

# THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PLANNING AND ITS EFFECT ON EFL STUDENTS' WRITING PERFORMANCE

Lestari Setyowati<sup>1)</sup>, M. Adnan Latief,<sup>2)</sup> & Utami Widiati<sup>3)</sup>

<sup>1</sup>STKIP PGRI Pasuruan, Jl. Ki Hajar Dewantara No.27-29, Tembokrejo, Purworejo, Kota Pasuruan

<sup>2,3</sup>Universita Negeri Malang, Jl. Semarang 5 Malang

e-mail: lestari.setyowati@yahoo.co.id

## **Abstract: The Implementation of Planning and Its Effect on EFL Students' Writing Performance.**

This quasi-experimental study is aimed at investigating the effect of planning (pre writing vs. rough drafting) on EFL students' writing performance. To answer the research question, a quasi experimental, post-test only nonequivalent group-design was used. The subjects of the study were fifty sophomores majoring in Teaching English as a Foreign Language in STKIP PGRI Pasuruan in the 2014-2015 academic year. From the accessible population of all students taking essay writing classes, two intact classes were chosen, each of which consisted of 24 and 23 students. These two intact classes were taught by the same instructor for 8 weeks from April 2015 to June 2015. The result of the experiment shows that there is no difference in writing performance between the students who were taught by prewriting strategies and those who were taught by rough drafting strategies ( $p = .144$ ).

**Keywords:** planning, prewriting strategies, rough drafting, writing performance

## **Abstrak: Implementasi Perencanaan Menulis dan Efeknya terhadap Kinerja Menulis Bahasa Inggris.**

Penelitian experimental semu ini bertujuan untuk menginvestigasi efek perencanaan menulis terhadap kinerja menulis mahasiswa yang belajar bahasa Inggris sebagai bahasa asing. Disain yang dipakai dalam experimental semu ini adalah *posttest only nonequivalent group-design*. Subyek penelitian ini adalah lima puluh mahasiswa bahasa Inggris semester empat STKIP PGRI Pasuruan di tahun akademik 2014-2015. Peneliti mengambil dua kelas utuh dari mahasiswa yang mengikuti mata kuliah menulis esai, dimana dalam setiap kelasnya terdapat 24 dan 23 mahasiswa. Dua kelas utuh ini diajar oleh instruktur yang sama selama 8 minggu dari bulan April 2015 sampai Juni 2015. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa tidak ada beda antara mahasiswa yang menggunakan strategi pra-menulis dan mereka yang menggunakan strategi draf kasar ( $p = .144$ ).

**Kata kunci:** perencanaan, strategi pra-menulis, draf kasar, kinerja menulis

It is commonly acknowledged that writing in a second or foreign language (SL/FL) is a skill which is considered complex and demanding. Therefore, much research on SL/FL writing has been intended to propose strategies to break down its complexity. The use of strategies before the actual writing tasks in the process of writing, such as explicit planning and implicit planning, are believed to benefit student writers.

Explicit planning before composing, as one of the writing strategies, is beneficial not only for common student writers, but also for students with learning disabilities. Sundeen's study (2012) provided evidence about the benefit of explicit prewriting instruction

for L1 adult students with learning disabilities. He taught the students how to plan their writing through the use of mind mapping to generate ideas and organize thoughts for personal narrative writing. He measured the students' writing daily by using multiple-baseline across-subjects design. The finding shows that explicit teaching planning strategy is beneficial for students with learning disabilities who usually struggle more with writing.

The importance of planning itself is introduced by writing researchers, namely Flower and Hayes (1981), Murray (1982), and Kellogg (1988), who believe that to be able to write well, one needs to plan

what he/she is going to write since planning gives a road map to prevent the writer from getting lost in the journey of the writing process. Murray (1982:4) argues that prewriting or planning out what is going to be written is an essential step in the writing process and usually takes 85% of the writing time. Most prewriting activities require the writers to explicitly plan what they want to say by using specific outlining techniques such as mind mapping, making diagram, brainstorming, and listing.

In the Indonesian context, most EFL learners during their college writing courses are advised by their lecturers, and textbooks as well, 'to-plan-then-write'. Most writing instructors are aware that 'plan first' technique before writing is beneficial because it helps learners to ease the demanding process of writing. Their beliefs hold true since many studies on writing have shown the effectiveness in 'plan first' writing strategy. This pedagogical implication basically comes from studies which show almost consistent results that the provision of 'plan first' writing strategy can help the overall quality of composition.

Research also shows that some student writers have their own preferences of the writing strategies to complete the writing task. This can be seen from a study conducted by Kieft, Rijlaarsdam, Galbraith, and Van den Bergh (2007). Their finding yields that students with a natural tendency toward planning benefit most from instruction that emphasizes planning, while those who had undeveloped strategies, or who had a tendency not to plan before writing, took advantages more from instruction that emphasized revision. In terms of the superiority, both strategies are effective in improving the writing quality. Then, it was concluded that the effectiveness of planning and revising strategy depends on the students' preferences of their own writing strategies (Kieft et al., 2007). Meanwhile, a type of planning which emphasizes revision (Kieft et al., 2007) and recommends the writer to "implicitly plan" his ideas is rough drafting strategy. It is a strategy that requires writers to collect, plan, and translate ideas during the first draft phase with little or no concern for reviewing what has been written on paper (Kellogg, 1999). Writers care less of criticizing the quality of the first draft, saving the editing and critical reviewing later on, as their main goal is to produce a text however loose and ragged it is. The free writing activity, in Kellogg's opinion (1999:132), is the "extreme version of rough draft strategy". In free writing, writers' activity is not interrupted by reviewing and careful planning, as they translate whatever ideas come into their mind at the moment without bothering to organize their thoughts. Thus, planning is minimized because the main aim is to compose a

text as rapidly as possible and translating the ideas with "a stream of consciousness" (Kellogg, 1999: 132). Kellogg further states that in some writing genres which demand clear organization, expression, and particular standard writing style, the first draft needs to be rewritten or revised so that the content of the second draft can become the reflection and the perfection of the initial draft.

These two paradigms of explicit and implicit planning have put considerable interests among writing researchers. Many researchers conducted experiments on comparing the effect of giving explicit planning before writing and giving no planning before writing. The results of these writing studies, unfortunately, seem to be mixed when it is seen from the L1 and L2 environments.

In the field of L1 writing, the results of pre-task planning (planning prior to composing) shows consistent effect on L1 writers' texts. Most studies, such as Kellogg (1988, 1990, 1999) yield results that pre-task planning, specifically outlining, is effective in improving L1 writing quality holistically. In the series of studies he carried out, Kellogg focused exclusively on how pre-task planning was organized by college students in composing in their L1. He assigned the students a letter writing task (Kellogg, 1988) and short informative writing task (1990). The findings show consistent results in which planning prior composing, specifically outlining, improves not only students' fluency but also the overall quality of their composition. However, this finding is contradictory to what has been found by Galbraith and Torrance (2004). In their study, they found out that students were able to generate more ideas when they drafted in sentences (such as in free writing), but higher quality of final drafts were able to be produced by them when an organized notes strategy was applied. In sum, they concluded that outline planning strategy is equally effective as interactive strategy.

Kieft et al. (2007) found that students with a natural tendency toward planning benefit most from instruction that emphasizes planning, while others who had undeveloped strategies, or who had a tendency not to plan before writing, benefitted more from instruction that emphasized revision. In terms of the superiority, both strategies are superior in improving the writing quality. Kieft et al. (2007) finally concluded that the effectiveness of this approach depends on the students' own writing strategies.

In L2 writing context, planning effects on students' writing seemed to be mixed in results. Ellis and Yuan (2003) investigated the impact of pre-task planning on 42 Chinese learners of English as a foreign language. The researchers found that pre-task planning

shows a significant impact on writing fluency and syntactic complexity. In contrast, a study conducted by Ong and Zhang (2010) found that planning prior composing actually blocked writing fluency and lexical complexity. More recently, Johnson et al. (2012) investigated the impact of pre-task planning in sub-processes, namely generation of idea, organization, and goal setting to 914 Spanish-speaking learners of English as a foreign language. The result shows that there is no indication of effect differences in any of the measures of grammatical complexity, nor in any measures of lexical complexity.

Many other studies have confirmed that pre-writing strategies using explicit planning can affect the quality of learners' compositions (Mahnam & Nejadansari, 2012; Abdollahzade & Taak, 2014; Mohseniasl, 2014), whether it uses electronic outlining (De Smeth et. al., 2011) or web-based prewriting strategies (Zaid, 2011); or whether it is done individually or collaboratively (Shin, 2008). Explicit planning-especially outlining-is beneficial not only for ordinary students, but also for students with learning disabilities (Sundeen, 2012).

Some studies conducted by Kellogg (1988, 1990, 1996) show consistent results that pre-planned writing strategy, such as outlining, is effective to improve the students' writing. Similarly, other forms of explicit planning, such as concept mapping (Ojima, 2006), are also effective to make a well-formed composition. Interestingly, other formats of planning, in which the students write freely for some time to generate their ideas, such as interactive strategy/multiple drafting strategy (Galbraith & Torrance, 2004) are equally effective.

As a result of such inconclusiveness, more studies in writing strategies need to be conducted to provide more evidence to verify the claim of planning writing strategy as proposed by Kellogg through his outlining technique, or revising writing strategy as claimed by Galbraith and Torrance (2004) with the interactive strategy, the idea of which comes from Elbow' freewriting activities. Writing research today seems to have little concern on planning in terms of organizing the ideas. This present study is intended to shed light on investigating the cause and effect relation of prewriting activities and rough drafting activities in EFL context in relation to organization of ideas. Furthermore, many questions related to planning in writing within EFL context remain unanswered since most planning studies are conducted in L1 and L2 environment.

The present study proposes to empirically investigate the effect of different planning conditions (pre-writing and rough drafting) on improving the EFL

writing performance. The research question is posed as "Do students who use prewriting strategy achieve better writing performance than those who use rough drafting?"

## METHOD

This study employed a quasi-experimental research design, involving college students who were taking an essay writing class in STKIP PGRI Pasuruan, East Java, Indonesia. In the essay writing class, the students learn how to write different types of short essays such as narrative, descriptive, expository, and argumentative, developed by various kinds of paragraph organization such as chronological, cause and effect, process, example and details, comparison and contrast, and classification. This research, however, focused on the argumentative essay since this type of essay is not only commonly written and read in the academic setting, but also most standardized writing tests use the argumentative type of essay in their test of writing English. This study adopted a between groups posttest only design in quasi-experiment (Cresswell, 2012:310) as it was impossible for the researchers to randomize the participants to the intended conditions.

Using random selection, class 2013 A was assigned to get the prewriting strategy to organize their ideas in writing, while the 2013 C was assigned to get the rough drafting strategy to organize their ideas, both in writing argumentative essays. In order to find out the participants' initial ability in writing, a general test of writing English was administered. The treatment took 10 weeks, excluding the try-outs, from April 2015 to June 2015. Only students who actively joined the writing course were taken as the sample of the study, 24 students from the 2013 A and 23 students from 2013 C. The age range of the participants varied between 19 to 22 years old. For the post-test administered at the end of the study, the students were assigned to write an argumentative essay.

Writing tests to collect the data were developed and validated through theoretical expert validation as well as empirical try out validation. Two different rubrics were used: Jacobs ESL Composition Profile to score the students' writing pretest and Primary Test Scoring Rubric developed by Latief (1990) for argumentative essays to score the students writing post-test. All students' compositions were rated by two raters. The statistical analysis used was t-test for independent large sample with the help of IBM SPSS 20.

Prior to treatment, the subjects in this study were tested. This baseline data collection serves three purposes, namely providing information for the partici-

pants initial ability in writing English, providing information for the researcher to find out the length of time needed to carry out the task, and third, helping the researcher to decide what statistical analysis to use to analyze the data. In this present study, inter-rater reliability was measured by using two measurements, namely Pearson Product Moment Correlation between the first and the second rater and Coefficient Alpha, to provide an estimate of the internal consistency. The statistical computation between the two raters shows that the reliability coefficient is .715, which indicates a relatively high level of consistency between the first and second raters, whereas the reliability coefficient between the two raters is 0.834.

Basically, both groups experienced similar learning stages. To be specific, two learning stages were applied in each unit of the experimental treatment: learning rhetorical theory of one sub topic in argumentative essay and applying the theory in a short practice and reading a short issue from authentic materials. The experimental group was exposed to the article of a controversial issue to trigger the knowledge on the topic to agree or disagree. The experimental group then had a group discussion. All these activities took the whole time of teaching and learning process in the first session. Thus, the first 90 minutes was dedicated to the exploration of the issue.

The second session for the experimental group was the planning phase. It was the phase that differentiate the experimental and the control group. In this phase the experimental group generated and organized ideas of the issue discussed in the previous meeting by using mind mapping, outlining, or argumentative mapping for 10 minutes. Whereas in the control group, the students had no chance to make explicit planning before writing as they were assigned to write about the topic right away by using freewriting activities for about 10 minutes. After that, the students were given 40 minutes to compose their writing. Finally, the rest of the time was used to reread and edit the writing. The main goal of this activity was to reshape the composition by improving the elements of argumentative essay, such as the hook, refutation, details, and summary before it was submitted to the teacher.

## FINDINGS

Three assumptions should be met before analyzing the data using the t-test for independent large sample, namely the assumptions of independence, the assumption of normality, and the assumption of homogeneity variances. In this research, only the assumption of normality is not fulfilled because of the presence of outliers. Because of the violation of nor-

mality, this research uses non parametric t-test for independent sample to analyze the data by using Mann-Whitney U test. This statistical tool does not require normality assumption to compute the data. (See Table 1)

**Table 1. Ranks Table**

Group	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
rough drafting	24	21,27	510,50
Writing performance prewriting	23	26,85	617,50
Total	47		

The ranks table regarding the output of Mann-Whitney U test indicating mean rank and sum of ranks for the two groups tested, namely the prewriting group and the rough drafting group, shows that the prewriting group has better writing performance as compared to the rough drafting group.

The result of statistical computation of non parametric independent t-test by using Mann-Whitney U test shows that there is no difference on the students' writing performance between those using prewriting strategies and those using the rough drafting strategy ( $p = .144$ ) as it fails to fulfil the assumption of normality which is required to have parametric t-test for independent sample (See table 2).

**Table 2. Test Statistics<sup>a</sup>**

	Writing performance
Mann-Whitney U	210,500
Wilcoxon W	510,500
Z	-1,462
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	,144

The test statistics table provides the test statistic,  $U$  statistic, as well as the asymptotic significance (2-tailed)  $p$ -value. The data show that there is no difference on the students' writing performance between those using prewriting strategies and those using the rough drafting strategy ( $p = .144$ ). The result of the analysis indicates that the researcher fails to reject the null hypothesis as there are not enough evidences to reject it.

## DISCUSSION

Two writing strategies are well-known for writing teachers and writing researchers; they are planning strategy (by using explicit activities to map out ideas, such as outlining and mapping) and revising strategy

(by using rough drafting and redrafting) (Kieft et al, 2007).

Murray (1982:4) believes that any form of pre-writing activities benefits learners, whether it is taking notes, talking to others, brainstorming, or outlining. Kellogg (1988 and 1990) also has found a consistent result that explicit planning prior to composing improves not only students' fluency but also the overall quality of their composition. So far, Kellogg's claim has been backed up with abundant writing research which confirmed that prewriting strategies by using explicit planning affect the quality of learners' compositions (Mahnam & Nejadansari, 2012; Abdollahzade & Taak, 2014; Mohseniasl, 2014), whether it uses electronic outlining (De Smet, 2011) or web-based prewriting strategies (Zaid, 2011); or whether it is done individually or collaboratively (Shin, 2008). Explicit planning-especially outlining-is beneficial not only for ordinary students as mentioned above, but also for students with learning disabilities (Sundeen, 2012).

Unfortunately, some writing researchers have questioned the superiority of prewriting strategies. Ong and Zhang (2010) found that planning prior composing actually blocked writing fluency and lexical complexity. They found out that free writing activity (writing freely in 30 minutes) enables the students to have better fluency as they were not engaged in detailed planning and to write whatever came to their minds. Their research, thus, suggests that pre-task planning is a hindrance to L2 writers. Galbraith and Torrance (2004) also argue that the use of *interactive strategy* (or multiple drafting strategy) is also effective to write a well-formed composition. For them, interactive strategy is also a kind of planning and provides enough evidence that pre-planned writing strategy, such as outlining proposed by Kellogg, is not the only way to produce a well-written composition. Being intrigued by these competing claims, it is necessary for the researcher to provide enough evidence to find out which is the better strategy for planning a composition in EFL context. Thus, the discussion of this study is divided into two parts, namely from the theoretical point of view and the statistical point of view.

Theoretically, the researchers believe that pre-writing helps learners to produce better writing quality in terms of the idea development. This belief has been confirmed by previous research findings discussed earlier. Among others, the prewriting activities benefit learners to lessen the cognitive load in the accomplishment of writing task. In relation to this, research has shown that there is a statistically significant relationship between working memory (WM) capacity and writing performance (Bergsleithner, 2010). This working memory can be overloaded when all stages of

writing are done simultaneously (McCutchen, 1996). To overcome these processing constraints, writers can develop a writing strategy to break the process into several steps, such as preplanning, making notes, rough drafting, and so forth (Torrance & Galbraith, 2006: 74). Thus, being able to select appropriate writing strategy enables writers to breakdown the working memory load (McCutchen, 1996).

In prewriting activities, learners can generate, organize, and select their ideas in relation to the topic being chosen. This exploration stage is important for beginner writers as they can focus on the purpose, topic, audience, and the organization of the composition. This stage also offers the student writers to explore their thoughts and feelings on the subject they are writing. This is in line with Kellogg's (1990) who believes that the prewriting strategies, such as outlining and clustering, help learners to cope with complex writing task demands as these strategies help them to generate and organize ideas. Moreover, prewriting strategies are proven to be able not only to improve the written expression used in the composition, but also to lessen the student-writing anxiety (Schweiker-Marra & Mara, 2000).

The finding of this research unfortunately does not support Kellogg's claim which states that explicit prewriting strategies such as outlining improves the overall quality of composition (Kellogg, 1990). The result of this present study yields that there is no difference in the students' writing performance either using planning before the actual writing task, or during the actual writing task. This study, therefore, gives support to Kieft (2007) who claim that both strategies, planning done before or during composing, are equally superior in improving the writing quality, prewriting strategies by using explicit planning before writing turns out to be not the only way to produce a well-formed composition.

The result of no difference in terms of the writing performance perhaps can be explained from the feature of planning before or during composing. Both planning types basically share similar characteristics; the difference lies only in the format of planning. In the explicit planning before composing, the students make plans by using outlining, clustering, and mapping. In their plans, they put down and list down what they want to write and how to put those ideas in order.

The students in the rough drafting group write down their ideas *not* in order because they want to "dump" all the ideas that pop into their mind in such a limited time. Free writing is a way to free up the mind, to allow students to focus on ideas rather than on accuracy and organization. Because the focus is on the *flow* of writing rather than correctness, the students

who enjoyed free writing are more creative to express themselves as they are not bound with grammatical rules or formal writing structure (Martinez, Knock, & Cass, 2011). Because of this, when the students make the rough draft by using free writing activities for 10 minutes, the ideas in the composition are already developed in the second draft. On the other hand, the students who use explicit planning do not have privilege to write the second draft. The composition made by the students in the prewriting group based on their planning become their first draft. Galbraith and Torrance (2004) call this strategy as “rough draft” strategy, similar to its name, but different in its essence with this present research. Based on Galbraith and Torrance’s research (2004), the multiple drafting strategy is more effective than rough drafting strategy (the production of an organized first draft of text through pre-planning activity). Although not supporting their finding, this study did not either reject the effectiveness of rough drafting strategy by using free writing activity as it is also advantageous in generating more ideas. This can be seen from the mean score differences in the posttest when they are computed descriptively. The mean score of the experimental group is 3.08 and the mean score of the control group is 2.88. It indicates that the students who used prewriting scored only 0.20 points higher on the posttest as compared to the students who use rough drafting.

Based on these data, the researchers believe that there might be a chance to reject the null hypothesis if the prewriting group was given more time to revise their first draft, instead of only rereading and editing the initial draft. Giving the students time to revise the first draft or to write the second draft would enable them to develop the ideas more.

From the statistical point of view, the temptation to conclude the result of the study based on the mean rank differences seems very hard to resist. Looking at the group mean rank differences, the rough draft group gained 21.27 and the prewriting strategies group gained 26.85. The indication that the students who use prewriting scored 5.58 points higher on the posttest as compared to the students who use rough drafting is a great temptation for the researcher to jump to a hasty conclusion. However, this small mean differences was not yet known to be significant and can be interpreted as important. Only after a statistical computation was done, the researcher found out that the mean difference was small enough so that the two planning types were considered comparable. In short, the confirmed answer is that the difference between the groups is not significant.

As stated previously, the experiment in this study was conducted to verify the theory whether planning

by using different types of prewriting strategies is more effective to improve the students’ idea development than planning by using rough drafting. The experimental group (N= 23) was exposed by using prewriting strategies ( mapping, outlining, argumentative mapping) and the control group (N = 24) was exposed by using rough drafting strategy. Following the intervention, non parametric t-test for independent samples was performed as it fails to fulfil the assumption of normality required to have parametric t-test for independent sample. It was observed that there is no differential effect of the prewriting strategies condition and the rough drafting condition; teaching the students rough drafting by using free writing activity generally leads to similar results as teaching by explicit and systematic prewriting activity.

Although the result of this study seems to suggest that the students who used rough drafting were able to achieve equally good performance as students who used prewriting strategies, the discussion of this finding should be done cautiously. Based on the data and the review of related literature, the possible explanations for the insignificant findings may be caused by 1) the heterogeneity of within groups’ characteristics, 2) the insufficient time length for planning, 3) the lack of sample size, 4) the time length of the treatment, and 5) the sensitivity of the Primary Trait Scoring Rubric used to score the posttest. Each of these is discussed as follow.

Firstly, research in planning studies usually used random assignment to draw the conclusion (Ellis & Yuan, 2003; Ong & Zang, 2010, Haghverdi et al., 2013). Randomly assigned the participants would reduce the bias as every participant has equal chance to receive any treatment under the study (Suresh, 2011). Random assignment also reduces the the variability between individuals in the group (Gravetter & Forzano, 2010). Referring to this present study, there are some variabilities within the group with the presence of outliers in the control group. The participants in the control group are too heterogeneous. The lowest score gained by the control group is 48 and the highest is 87.50 with score range of 39.50. Whereas in the experimental group, the group is more homogeneous. The lowest score of the pretest is 62, and the highest is 92.50 with score range of 30.50. Because of the outlier in the control group, one who has the lowest score, it causes the score range wider. Additionally, the heterogeneous characteristics within the group can also be traced from the achievement of some students in this group which is not the real reflection of the group. In the control group, some students have high ability in writing. Four of them have become the finalists of

National Essay Writing competition held in Islamic University of Malang in 2015, and two of them have become the runner up and the third winner of the competition. In the posttest, unfortunately, they were not able to reach the maximum score in the posttest when their compositions were scored by using Primary Trait Scoring Rubric (PTSG).

In the experimental group, there are also two outliers who performed poorly in the posttest, subject number 3 and subject number 20. However, the 8 weeks treatment was able to help them reach approximately equal ability with the control group. This can be seen from the mean differences in the pretest, and the mean differences in posttest between the groups. In short, if statistical computation shows no significant difference in the pretests and posttest between the group, the possible explanation would be the presence of outliers in the control and experimental group which may affect the overall groups performance. Although the outliers have been removed from the groups for the purpose of statistical tool adjustment, the data set are still not normally distributed. In this study, the researcher fails to fulfil the assumption of normality which is required to have parametric t-test for independent sample. Therefore, it is suggested that future researcher who wishes to replicate this study have homogenous groups. To do this, other researchers can apply random sampling to ensure homogeneity of variances instead of using intact classes.

The second issue is the time length of planning. Students in the experimental group were given only 10 minutes for making explicit planning. This 10 minutes time were given based on the review of previous literature in planning studies, namely Ellis and Yuan (2003) and Ong and Zhang (2010). Ellis and Yuan study was conducted in Chinese setting for undergraduate students majoring in English in the International Business Department, while Ong and Zhang's study was conducted in EFL tertiary students enrolled in the Communication Skills Programme in Singapore. For the participants of their studies, perhaps 10 minutes time for planning is sufficient because their participants are exposed to English most of the time. But for Indonesian EFL context, 10 minutes time might not be sufficient. Based on the data from the experiment, many participants in this study were not able to make a finished plan for their composition. Only few of them were successful in making a plan by using different types of prewriting activities. Most of the students in this study complained that 10 minutes is not sufficient for them, not enough to generate their ideas and to gather information they needed. Thus, there is a chance that this study might be able to reject

the null hypothesis if the time for making explicit plan is extended into at least 15 minutes. Future researcher interested to replicate this study should extend the time for planning to approximately 15 minutes to enable the students gather sufficient information for their composition.

Thirdly, the size of the sample. Previous researches in planning studies were varied in the number of sample size. Ellis and Yuan (2003) only used 42 undergraduate students majoring in English in the International Business Department of a Chinese University in which they then divided their participants into three different groups with each consisted of 14 students. Bigger sample size is used by other researchers, namely Ong and Zang (2010) who used 108 Chinese EFL tertiary students in the Communication Skills Programme in a University in Singapore in which these participants were then divided into four different groups, Zaid (2011) who used 108 EFL students in College of Languages and Translation, Haghverdi et al. (2013) who used 90 Iranian EFL students for their study, and Abdollahzade and Taak (2014) who used 80 EFL learners. Large sample size was used by Johnson et al. (2012). In their experiment, they used 968 Spanish-Speaking EFL Learners as their participants.

The sample size is indeed a serious issue in an experimental design. Although there is no clear-cut answer on an ideal sample size, Cohen et. al (2007) state that the larger the sample size, the better. Greater sample size will enable the researcher to gain better reliability and enable the researcher to use more sophisticated statistics. In this research, the total population of 2013 students is 82 (26 students in A class, 26 students in B class, and 30 students in C class). Because of administrative difficulties in using random sampling, the researchers took two intact classes given by the institution, namely class A (N = 26/the control group) and class C (N = 30/the experimental group). However, during the process of data collection, not all students who joined the general writing proficiency test in the beginning of the study joined the posttest. Some of them were excluded from the study because of the attendance problem. Therefore, during the data collection, the researchers had 23 students and 24 students for for each class, whereas according to Cohen et al. (2007: 101), the sample size for any experimental design requires 30 participants to be the minimum number of each case. Thus, for the two groups, this research at least requires 60 participants to be able to reflect the population.

The fourth issue is related to the time length of the treatment. This study was conducted for 8 weeks

from April 07, 2015 to May 26, 2015. Three prewriting strategies were taught to the students in the experimental group, namely outlining, concept mapping, and argumentative structure mapping. These strategies were taught in even meetings (meeting 2,4,6, and 8), while the odd meetings were used for argumentative writing rhetorical theory (meeting 1,3,5, and 7). Thus, the outlining technique was taught twice, the argumentative structure mapping was taught once, and the mapping strategy was taught once. The discovery that there was no significant difference in the students' idea development in writing between the treatment group and the control group might be due to the short period of training of using these prewriting strategies, as each type of explicit planning was given only once (except for the outlining technique). Because of this, they did not become familiar enough with each of the prewriting techniques. Unlike the experimental group, the control group received the rough drafting strategy through free writing activity. In eight weeks, the control group had become accustomed to using the technique. Although they were given 10 minutes to write their rough draft, there was improvement in the number of words they produced since they were introduced rough drafting technique from the beginning from the average of approximately 76 words to 96 words.

Therefore, there is a possibility that the research would have been able to reject the null hypothesis if only each of the prewriting techniques had been given twice (twice for outlining, twice for concept mapping, and twice for argumentative map). As a result, the training course should be extended to at least 10 meetings. The lack of the difference between the groups may indicate that the students in the experimental group needed more training in practicing the prewriting strategies so that the effect can really make a difference. Giving them more training would enable them to be familiar with the concept of prewriting strategies and be used to using it for planning their writing explicitly. Thus, devoting the whole semester meeting ( $\pm 16$  meetings) for data collection, including pretest and posttest, seems to be an ideal length of time for gaining a possible significant result. In sum, the future researcher needs to conduct this study over a longer period to discover a more objective conclusion.

Finally, the failure of rejecting the null hypothesis might be due to the insensitiveness of the scoring rubric. In this study, two rubrics were used to score the students' composition. The first one is Jacobs et al.'s ESL Composition Profile to score the students' writing pretest with a scale of 0 to 100, and the second one is Primary Trait Scoring Guide (PTSG) developed by Latief in 1990 with a scale of 0-4. In PTSG, the scorers focused only on certain criteria designated

distinctive and important for particular essays, such as purpose and audience (Babbin & Harrison, 1999). Because of this, PTSG is considered simple as it does not need much time for the scorers to understand the element to be scored and how to apply it in actual scoring. In relation to this study, PTSG enables the researcher to train the raters in relatively short time. Due to its simplicity and practicality, the researcher decided to use this rubric to score the students' posttest essays. However, this advantage has become the disadvantage in that it ignores the other elements of writing important to the composing processes, such as language and mechanics.

After data analysis process, it was concluded that the range of 0 to 4 offered Latief (1990) PTSG is too distinct, and is not sensitive to differentiate well-developed composition and under-developed composition. Moreover, despite the simple scoring offered by PTSG, the weaknesses outweigh the strength. The problems found in the sample writing above are problems that cannot be solved by PTSG rubric. Because of this limited scope and specificity, PTSG might not be appropriate for scoring the students' final draft. In relation to this, Babbin and Harrison (1999) said that Primary Trait Scoring is mostly helpful in responding the students' draft, and in encouraging and shaping revision.

Jacobs et al.'s ESL Composition Profile might be able to solve these problems as it has five elements to score the quality of students' essay, such as content, organization, vocabulary, language, and mechanics. With a score range from 0 to 100, Jacobs ESL composition profile might be more sensitive than PTSG. The traits used in Jacobs et al.'s ESL Composition Profile were designed by writing researchers working for a testing organization and is probably one of the most recognizable rubrics in the field of second language writing (Brooks, 2012). Based on this analysis, the researcher is in the opinion that the result of this study might show different result if only she used more sensitive scoring rubric, in this case Jacobs ESL Composition profile. Using more sensitive rubric would give more chances for the researcher to reject the null hypothesis. Therefore, the researcher suggests future researchers to replicate this study to use more sensitive scoring rubric. Instead of using primary trait scoring, future researchers are suggested to choose more sensitive scoring rubric preferably with score range between 0 to 100, either using analytical scoring rubrics or holistic scoring rubric developed by writing researchers. Those are the possible explanations for the insignificant result observed. There is indeed a need to investigate further research in this area. Although there are still much left spaces to fill in order to have



better improvement and modification, this present study has enriched the researcher with valuable knowledge and opportunity to gain better understanding on the teaching and learning writing in EFL context more specifically in prewriting stage.

## CONCLUSION

With the aid of non parametric t-test for independent sample analysis statistical tool, the result of the study shows that there is not enough evidence to indicate differences in the writing performances of the two groups involved; both groups performed equally well in this experiment as no statistically significant difference was found. The students who received prewriting strategies, namely outlining and mapping, did not demonstrate better quality in their writing argumentative essay in terms of their idea development, as compared to the students who received rough drafting strategy.

Some recommendations are made based on the finding of the study. The finding is specifically addressed to writing lecturers, writing test developers, and future researchers. For the writing lecturers, the result of this study suggests some recommendations applicable in the teaching practices, namely, the provision of time to plan in writing as well as the use of prewriting strategy and rough drafting strategy in teaching writing.

Secondly, in terms of the various writing strategies, lecturers can also introduce planning strategy (using explicit and organized plan) and revising strategy (producing initial draft, and then revising). Based on this research, both strategies are effective to produce an acceptable composition.

As they are both effective, the students can and should customize the writing process to suit their own style, but in a writing course, students should be introduced to various options to help them expand their skills. Using explicit and organized plan before writing, such as outlining, brainstorming, and mapping helps the students writer overcome the barriers that keep them from thinking creatively. This technique usually relies on written lists of components, such as outlining and argumentative mapping. The list can con-

tain ideas in the form of words, phrases, short sentences related to a topic. Sometimes, the ideas are not listed, but they are clustered. Each cluster represents a sub topic, such as concept mapping. To make the cluster interesting, some are given color, each of which represents a sub topic with lines connecting each idea, such as mind mapping. Generating and collecting ideas like this are very beneficial for the students as they can choose the best ones to be developed in the writing.

For writing test developers, there should be a specific instruction in the writing test that encourages learners to plan their writing with specific time demand. Asking the students to “produce the first draft then collect” in the writing test might not be able to reflect their actual writing ability. Thus, the provision of planning in the writing test will enable the students to produce better quality of writing.

Finally, this study can be replicated by using different types of writing modes and different level of students so that the effect of planning can be further validated. It was stated that the participants of this study were the fourth semester students joining the essay writing class. In relation to this, the future researcher can conduct other research comparing the effect of planning with different writing modes such as narrative, descriptive, expository, and argumentative. Future researchers can also compare the different effects of planning with different levels of students, such as the paragraph writing class and the essay writing class. It is also possible to replicate this study to see the effect of planning across different levels of proficiency with different writing modes. Additionally, future researchers can also investigate the effect of planning across different gender or age groups, which possibly enrich the body of knowledge and the understanding of foreign language learners’ writing process. Taken together, the findings of this study provide not only the theoretical values dealing with writing in the EFL context, but also practical values particularly for writing instructors and writing test developers to enable them to manipulate the variables to seek better result in the field of teaching and learning writing.

## REFERENCES

- Abdollahzade, E & Taak, M. 2014. Planning Time and Writing Quality In Expository Writing. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98:29–35.
- Babbin, E.H & Harrison, K. 1999. *Contemporary Composition Studies: A Guide to Theorists and Terms*. London: Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Bergsleithner, J.M. 2010. Working Memory Capacity and L2 Writing Performance. *Journal Ciências & Cognição*, 15 (2): 02 – 020.
- Brooks, G. 2012. Assessment and Academic Writing: a Look at The Use of Rubrics in the Second Language Writing Classroom. *Kwansei Gakuin Uni*

- versity *Humanities Review*. 17, 227-240. Retrieved April 14, 2015 from <http://kgur.kwansei.ac.jp/dspace/bitstream/10236/10548/1/17-18.PDF>.
- Cohen, L, Manion, L, & Morrison, K. 2007. *Research Methods in Education* (6th Ed). New York: Routledge.
- Cresswell, J. W. 2012. *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. (4th Ed). Boston: Pearson Education Inc.
- De Smeth, M, Broekkamp, H., Brand-Gruwel, S., & Kirschner, P.A.,J.R. 2011. Effects Of Electronic Outlining On Students' Argumentative Writing Performance. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 27 (6): 557-574.
- Ellis, R. & Yuan, F. 2003. The Effect of Pre-Task Planning and On-Line Planning on Fluency, Complexity and Accuracy in L2 Monologic Oral Production. *Applied Linguistics*, 24 (1): 1-27.
- Flower, L & Hayes, R J., 1981. A Cognitive Process Theory of Writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 32 (4): 365-387.
- Galbraith, D., & Torrance, M. 2004. Revision in the Context of Different Drafting Strategies. In L. Allal, L. Chanquoy, & P. Largy (Eds.), *Revision of Written Language: Cognitive and Instructional Approaches* (pp. 63-86). Dordrecht, NL: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Gravetter, F.J., & Forzano, L.A, B. 2010. *Research Methods for the Behavioral Sciences* (4th Ed.). California: Wadsworth.
- Haghverdi, H. R., Khalaji, H.R., & Biri, R. 2013. The Impact Of Task Planning On Iranian EFL Learners' Writings. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 70, 719 – 723. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.01.115.
- Johnson, M.D., Mercado, L., & Avocado, A. 2012. The Effect of Planning Sub-Processes On L2 Writing Fluency, Grammatical Complexity, and Lexical Complexity. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21, 264-282.
- Kellogg, R.T. 1988. Attentional Overload and Writing Performance: Effects of Rough Draft and Outline Strategies. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 14 (2): 355-365.
- Kellogg, R.T. 1990. Effectiveness of Prewriting Strategies as a Function of Task Demands. *American Journal of Psychology*, 103 (3): 327-342.
- Kellogg, R.T. 1996. A Model of Working Memory in Writing. In C.M. Levy & S. Ransdell (Eds.), *The Science of Writing: Theories, Methods, Individual Differences, And Applications* (pp. 57-71). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Kellogg, R.T. 1999. *The Psychology of Writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Retrieved June 20, 2014 from <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=SE1ZeQ16V9AC&pg= %20 %20PA126&lpg = PA126 &dq=mental+outline+in+writing&source>.
- Kieft, M, Rijlaarsdam G, Galbraith D, & Van den Bergh H. 2007. The Effects of Adapting a Writing Course to Students' Writing Strategies. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*. 77, 565-578.
- Latief, M.A. 1990. *Assesment of English Writing Skills for Students of English as a Foreign Language at the Institute of Teachers Training and Education IKIP Malang Indonesia*. Unpublished Ph.D. Disertation. Iowa: Graduate College of the University of Iowa.
- Mahnam, L & Nejadansari, D. 2012. The Effects of Different Prewriting Strategies on Iranian EFL Writing Achievement. *International Education Studies*. 5(1): 154-160.
- Martinez, C T; Knock, N; & Cass, J. 2011. Pain and Pleasure in Short Essay Writing: Factors Predicting University Students' Writing Anxiety and Writing Self-Efficacy. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*. 54(5): 351-360.
- McCutchen, D. 1996. A Capacity Theory of Writing. Working Memory in Composition. *Educational Psychology Review*. 8(3): 299-325.
- Mohseniasl, F. 2014. Examining the Effect of Strategy Instruction on Writing Apprehension and Writing Achievement of EFL Learners. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(4): 811-817.
- Murray, D.H. 1982. *Learning by Teaching*. Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.
- Ojima, M. 2006. Concept Mapping as Pre-Task Planning: A Case Study of Three Japanese ESL Writers. *System*. 34(4): 566-585.
- Ong, J. & Zhang, L.J. 2010. Effects of Task Complexity on the Fluency and Lexical Complexity in EFL Students' Argumentative Writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 19, 218-233.
- Schweiker-Marra, K. E. & Marra, W. T. 2000. Investigating The Effects Of Prewriting Activities On Writing Performance And Anxiety Of At-Risk Students. *Reading Psychology*, 21(2): 99-114.
- Shin, Y. 2008. *The Effects of Planning on L2 Writing: A Study of Korean Learners of English as a Foreign Language*. Published Dessertation. University of Iowa. Retrieved February 20, 2013 from <http://ir.uiowa.edu/etd/44/>.
- Sundeen, T. H. 2012. Explicit Prewriting Instruction: Effect on Writing Quality of Adolescents with Learning Disabilities. *Learning Disabilities: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 18(1):23-33.
- Suresh, K.P. 2011. An overview of Randomization Techniques: An unbiased Assessment of Outcome in Clinical Research. *Journal of Human Reproductive Sciences*, 4(1): 8-11.
- Torrance, M & Galbraith, D. 2006. The Processing Demands of Writing. In Charles A. MacArthur, Steve Graham, Jill Fitzgerald (Eds). *Handbook of Writing Research*, (pp. 67-82). New York: Guilford Press.
- Zaid, M. 2011. Effects Of Web-Based prewriting Activities On College EFL Students' Writing Performance And Their Writing Apprehension. *Journal of King Saud University – Languages and Translation*. 23,77-85.