LLT Journal, e-ISSN 2579-9533, p-ISSN 1410-7201, Vol. 21, No. 2, October 2018

LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching
http://e-journal.usd.ac.id/index.php/LLT
Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

AN APPROACH IN TEACHING WRITING SKILLS: DOES IT OFFER A NEW INSIGHT IN ENHANCING STUDENTS' WRITING ABILITY

Nidya Indrilla and Dyah Setyowati Ciptaningrum
Yogyakarta State University
nidyaindrilla19@gmail.com and dyah_ciptaningrum@uny.ac.id
DOI: doi.org/10.24071/llt.2018.210201
received 17 March 2018; revised 14 August 2018; accepted 10 September 2018

Abstract
This paper aims to reveal the effectiveness of Scientific Approach in the teaching writing skills. This research used a quasi-experimental design. The population was grade VIII students of Redion School. Two classes were randomly selected as the sample. They are class 8B which used Scientific Approach as the experimental group, while class 8D becomes the control group which used conventional approach. The data were collected by using writing test. The data were analyzed through descriptive and inferential statistics with the SPSS 20 for Windows computer program. The results were as follows: (1) there were significant differences in the writing achievement among the students taught by using the Scientific Approach and conventional approach, (2) the use of the Scientific Approach was more effective than that of the conventional approach in teaching writing skills.

Keywords: Scientific Approach, teaching writing skills, writing achievement

Introduction
The effective learning of writing allows the students to learn easily and fun. In consequence, this needs the teacher's roles to assist and guide the students in order to achieve the learning objectives. For instance, the teacher has the roles in choosing and using an appropriate approach to the learning process of writing. Unfortunately, in Indonesia, in practice, the learning of writing that often occurs in the classroom is dominated by teachers (Antika, 2014). This viewpoint is usually called as the learning using a teacher-centered approach or a conventional approach. The learning activities in the classroom are spent by the teacher in explaining the lesson, whereas the learners take notes and listen to the teacher (Chang, 2011). The traditional approach is not effective to educational solutions that should refer to the active learning (Kompa, 2012). Therefore, this perspective in the process of teaching and learning writing should be changed from using the teacher-centered approach to the student-centered approach. One learning approach based on the student-centered approach is Scientific Approach.

The effectiveness of the Scientific approach has been often examined in the separate/independent studies on different scopes and contexts, e.g. (Astuti, 2015; Komariah, 2016; Oktarina, 2014). However, the effectiveness of the Scientific Approach specifically in the teaching and learning of writing in different contexts

needs further exploration. Therefore, in this current research, the Scientific Approach was investigated to know its effectiveness in the teaching writing of recount text.

Writing Skill

Writing is how person communicates his or her thoughts and feelings by visible signs, understandable not only for himself but also for all other people. It means that when one writes, she or he can express her or his feelings and thoughts, from words into sentences and sentences into paragraphs which have meaning (Siddiq, 2013). Thus, writing is defined as a 'process of thinking' (Rukayah, 2014). Hence, writing is as linguistic communication, since this language skill is used to communicate to each other (Quirk et al., 1985; Rukayah, 2014). For the students, writing skill is a significant skill to be possessed by the second language learners (Javed et al., 2013) because it gives positive impacts on the students' life. Unfortunately, the learners' still have difficulties in writing, such as the problems of language, cognitive and content (Wigati, 2015). In this case the teacher is a very important part in the process of teaching writing. As educators, teachers must ensure that their students learn something useful, beneficial and lasting for their future. Three roles of the teacher in the teaching and learning process of writing are as a motivator, a resource (giving clarification and facilitation), and a feedback provider (Harmer, 2002). Therefore, the teacher has full responsibilities and significant roles in the teaching and learning process of writing.

Teaching Writing Skill

Usually, in the classroom, the teaching writing is frequently seen as a way of finishing the homework and assignments, especially at the elementary and intermediate levels (Byrd, 2011). The learning activity in the classroom is spent by the teacher in explaining the lesson, whereas the learners take note and listen to the teacher (Chang, 2011). This viewpoint is usually called as the learning using a teacher-centered approach or a conventional approach. It is clearly in contrast with the opinion which said that the learning is a constructive process, where the learners construct actively the knowledge, and not received passively from the teacher (Pardjono, 2002). In consequence, Piaget and Dewey's theories refused this traditional learning approach (Pardjono, 2002) because it is not effective to educational solutions that should refer to the active learning (Kompa, 2012). Thus, the teacher has to select and apply the appropriate learning approach to teach the material. Literally, specifying what approach will be used in learning is an important thing for teachers because an approach is defined as someone's perspective toward the learning process (Rusman, 2014). Therefore, applying the suitable approach can help and affect the successful of teaching writing in the class. There are two kinds of the learning approaches, namely Teacher-centered approach and Student-centered approach (Al-Zu'be, 2013).

Teacher Centered-Approach or Conventional Approach

The teacher-centered approach generally uses a traditional approach which is based on the behaviorist theory. It is claimed that behaviorism concept that recommends stimulus-response became a prominent paradigm in the learning system in the last third of the twentieth century (Ortega, 2013). Hence, this

approach is called 'focus on forms' approach (Ellis, 2009). Nevertheless, the implementation of conventional approach gives the positive impact, such as teachers can organize students' activities in the classroom and recognize their characteristics (Al-Zu'be, 2013). Thus, this approach still has the magnetism to be used by some teachers in the teaching and learning processes. For instance, in Indonesia, the teacher still dominates the whole teaching and learning process in the classroom (Antika, 2014), mainly in teaching writing. On the other hand, this approach also has the weaknesses. It tends to make the learners passively receive information only from the teacher (Ahmed, 2013), limits the students' ability to think creatively (Li, 2016), and puts the learners as the learning object and the teacher as the only one source of learning in which it has classical learning activities (Rusman, 2014) where the learners only do and finish some assignments and homework (Byrd, 2011).

Furthermore, the teacher-centered approach represents the passive learners and the active teacher (Al-Zu'be, 2013) in which the learners take notes and listen to the teacher and the teacher delivers the knowledge to them (Chang, 2011), thus, the learners do not have an opportunity to engage in the activities appropriate with their wants and interests (Rusman, 2014). Therefore, the teacher-centered approach is not fit to apply in the teaching and learning processes considering the students have different abilities and characteristics (Antika, 2014), especially in teaching of writing skill. As the results, the students' achievement yields the unsatisfactory results and ineffective learning. Hence, the traditional approach is not effective to educational solutions that should refer to the active learning (Kompa, 2012). Therefore, this paradigm should be changed to the student-centered approach to make the learners more active in developing their knowledge and abilities.

Scientific Approach

The students-centered approach means the learners as the learning subject (Rusman, 2014). One type of the learning approaches based on the student-centered approach is Scientific Approach. In this 2013 Curriculum, the use of the Scientific Approach becomes famous in the education field in Indonesia. Initially, this approach has been used in science, but recently it is almost applied in all school subjects. The scientific approach is defined as the learning way to facilitate the students to gain the knowledge and ability. The scientific approach is based on the concept of science where someone knows what will one does, how it will be done, and what the goals or results want to be achieved. Science pushes the students to have curiosity, rewards creativity, and promote their spirit to ask the question, because it is intended to negate anxiety in the process of teaching and learning, particularly in the second language learning like English (Kessler, 1992). Hence, Tang *et al*. (2010) assumed that 'doing science' in the scientific approach becomes magnetism in the learning as an easy innovation to do. Therefore, Kessler (1992) called science as a powerful approach to combine science and language learning.

A learning theory underlying the scientific approach is the Bruner's theory which stated that the students study and construct the knowledge through the cognitive process (Hosnan, 2014). Furthermore, this approach emphasizes the

students on the learning process to seek the knowledge rather than to transfer it. In the scientific approach, the learning process aims to support and to assist the students' learning process in finding and in using their knowledge (Saefuddin & Berdiati, 2014). Therefore, in implementing this approach, the students are expected to be able to think critically (Komariah, 2016).

The Scientific approach is suitable to teach the English language, especially writing skill, because it aims to train the students in communicating ideas, particularly in writing (Hosnan, 2014). It means that this approach is effective to promote the students' language skills, particularly in writing skill. This is reinforced by the results of studies which stated that the use of the scientific approach is more effective than that of the traditional approach (Suharyadi, 2013) and it could improve the students' learning activities and develop their characteristics of responsibility (Oktarina, 2014). Then, based on the result of research conducted by Syahid and Tuharto (2015), they found that Scientific Approach was an effective approach in teaching mathematics. Therefore, the use of the scientific approach is expected to be a better approach to teaching English, especially in writing skill.

In implementation of the scientific approach, the learning process applies the science steps in constructing the knowledge in order to make the students think creatively. There are five steps offered by the Scientific approach, namely observing (to know the learners' curiosity), questioning (to develop creativity and curiosity of the students), exploring (to obtain more information about the object/data), associating (to analyze the data.), and communicating (to convey the results to others) (Saefuddin & Berdiati, 2014). Those stages can help and assist the students in the learning process becomes the active learners and the teacher. Therefore, the use of the Scientific Approach is expected to be able to affect the students' ability in writing and to make the process of teaching and learning writing becomes effective.

Method

This research used a Quasi-experimental design with a type of posttest-only control group. The population was all grade VIII students of Redion School (pseudonym). The sample was two classes that were established using the cluster random sampling technique. It was divided into one experimental group and one control group. It can be seen in the following Table 1.

Table 1. The sample of Research

Classes	Groups	Treatments
8B	Experiment	Scientific
8D	Control	Conventional

The data were collected by using tests (posttest) in the form of writing composition. The tests aimed to measure the students' ability in writing of recount text and the effectiveness of the treatments. The writing tests were given to the experimental group and the control group. To obtain the scores of the students' writing, the raters used a writing rubric.

The validity of the instruments was obtained through content validity. Therefore, the researcher asked an expert judgment to verify the validity of the instruments. For the reliability, *Inter-rater reliability* was used in which two raters were chosen to assess the scores of the students' writing, both the pretest and the posttest. Then, the scores were calculated by using *Intraclass Correlation (ICC)* in SPSS 22 *for windows.* ICC was divided into 5 levels: *small* (0.00-0.25), *low* (0.26–0.49), *moderate* (0.50– 0.69), *good* (0.70–0.89), and *excellent* (0.90-1.00) (Volistiana, 2014).

Based on Table 2, the results of ICC on the posttest got high values (i.e .968, .984) with the excellent correlation rate. Thus, the high-reliability coefficient of rating showed that the results of each rater were consistent or reliable in giving scores (Sujarwanto & Rusilowati, 2015). Therefore, based on the results, the raters gave the consistent/reliable scores in assessing the students' writing.

Table 2. The results of ICC

		ICC	Results
POST	Single Measures	.968	Excellent
	Average Measures	.984	Excellent

Findings and Discussion

The data were analyzed statistically through descriptive statistic and inferential statistic. The descriptive analysis of the pretest and posttest results have been shown in the statistical data in Table 3.

Table 3. The Results of Pretest and Posttest

		Min	Max	Mean
POST	8B (SA)*	83	95.5	89.66
	8D (Conv)*	65.25	83.25	74.94

*Note: SA: Scientific Approach; Conv: Conventional approach

Referring to Table 3, it presented the differences in the posttest scores of two groups. After giving the treatments, the posttest scores of each group yielded quite satisfying results with the mean scores of 89.66 and 74.94 respectively.

For the inferential statistic, the data were analyzed through the statistical tests, they are Normality Distribution test, Homogeneity of Variance test, and T-test (Independent Samples Test) in SPSS 22 for windows where the conclusions were drawn at level 0.05. They were presented in Table 4.

Table 4. The results of the Inferential Statistics

			Sig.	Results
Normality Distribution	Posttest	SA	.200*	$p>0.05$ = normal
		Conv	.170	$p>0.05$ = normal
Homogeneity of Variance	Posttest		.513	Sig. > 0.05 = homogeneous
T-Test			.000	Sig. < 0.05 = significant difference

Referring to Table 4, the result of the normality distribution test showed that the data distribution of the pretest and posttest for the control group and the experimental groups were normal. Then, it also can be concluded that the

variances of the groups were homogeneous. Thereafter, it is continued to the T-test. The results of T-Test presented that the sig. value$_{(p\text{-value})}$ was less than Sig. level$_{(\alpha)(0.05)}$ (0.000<0.05). In conclusion, there is a significant difference in the students' achievement in writing of recount text among the students taught by the scientific approach and those taught by using the conventional approach to the eighth-grade students of Redion School.

Discussion

The process of learning writing is focused on the students' activities (learning process) rather than the learning product. It should be designed well in order to give the experiences and understanding to the students in learning writing. Thus, they role is as the constructors of meaning, not as the receivers the meaning (Baker et al., 2009). Thus, it needs the appropriate learning approaches to assist the teacher and the learners in the process of teaching and learning writing. Theoretically, the learning approaches like Scientific Approach are two effective approaches that can be applied in teaching and learning writing. Therefore, this study aimed to reveal the effectiveness of the Scientific Approach in teaching writing of recount text at the eighth-students of Redion School. In conclusion, the use of the scientific approach was more effective than that of the conventional approach.

In this study, the researcher investigated the effectiveness of the Scientific Approach in the teaching of writing skill at grade VIII students of Redion School. This approach theoretically was believed as the effective approach. Therefore, the next section discussed the findings to verify the theories of the effectiveness of the Scientific Approach.

The effective learning was achieved if 75% of students reach a predetermined score of minimum criteria of mastery learning or *KKM* (Syahid & Tuharto, 2015). In this study, the predetermined value of minimum criteria of mastery learning is 75. The results of the posttest score pointed out that over 75% of the students from class 8B had scores above the *KKM* value, but from class 8D only half of the students got scores above 75. Thus, it caused the change of the means scores of two groups in which class 8B that used the scientific approach had the mean score of 89.66 and class 8D which used the conventional approach got the mean score of 74.94. It meant that the learning writing which used the Scientific Approach was effective, but the learning writing which applied the conventional approach was still less effective. Then, based on the result of T-Test in Table 4, it shows that the students' achievement in the writing of recount texts who were taught by using the scientific approach and those taught by using the conventional approach had a significant difference, with the mean difference of 14.72. This was in line with the result of research which found that the Scientific approach and the conventional approach had the significant difference, with the mean difference of 11.97 (Astuti, 2015). Therefore, the use of the Scientific Approach was more effective than that of the conventional approach in teaching writing of recount texts.

In this study, initially the class situation was very noisy, the students were passive learners, and the teacher could not control them well. They even could not create a recount text and did not understand what the recount text is. However,

after applying the Scientific Approach with some activities, they were active, had mutual interaction among them, and could produce a recount text. The students also participated physically and mentally in developing the knowledge (Sarwanti, 2016). In addition, the scientific approach could promote the students' traits, expressed their thoughts, acquired satisfactory achievements, and had the chance to train their writing ability (Javed at al., 2013). Therefore, in this study, it can be said that the use of the scientific approach is more effective than that of the conventional approach. It also confirms the result of study which stated that this approach is more effective than the conventional approach or teacher-centered approach (Astuti, 2015; Suharyadi, 2013). Although the researcher had trained the teacher, the teacher was still nervous and looked awkward. Eventually, in the first meeting, the Scientific Approach was not fully implemented by the teacher because the teacher still unconsciously mixed the steps of the Scientific Approach to the conventional approach. This was indicated by the result of teacher's interview where the teacher said that it was difficult for him to understand every step in the procedures of the Scientific approach (Komariah, 2016). However, at subsequent meetings, the teacher began to understand the stages of the Scientific Approach and fully applied it during the process of teaching and learning writing. Therefore, the scientific approach can promote the teacher's motivation.

Unlike the Scientific approach, the conventional approach was less effective to teach the writing of recount texts. This approach did not have particular steps in its implementation. In practice, the teacher only used the textbooks and notes (Muhlison, 2011). It means that the traditional approach presents students with the minimal activity where the students only sit and listen to the teacher. Moreover, the implementation of the conventional approach (e.g. drilled method and memorized the lesson) resulted in limited students' knowledge (Li, 2016). In fact, the students have to practice rather than sit and listen to the teacher (Zohrabi et al., 2012), and they also need rooms for their personal growth (Ahmed, 2013). The positive side of the conventional approach lies on the teacher who can entirely control the class and activities in orderly fashion (Al-Zu'be, 2013). This statement was in contrast with the reality of this study because the students were very noisy and the class situation was difficult to manage by the teacher. Hence, the conventional approach was an inefficient approach to solve the problems in education, and it was contrary to the active learning concept (Li, 2016). It also focused on the teacher-centered approach that was not efficient compared to the student-centered approach (Zohrabi et al., 2012). Therefore, the results indicated that the use of the conventional approach was less effective in teaching writing skill compared to the other two approaches.

Conclusion

This research has explored how the effectiveness of the Scientific Approach in teaching writing skill. The results can be summarized as follows: (1) there is a significant difference in the students' achievement in writing of recount text among the students taught by using the Scientific approach and those taught by using the conventional approach to the eighth-grade students of Redion School,

and (2) the use of the Scientific approach was more effective than that of the scientific approach in teaching writing of recount texts.

In a nutshell, the processes of teaching and learning writing need a creative teacher and active learners. A creative teacher surely chose and used a good approach to make students to be more interested and want to learn writing. By focusing on the students or commonly known as the student-centered principle, like the Scientific approach, the students are able to develop their whole abilities, potential, achievement and behavior through meaningful and useful activities, thus their knowledge would be more worthwhile for their life. Therefore, the Scientific Approach indeed offers a new insight in enhancing the students' writing ability.

References

Ahmed, A. K. (2013). Teacher-centered versus learner-centered teaching style. *Journal of Global Business Management*, *9*(1), 22.

Al-Zu'be, A. F. M. (2013). The difference between the learner-centred approach and the teacher-centred approach in teaching English as a foreign language. *Educational Research International*, *2*(2), 24–31.

Antika, R. R. (2014). Proses pembelajaran berbasis student centered learning (Studi deskriptif di sekolah menengah pertama Islam Baitul 'Izzah, Nganjuk). *Jurnal biokultur*, *3*, 251–265.

Astuti, D. (2015). Efektivitas pendekatan saintifik terhadap keterampilan menulis karangan narasi di kelas IV SD Jomblangan, Bantul. *Basic education*, *4*(3).

Baker, E. D., Hope, L., & Karandjeff, K. (2009). Contextualized teaching & learning: A faculty primer. A review of literature and faculty practices with implications for California community college practitioners. *Academic senate for California community colleges*.

Byrd, D. R. (2011). Putting the writing process into action in the L2 classroom: Pre-writing techniques that work. *The journal of language teaching and learning*, *1*(1), 64–77.

Chang, S. C. (2011). A contrastive study of grammar translation method and communicative approach in teaching English grammar. *English language teaching*, *4*(2), 13.

Ellis, R. (2009). Task-based language teaching: Sorting out the misunderstandings. *International journal of applied linguistics*, *19*(3), 221–246.

Harmer, J. (2002). *The practice of English language teaching* (3rd ed). London: Longman.

Hosnan. (2014). *Pendekatan saintifik dan kontekstual dalam pembelajaran abad 21*. Bogor: Ghalia Indonesia.

Javed, M., Juan, W. X., & Nazli, S. (2013). A Study of students' sssessment in writing skills of the English language. *Online submission*, *6*(2), 129–144.

Kessler, C. (1992). *Cooperative language learning: A teacher's resource book*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Komariah, E. (2016). The implementation of scientific approach in teaching writing: Teacher's teaching performance and classroom activities. *Proceedings of English education international conference, 1*, 164–168.

Kompa, J. S. (2012). Disadvantages of teacher-centered learning. *Joana Stella Kompa. Np*, *25*.

Li, Y. W. (2016). Transforming conventional teaching classroom to learner-centred teaching classroom using multimedia-mediated learning module. *International journal of information and education technology*, *6*(2), 105–112.

Muhlison. (2011). *The effectiveness of contextual teaching and learning to teach reading comprehension (An Experimental Study at the Eight Grade Students of MTs At-Thosari Kalirejo Ungaran Timur in Academic Year of 2010/2011)*. IAIN Walisongo, Semarang.

Oktarina, O. (2014). *Penerapan pendekatan scientific untuk meningkatkan aktivitas pembelajaran dan mengembangkan karakter tanggung jawab serta disiplin siswa yang berorientasi pada kurikulum 2013*. Universitas Bengkulu, Bengkulu.

Ortega, L. (2013). *Understanding second language acquisition*. New York: Routledge.

Pardjono. (2002). Active learning: The Dewey, Piaget, Vygotsky, and constructivist theory perspectives. *Jurnal ilmu pendidikan, 9*(3).

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language.* New York: Longman.

Rusman. (2014). *Model-model pembelajaran: Mengembangkan profesionalisme guru*. Jakarta: PT. RajaGrafindo Persada.

Rukayah. (2014). The writing skill of 3th grade students of sibulue subdistrict junior high school of bone regency. *International journal of linguistics, 6*(2).

Saefuddin, H. A., & Berdiati, I. (2014). *Pembelajaran efektif*. Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya.

Sarwanti, S. (2016). Scientific method in English language teaching. *Transformatika*, *12*(1), 60–75.

Siddiq, A. (2013). The use of semantic mapping technique to improve writing skill in descrptive Text. *JP3*, *1*(12), 8–15.

Suharyadi. (2013). Exploring "scientific approach" in English language teaching. *Prosiding 2 seminar nasional exchange of experiences, Malang*, 1348–1355.

Sujarwanto, & Rusilowati, A. (2015). Pengembangan instrumen performance assessment berpendekatan scientific pada tema kalor dan perpindahannya. *Unnes science education journal*, *4*(1), 780–787.

Syahid, U., & Tuharto. (2015). Studi komparasi model pembelajaran matematika dengan pendekatan saintifik dan pendekatan kontekstual ditinjau dari kemampuan pemecahan masalah matematika siswa kelas VIII SMP. *Jurnal pendidikan matematika dan sains*, 1–13.

Tang, X., Coffey, J. E., Elby, A., & Levin, D. M. (2010). The scientific method and scientific inquiry: Tensions in teaching and learning. *Science education, 94*(1), 29-47.

Volistiana, R. N. (2014). *Uji reliabilitas step test untuk keseimbangan anak usia 5-6 tahun*. Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta.

Wigati, F. A. (2015). Meningkatkan kemampuan essay writing dengan menerapkan metode collaborative writing plus pada mahasiswa dengan level English proficiency yang berbeda. *Majalah Ilmiah Solusi*, *2*(05).

Zohrabi, M., Torabi, M. A., & Baybourdiani, P. (2012). Teacher-centered and/or student-centered learning: English language in Iran. *English language and literature studies*, *2*(3), 18–30.