was concerned with the subjects' competence in every stage of writing process using scaffolding strategy.

The result of the observation on the subjects' improvement in the writing process in Cycle I could be seen in Table below.

<b>The result of The Subjects' Improvements in each stage in cycle I</b>					
<b>No</b>	<b>Stages</b>	<b>Demonstrated Competence</b>	<b>Level of Achievement</b>		
			<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>
1.	<b>Pre-writing</b>	Explore, Select, and Ordering ideas to make an outline	87.5%	12.5%	0%
2.	<b>Drafting</b>	Write a rough draft as a development of the outline	81.25%	18.75%	0%
3.	<b>Revising</b>	Rewrite the draft as their friends suggested	100%	0%	0%
4.	<b>Editing</b>	Identify the mechanical and grammar errors	75%	25%	0%

From the table, it could be seen that in prewriting stage, there was 87.5% of the subjects gained good demonstrated competence since they could explore, select, and order ideas to make a good outline. There were only 12.5% of the students who attained fair level and none of the students who were still in poor achievement. The good result here as the researcher only required the students to write the outline that consist of only the thesis statement, each topic sentence of the body paragraph, and the conclusion. Then the researcher checked their outline and gave some suggestion. It seemed that the students followed the researcher's suggestion in select and ordering the ideas.

In the drafting stage there were 81.25% of the subjects reached good level in writing a rough draft as a development of their outline. It could be seen from well-organized of their rough draft. All of their essays had an introduction, a body, and a conclusion. And there were only 18.75% who were in fair level meant that their essay already had an introduction, and a conclusion, but in some cases they forgot to mention the topic sentences, and none of the students in poor level.

In the revising stage, there were 100% of the subjects reached good level in rewriting their draft as their friends suggested. This fact became the problems in this study as the result of their content writing in the final scores as not as good the competence their demonstrated. The researcher just look at their revised draft that they had already follow their friend's suggestions. However, at the end the students' final score did not reflected their good competence in developing the content, so the researcher had an assumption that the students' competence in doing peer-revising was very low. They could not give any good feedback to their friends' draft.

In the editing stage, there were 75% of the subjects attained good at demonstrated competence. However, it did mean that they fully understood how to use the editing guidelines. It was proved that they did not follow the instruction in using the editing guidelines by giving circle and number, yet they only giving circle without giving any number.

### ***Analysis on the Subjects' Learning Result on the Subjects' Product***

The analysis on the subjects' learning result on the subjects' product was done using an analytical scoring rubric. Based on the result of analysis of the students' writing product in the first cycle, it was found that the subjects had not yet gained significant improvement. It was indicated by the low score of the subjects' final composition in grammar.

#### **The result of the students' result in each of the components of writing in cycle I**

<b>Component of writing</b>	<b>Excellent</b>		<b>Good</b>		<b>Fair</b>		<b>Poor</b>	
	<b>People</b>	<b>(%)</b>	<b>People</b>	<b>(%)</b>	<b>People</b>	<b>(%)</b>	<b>People</b>	<b>(%)</b>
Content	4	25%	8	50%	4	25%	0	0
Organization	13	81.25%	3	18.75%	0	0%	0	0
Grammar	1	6.25%	8	50%	7	43.75%	0	0

The result of the analysis of the subjects' final product was described elaborately as follows.

In the content criteria, 75% of the students were able to achieve minimum level prescribed for successful writing a contrast and comparison essay. There were 25% of the students who reached excellent level; 50% reached good level; the same percentage with excellent level 25% of the students reached fair level and there wasn't any students got poor level.

In the organization criteria, 100% of the students were able to achieve minimum level prescribed for successful writing a contrast and comparison essay. There were 81.25% of the students who reached excellent level and 18.75% reached good level.

In the grammar criteria, 56.25% of the students were able to achieve minimum level prescribed for successful writing a contrast and comparison essay. There were 6.25% of the students who reached excellent level; 50% reached good level; 43.75% reached fair level; and there wasn't any students got poor level.

### **Reflection**

Based on the findings of Cycle I, it can be concluded that the scaffolding strategy used in the process of writing to improve the students' ability in writing a contrast and comparison essay at State College for Islamic Studies (STAIN) Kediri has not been successful yet. It is proved by the study result that from the three criteria of success prescribed, there is still one criteria has not yet been achieved. The first and the second criteria had already been successfully, but the third criteria was failed to be achieved. Therefore, the study was continued in the second cycle.

### **Cycle II**

The detailed actions conducted in cycle II were depicted in the table below.

<b>Meeting</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Notes</b>
1	Prewriting and Drafting stage	<p>In this stage, the researcher distributed another example of a contrast and comparison essay entitled "<i>My Two Homes</i>". The example essay was distributed each for two students, it was done to make the students did a work in pairs when they analyzed the essay. In discussing the example essay, the researcher delivered some guided question in analyzing it.</p> <p>After the question answer session, the researcher drew a web-word taken from that essay. It was done to make the students familiar how to explore and select the ideas for their writing.</p> <p>Succeeding in giving example how to explore and select ideas through word-web, the researcher led the students to find the suitable topic for them.</p> <p>Before making an outline, the students were asked to make a word-web to explore their ideas. Finishing making a word-web related to their topic, they made an outline for their writing. The outline only consisted of the thesis statement, the topic sentences, and the conclusion. After finishing their outline, the students consulted their outline to the researcher.</p> <p>Since the time was up, the researcher asked the students to write their rough draft at home. She also reminded the students not to worry about the grammar, what they needed were concentrating on the content and the organization of their draft. The researcher then asked them to find more than one article related to their</p>

2	Revising stage	<p>topics to back up their writing. She also encouraged the students to write their draft in double spaces to make it easier for revision and insertion later.</p> <p>In this stage, the researcher did as in the first cycle. She gave the students the revising guidelines, but the question was little bit different as in the first cycle. The difference between the revising guideline in the first and second cycle was that in the second cycle the revising guideline added by giving question about are there any irrelevant sentences in the body paragraph to make the students realized about the content of their friends' draft. Moreover, the revising guidelines required the students to give some suggestion to their friend's draft related to the content.</p>
3	Editing stage	<p>In this meeting the students still did peer-editing by using the same editing guidelines like in the first cycle. Then they revised their draft and typed it. The next meeting they submitted all of their work such as outline, first draft, revising draft, editing draft and final draft.</p>

---

In order to know whether or not the implementation of the action plan in Cycle II was successful, once again both the researcher and her collaborator analyzed the data taken from the observation checklist, field notes, and students' product writing (outline, rough draft, revised draft, and edited draft). The findings were described as follows:

#### ***Analysis on the Result of the Teaching and Learning Process***

The analysis on the result of the teaching learning process was taken from the observation checklist. The result showed that in teaching and learning process, this study had met the criteria of success prescribed that most of students or at least 75% students were actively involved during the teaching and learning process. In cycle I, the result of the observation checklist showed that total point earned 82 out of 88 possible or 93.2% of the students were actively involved during teaching and learning process. This result was not far different from the cycle II which earned 67 points out of 72 or 93% of the subjects were actively involved in teaching learning process.

#### ***Analysis on the Subjects' Improvement in the Writing Process***

The analysis on the subjects' improvement in the writing process was taken from the students' improvement sheet. In the subjects' writing ability in each stage of the scaffolding strategy in process of writing had met the criteria of success prescribed that most of the students or 75% of the subjects achieved a

good level at each stage of process writing. The result from the first and second cycle was not far different. The result could be seen in detail as follows.

**The result of The Subjects' Improvements in each stage in cycle I and II**

No	Stages	Demonstrated Competence	Good		Fair		Poor	
			Cycle I	Cycle II	Cycle I	Cycle II	Cycle I	Cycle II
1.	<b>Pre-writing</b>	Explore, Select, and Ordering ideas to make an outline	87.5%	93.75%	12.5%	6.25%	0%	0%
2.	<b>Drafting</b>	Write a rough draft as a development of the outline	81.25%	87.5%	18.75%	12.5%	0%	0%
3.	<b>Revising</b>	Rewrite the draft as their friends suggested	100%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
4.	<b>Editing</b>	Identify the mechanical and grammar errors	75%	75%	25%	25%	0%	0%
5.	<b>Publishing</b>	Type the final composition	100%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%

### ***Analysis on the Subjects' Learning Result on the Subjects' Product***

The analysis on the subjects' learning result was taken from their final draft that scored by scoring guide. As like the two previous criteria of success that was successful to be achieved by the student, in relation to the subjects' writing products, they also achieved the criteria of success prescribed that 75% of the students' writing products should achieve the good level of all the items in the marking scheme. The result could be seen in details as follows.

### **The result of the students' writing in each of the components of writing in cycle I & II**

Component of writing	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor	
	Cycle I	Cycle II	Cycle I	Cycle II	Cycle I	Cycle II	Cycle I	Cycle II
Content	25%	12.5%	50%	62.5%	25%	25%	0%	0%
Organization	81.25%	50%	18.75%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Grammar	6.25%	12.5%	50%	62.5%	43.75%	25%	0%	0%

It is interesting to note that even though all of the three criteria of success had been achieved, the result from the second cycle showed the decrease level from the achievement from the first cycle. The result of the analysis of the subjects' final product was described elaborately as follows. In the content

criteria, there was not any improvement compare to the result in the first cycle. Moreover, it was even worse. From 25% of the subjects gained an excellent level in the first cycle, it decreased into 12.5%. The same result occurred in the organization criteria, from 81.25% of the students who reached excellent level decreased into 50% of the subjects. From the three criteria, the grammar criteria gave the nice result as there was an improvement in the students score. While in the first cycle there was only 6.25% of the subject who gained the excellent level, it was increasing in the second cycle that there were 12.5% of the subject in this level. It meant that there were twice increasing in the second cycle compare to the first cycle.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the findings and discussions of this study, it could be concluded that the scaffolding strategy used in the process of writing has been successful in improving the students' ability in writing a contrast and comparison essay at State College for Islamic (STAIN) Kediri. It was proved by the result findings that all of the three criteria of success prescribed had been achieved.

The conclusion was described elaborately as follows:

1. The first criteria of success that was in teaching and learning process, this study had met the criteria of success prescribed that most of students or at least 75% students were actively involved during the teaching and learning process. Moreover, through informal interview during teaching and learning process conducted by the researcher, most of the students said that this class was the most enjoyable class they had compare to the other classes.
2. In the second criteria of success that was in the students' ability in every stage of process writing, the study also had met the criteria prescribed that most of the students or at least 75% of the students achieved good level at demonstrated competence in each stage of the process of writing.
3. In the last criteria of success that was in the students' writing product, this study had fulfilled the criteria prescribed that 75% of the students' writing products should achieve the good level of all the criteria (content, organization, and grammar) in the marking scheme. The result of this study shown that there were 75% of the subjects were able to achieve at least good level for the content and the grammar criterion.

When we compare the result of the study in the three criteria of success prescribed it seemed that there were any mismatch between the result in students' writing ability in every stage and the students' writing product. Logically, when the students are able to achieve the good competence level for each stage in every process of learning, it should be reflected the good level also for their writing product. However, the fact is so different. It is so as the students has very low ability in doing peer-revising and peer-editing. They do not know how to give feedback and suggestion to their friends' draft. Thus, it seems that the students have followed their friend's suggestion, but in fact they do not give or get any suggestion from their friend. Departing from this condition, hopefully the next future researcher will do research to look for the appropriate strategy in doing peer-revising and peer-editing.



## REFERENCES

- Agustiningsih, D. 2005. *Implementing Peer Assessment to Improve the Writing Ability of the Second Year Students of SMP Negeri 4 Palu*. Thesis. Malang: State University of Malang.
- Allan, D. E & Valette, M. 1997. *Classroom Techniques: Foreign Languages and English as a Second Language*. New York: Harcourt Brace Javanovich.
- Arends, R. 2001. *Learning to Teach* (5<sup>th</sup>). Boston: McGraw Hill.
- Astuti. 2004. *Cooperative Learning in Improving Paragraph Writing of the Third-Year Students at SLTP Lab. State University of Malang*. Thesis. Malang: State University of Malang.
- Attamim, Z. 2007. *The Implementation of Cooperative Learning to Improve the Students Proficiency in Writing Paragraphs at Muhammadiyah University of Ponorogo*. Thesis. Malang: State University of Malang.
- Dixon, C. N & Nessel, Denise. 1983. *Language Experience Approach to Reading (and writing): Language Experience Reading For Second Language Learners*. New Jersey: Alemany Press.
- Eksan, R. 2004. *Improving Writing Ability of the Second Year Students of SLTP Negeri 18 Malang through Process Writing Strategy*. Thesis. Malang: State University of Malang.
- Fitzgerald, J., & Graves, M. F. (2005). Reading supports for all: scaffolded reading experiences help English language learners master both reading and content. [Electronic version]. *Educational Leadership*, 62(4), 1-6.
- Goffman, L. W & Berkowitz, D. G. 1990. *Thinking to Write: A Composing Process Approach to Writing*. New York: Maxwell Macmillan.
- Kalesu, A. 2005. *Implementing the Process Writing Approach to Develop the Writing Ability of the Third Year Students of SMP Negeri 9 Palu*. Thesis. Malang: State University of Malang.
- Katilie, N. 2003. *Improving Students' Writing by Using Scaffolding Strategy in the Process of Writing at SLTP Negeri 3 Tolitoli*. Thesis. Malang: PPS UM Malang.
- Kemmis & Mc Taggart. 1998. *The Action Research Planner*. Geelong: Deakin University Press.
- Kharm, N. 1986. *Composition Problems: Diagnosis and Remedy*. Forum, Vol. XXIV, No. 3.
- McKenzie, Jamie. 1999. From Now On The Educational Technology Journal, Chapter 19 - *Scaffolding for Success in Beyond Technology: Questioning, Research and the Information Literate School Community*, Vol 9|No 4|December|1999
- McNiff, Jean. 1988. *Action Research: Principle and Practice*. London: Routledge.

- Miftah, M. Z. 2009. *Improving the Tenth-year Students' Writing Ability at MA Mambaus Sholihin Gresik through Mind Mapping*. Thesis. Malang: State University of Malang.
- Mochtar, K. 2004. *Improving the Second Year Students' Ability in Writing Narrative Paragraph by Using Picture Series at MTs. Al Khairaat Kaluku Bula Central Sulawesi*. Thesis. Malang: State University of Malang.
- Mukminatien, N. 1997. *The Differences of Students' Writing Achievements across Different Course Level*. Dissertation. State University of Malang.
- Muth'im, A. 2010. EFL Learners' Ability in Writing Comparison-Contrast Essays. In B. Y. Cahyono (Ed.), *Second Language Acquisition and English language Teaching* (pp. 105-115). Malang: State University of Malang Press.
- Ningrum, A. S. B. 2007. *Improving the Students' Ability in Writing Expository Essay by Using Scaffolding Strategy in the Process of Writing at STAIN Tulungagung*. Thesis. Malang: PPS UNISMA Malang.
- Nirwani, S. 2007. *Applying Autonomous Writing Instruction Model to Improve the Second Year Students Writing Skill of SMAN 7 Malang*. Thesis. Malang: State University of Malang.
- Richards, J.C. 1990. *The Language Teaching Matrix*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Riyanto. 2001. Peningkatan Kemampuan Menulis Paragraph Singkat Bahasa Inggris yang Koheren dengan Menggunakan Pertanyaan terstruktur, Siswa kelas 3 SLTP Negeri 3 Palembang. *Buletin Pelangi Pendidikan*. 2 (4): 14.
- Sabarun. 2006. *Improving the Writing Ability of the Fifth Semester Students of the English Department of malang Muhammadiyah University through Cooperstive learning Strategy*. Thesis. Malang: State University of Malang.
- Slavin, R. E. 1994. *Educational Psychology: Theory and Practice*. Fourth Edition. Boston: Paramount Publishing.
- Sriemulyaningsih, M. J. K. 2010. *Using Graphic Organizers to Improve Students' English Writing Skill in the Process of Communicating at the Fifth Grade Elementary School of Sekolah Citra Berkat Surabaya*. Thesis. Malang: State University of Malang.
- Sukidin, Basrowi, Suranto. 2002. *Manajemen Penelitian Tindakan Kelas*. No city: Insan Cendekia.
- Suryadi. 2006. *Using Outlining Strategy to Improve Descriptive Writing Skill of the Eight Year Students of SMP Negeri 4 Malang*. Thesis. Malang: State University of Malang.
- Sutikno. 2004. *Improving Students' Ability in Writing by Dialogue Journals at SMP Negeri 5 Malang*. Thesis. Malang: State University of Malang.
- 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), pp. 139-150.
- Wilujeng, S. 2005. *Improving Student's Writing Skill through Mind Mapping*. Thesis. Malang: State University of Malang.