

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF GRPQ TO TEACH WRITING VIEWED FROM STUDENTS' INTEREST

Oleh:

Menik Widiyati

Universitas Muhammadiyah Purworejo

e-mail: menik.widiyati.18@gmail.com

Abstrak

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk membuktikan secara empiris efektifitas GRPQ untuk mengajar menulis. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode eksperimen dengan disain faktorial. Populasi penelitian mencakup semua mahasiswa semester empat Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Universitas Muhammadiyah Purworejo. Peneliti melibatkan dua kelas, IVA sebagai kelas eksperimen menggunakan GRPQ dan IVB sebagai kelas kontrol menggunakan Direct Instruction. Instrumen penelitian berupa kuesioner untuk mengungkap tingkat minat mahasiswa dan tes menulis untuk mengukur kemampuan menulis mahasiswa. Setelah menguji data menggunakan analisis multifaktor ANOVA 2 x 2, peneliti memperoleh beberapa temuan: (1) GRPQ lebih efektif daripada Direct Instruction untuk mengajar menulis; (2) Mahasiswa dengan minat tinggi memiliki kemampuan menulis yang lebih baik daripada mahasiswa dengan minat rendah; (3) Tidak ada efek interaksi antara metode mengajar dan minat mahasiswa terhadap kemampuan menulis mahasiswa.

Kata kunci: *GRPQ, direct Instruction, menulis, minat*

INTRODUCTION

Writing is one of the media to get ideas across. More importantly, writing can foster critical thinking because a writer is supposed to present something different or novel. In addition, it is also an effective way to persuade or empower those who read. With its strong influential impact on mind, writing can change one's perspective or even one's life.

Some scholars argue that writing can be personal expression. Writing encourages writers to find their own voices to produce writing that is fresh and spontaneous. Thinking precedes writing and the free expression of ideas can encourage self-discovery and cognitive maturation. Writing development and personal development are seen as symbiotically interwoven to the extent that 'good therapy and composition aim at clear thinking, effective relating, and satisfying self-expression' (Moffet, 1982: 235).

Nystrand (1989: 75) sees writing as interaction between writers and readers. The success of a writer relies on his ability to satisfy the rhetorical demands of readers by embedding his or her writing in a non-local discourse world. The process of writing is a matter of elaborating text in accord with what the writer can reasonably assume that the reader knows and expects.

In educational context, teaching writing poses some challenges since teachers need to solve the difficulties that students encounter. The difficulties include psychological problem, linguistic problem, and cognitive problem (Byrne, 1997: 4-5).

The first problem deals with students' psychology. Writing is essentially a solitary activity and the fact that people are required to write on their own draft, without the possibility of interaction or the benefit of feedback, in itself makes the act of writing difficult. Writers have no immediate feedback to let them know how they are doing and whether they should change their approach. There is no immediate interaction between the producer and the receiver.

The second problem is students' linguistic skills. Unlike oral communication, the language used in written language is either simplified (list, telegram, note, etc.) or more elaborate, more formal. In a foreign language this process is all the more difficult as there may be interference on a cultural level, not just the linguistics, between mother tongue and the foreign language.

The third one is cognitive problems. Writing is learned through process of instruction. The written form of the language and certain structures, which are less used in speech, should be mastered and learned. The way to organize the ideas is also important for effective communication which has to be learned in writing.

To overcome these problems, teachers are supposed to make use of an effective teaching method. Among varied numbers of teaching methods, GRPQ is especially worthy of consideration. The Guided Reciprocal Peer Questioning (GRPQ) method is a cognitive strategy instruction that has been shown to develop the greatest number of generic skills which include collaboration skills, communication skills, critical-thinking skills and problem-solving skills. Reciprocal peer questioning provides students with open-ended questions intended to generate focused discussion in small groups (King,

2002). Students individually prepare content-specific questions and then generate question stems and answer them.

GRPQ is a method that is transferable and can be learned by students of all abilities (Rosenshine, 1997). It is effective, efficient, useful, and reasonably easy to use. It should be considered to be part of the school curriculum to cultivate students' learning strategies among students for lifelong learning.

Millis and Cottell (1998) point out that the procedures of GRPQ are: (1) the instructor gives a mini-lecture in class and then provides a list of open-ended questions. Included are questions that encourage synthesis, comparison and contrast, arguments and extrapolation to other contexts; (2) students are then given a few minutes to individually prepare several content-specific questions aided by these open-ended questions; (3) the students form groups and take turns asking their questions and discussing possible answers; (4) working individually, the students write based on the questions they pose.

Meanwhile, Direct Instruction is a method commonly used by teachers to teach writing. Direct Instruction is a method by which students are taught face to face in small or large group utilizing systematic and explicit instruction (Duran et al., 2003: 3). In carrying out Direct Instruction Method, Huitt (1996) points out that there are four categories of events of instruction: (1) presentation; (2) practice; (3) assessment and evaluation; and (4) monitoring and feedback.

Presentation, there are five instructional events in this phase. In the first event, teachers and students go over previously learned knowledge or skills that are relevant or prerequisite to the new learning that is to take place. In the second event, teachers describe what is to be learned in this lesson. Teachers state the objectives and how the student is to be held accountable for the learning activity. In the third event, teachers describe why a particular objective is important for students to master. The fourth event is the active, careful explanation to students of the content or skill to be learned. In the fifth event, teachers probe the students regarding their initial understandings.

Practice, there are three events of instruction here. In the sixth event, students practice the newly learned knowledge or skills under the teacher's direct supervision.

In the seventh event, students practice the new concept independently. In the eighth event, which can be incorporated into teacher probes, as well as guided and independent practice, students connect with and practice material they have already learned.

Assessment and Evaluation, there are two instructional events in this phase. In the ninth event, teachers make formative evaluation decisions about students on a daily basis to determine if they are making progress. In the tenth event, teachers gather summative assessment data to see if students have mastered the concepts.

Monitoring and Feedback, there are two instructional events in this phase. In the eleventh event, cues and prompts, teachers review previous material, ask questions or probes, or have students engage in guided practice. In the twelfth event, providing corrective feedback and reinforcement, is done whenever the teacher has made an assessment of student learning at any point in the lesson.

Apart from the use of teaching methods, a successful writing class might be influenced by other factors. One of them is students' interest. Interest refers to motivating force which causes individual to give attention to a person, a thing, or an activity (Crow & Crow, 1963: 159). Interest and excitement are central emotions that accompany intrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 1985: 29). Students who have an interest in learning writing will be motivated to engage in learning process. The power of interest will encourage them to learn better. As a result, they will gain better result.

So as to prove the theories above, the research was conducted to find whether: (1) GPRQ is more effective than Direct Instruction to teach writing.; (2) Students with high interest have higher writing skill than those with low interest.; (3) There is an interaction effect between teaching methods and students' interest on students' writing skill.

RESEACH METHOD

The research is an experimental study using factorial design, a design in which the researcher can simultaneously assess the effect of two or more independent variables on the dependent variable. Factorial designs have been developed at varying

level of complexity. This research applied the simplest factorial design that is 2 x 2, which is further read as 2 by 2. In this design, both independent and dependent variables have two levels. There are three employed variables: independent, dependent, and attributive. The independent variables are teaching methods namely GRPQ and Direct Instruction. The dependent variable is students' writing skill. The attributive variable is students' interest.

The population of this research is the fourth semester students of English Department of Teacher Training and Education Faculty of Muhammadiyah University of Purworejo. This research makes use of cluster random sampling which was carried out chronologically as follows: (1) Among six classes in third semester of English Department which share similar level of writing skill, two classes were taken using lottery. The result is class IVA and IVB; (2) After gaining two classes as the sample of the research, the next step is determining the experimental class and the control class by the help of lottery. Class IVA becomes the experimental class taught using GRPQ, and class IVB is the control class taught using Direct Instruction.

To collect the data, research instruments are required. The instruments employed in this research are questionnaire to assess students' interest level and writing test to see students' writing skill. Before given to the sample, the instructions of both instruments were examined using readability test. Readability test is given to a class which shares similar writing skill with the experimental and control class. The instructions are considered readable if the students who answer 'yes' are more 75%.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The following is the result of Multifactor Analysis of Variance 2 x 2:

<i>Source of Variance</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F_o</i>	<i>F_{t(0.05)}</i>
Between column	208.33	1	208.33	10.52	4.06
Between rows	2552.08	1	2552.08	128.90	4.06
Columns by rows	52.08	1	52.08	2.63	4.06
Between groups	2812.50	3	937.50		
Within groups	871.17	44	19.80		

Total	3683.67	49
-------	---------	----

1) The Effectiveness of GRPQ

F_o between columns (10.52) is higher than $F_t (.05)$ (4.06), so the difference between columns is significant. It means that the null hypothesis (H_0) which states that there is no significant difference in writing skill between the students taught using GRPQ and students taught by using Direct Instruction is rejected. It can be concluded that teaching writing using GRPQ is significantly different from the one using Direct Instruction. The mean score of students taught using GRPQ (75.33) is higher than the one of those taught using Direct Instruction (70.63). It means that teaching writing using GRPQ to the fourth semester students of English Department of Teacher Training and Education Faculty of Muhammadiyah University of Purworejo is more effective than the one using Direct Instruction.

GRPQ is an effective method to use in teaching writing. It is a cognitive strategy instruction that has been shown to develop the greatest number of generic skills which include collaboration skills, communication skills, critical-thinking skills and problem-solving skills. It also helps the students to develop thinking skills, creativity and learning strategies. The students are more active in the teaching learning process because before they write individually, they have to discuss what they want to write and they are free to share their ideas with their friends who are having the same topic. Sharing in group makes them develop their creativity and thinking skill that can help them to get a good achievement. In the teaching learning process, the teacher is less active. He/she plays a role as a guide and motivator.

On the contrary, in Direct Instruction method, the students are the objects of learning. They are passive students rather than active since they fully depend on the teacher's instruction and guidance, they listen to the teacher's instruction and do the things required by the teacher. Teacher plays an important role in this method. Teacher is as source of information and knowledge. It is stated by Nunan (2003: 49) that in Direct Instruction method, the teacher straightforward gives instruction to the students, and supported by Arends (1997: 64) that teacher's role in Direct Instruction

method is giving explanation, presenting material, asking the students to do the required things like homework. Direct Instruction method makes students strongly depend on the teacher in terms of how to begin writing. As a result, the students' skills tend to be low.

2) The Students' Writing Skill

F_o between rows (128.90) is higher than $F_t (.05)$ (4.06), so the difference between rows is significant. It means that the null hypothesis (H_0) which states that there is no significant difference in writing skill between the students with high level of interest and students with low level of interest is rejected. It can be concluded that students having high interest demonstrate a significantly different result in writing skill from the ones having low interest. The mean score of students having high interest (77.67) is higher than the one of those having low interest (68.29). It means that the writing skill of the students having high interest is better than that of those having low interest.

This research proves that the students who have high interest have better writing skill than those who have low interest. The computation result can be seen in table 1 Multifactor analysis of Variance. The level of interest can contribute to the students' writing skill. The students are said having high interest to a certain object if they have high consciousness, willingness, pleasure, and attention. Hurlock (1956: 402) states that high interest provides a strong motivation to learn. They have self-awareness to do something. In writing, the students are motivated to express idea in order to produce a written text without any force from other.

On the contrary, the students having low interest do not give attention to the teacher and the material which is given. They do not have desire to learn. They tend to be passive and simply follow the given instructions. The students who have low interest tend to be lazy to produce idea in writing process. They just wait the idea coming from their teacher so it can influence their written product. From the explanation above, it can be concluded that the students who have high interest have better writing skill than the student who have low interest.

3) The Interaction Effect between Teaching Methods and Students' Interest on Students' Writing Skill

F_o between columns by rows (2.63) is lower than $F_t(.05)$ (4.06). It means that the null hypothesis (H_0) which states that there is no interaction between teaching methods and students' interest in teaching writing is accepted. It also means that the effect of teaching methods on the student's writing skill does not depend on the student's interest level.

This research proves that there is no interaction between teaching methods and the students' interest in teaching writing. The computation result can be seen in table 1 Multifactor analysis of Variance. GRPQ gives positive effects to the students' writing process for both having high interest and low interest. Rose (2001) states that all people have a preferred learning style. It is a way of learning that suits best. If the method that matches the preferred way of learning is used in teaching and learning process, it will be more natural. Domain in Arleen (2007) says that learning is the greatest game in life and the most fun. It shows that learning should be in the way students like. It is clear that GRPQ is a good teaching method for all levels of students' interest.

GRPQ is a cognitive strategy instruction to develop the greatest number of generic skills which include collaboration skills, communication skills, critical-thinking skills and problem-solving skills. Thus, these skills will generate a good writing. There is no correlation with students' interest. No matter how interested the students are, GRPQ will not work without the presence of those mentioned skills.

Direct Instruction is more likely teacher-centered than student-centered. No matter how interested the students are, they will not be able to gain maximum result in learning if the teacher does not give a chance for the students to be active in the learning process. Learning, after all, is not the passive absorption of information, but the active creation of knowledge and skill (Meier, 2000: 68). To conclude, Direct Instruction is not effective for all levels of students' interest.

Based on the explanation above, it can be concluded that the implementation of the teaching methods on the students' writing skill do not depend on the level of the

students' interest. That is why there is no interaction between teaching methods and the students' interest in teaching writing. The methods and the students' interest level are not operating together. McMillan (1992: 183) states that an important aspect in interpreting result interaction is that because of possible interaction, what may not be true for a total group may not be true for certain subject population. The research shows that for all students' interest level make no difference whether they have GRPQ or Direct Instruction.

CONCLUSIONS

Conclusions drawn from the research findings are: (1) GRPQ is more effective than Direct Instruction to teach writing for the fourth semester students of English Department of Teacher Training and Education Faculty of Muhammadiyah University of Purworejo; (2) The writing skill of the fourth semester students of English Department of Teacher Training and Education Faculty of Muhammadiyah University of Purworejo having high interest is better than that of those having low creativity; and (3) There is no interaction between teaching methods and students' interest on teaching writing for the fourth semester students of English Department of Teacher Training and Education Faculty of Muhammadiyah University of Purworejo.

REFERENCES

- Arends, R. I. 2009. *Learning to teach*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Arleen Amidjaja. 2007. *1001 Fun and mind stimulating thing to do with your kids*. Jakarta: Elex Media Computindo.
- Byrne, Donn. 1997. *Teaching writing skills*. London: Longman.
- Crow, L. and Crow, A. 1963. *An outline of general psychology*. New Jersey: Little Field, Adams Co.
- Deci, E. L. and Ryan, R. M. 1985. *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum.
- Duran, E., dkk. 2003. *Systematic Instruction in Reading for Spanish-Speaking Students*. Illinois: Charles C. Thomas Publisher, Ltd.

- Huitt, W. 1997. *The SCANS Report Revisited*. Retrieved from <http://www.edpsycinteractive.org>
- Hurlock, Elizabeth B. 1956. *Child Development Fifth Edition*. Tokyo: McGraw.
- Helson, D.E., et al. 1995. Enduringness and Change in Creative Personality and the Prediction of Occupational Creativity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 1173-1183.
- King, A. 2002. *Structuring Peer Instruction to Promote High-Level Cognitive Processing*. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4101_6
- McMillan, J. H. 1992. *Educational Research Fundamental for the Consumer*. New York: Harper Collin Publisher.
- Meier, D. 2000. *The Accelerated Learning Handbook: A Creative Guide to Designing and Delivering Faster, More Effective Training Program*. New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies Inc.
- Millis, B. J. and Cottell, P. G., Jr. 1998. *Cooperative Learning for Higher Education Faculty*. Phoenix: The Oryx Press.
- Moffett, J. 1982. Writing, Inner Speech and Mediation. *College English*, 44: 23-44.
- Nunan, D. 2003. *Practical English Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nystrand, M. 1989. A Social Interactive Model of Writing. *Written Communication*, 6: 66-85.
- Rose, C. 2001. *About Accelerated Learning*. Retrieved from <http://www.acceleratedlearning.com/>
- Rosenshine, B. 1997. Teaching Students to Generate Questions: A Review of the Intervention Studies. *Review of Educational Research*, 66, 181-211.