

Improving The Students' Writing Competence in a Second Language Acquisition through The Implementation of Lesson Study

Syahfitri Purnama

Universitas Indraprasta PGRI, Jakarta, Indonesia
E-mail:syahfitripumama@gmail.com

Abstract. Writing is the most difficult skill for second language learners. It can be seen, for example, they always make ageneralization, simplification, less of knowing vocabularies, punctuation, spelling, and grammar. This paper will describe improving the students' writing competence in second language acquisition through the implementation of lesson study in faculty of language education of Indraprasta PGRI University of Jakarta. This research uses qualitative approach and the data taken from the students who are studying writing in the class. In applying lesson study, lecturer model explains about the materials based on the syllabus of the subject. The students are also given tasks in their groups. The observers watch and write about the students and assist them. After doing this, the observers discuss about the class with the lecturer model. By doing the implementation of Lesson Study, the students can work in group together, the class is so inspiring, they feel satisfied with the explanation of the lecturer model and have good impact to improve the students' writing competence.

Keywords: Language Acquisition; Writing; Lesson Study

I. INTRODUCTION

Writing is the most difficult skill for second language learners because the language has a system. To form a good sentence, the learners should be able to combine phonemes to form words, words to form phrases, phrases to form sentences, and sentences to form spoken or written texts—each unit following its own rules as well as the rules for the combination. Grammatically, in forming a simple sentence, it should have subject + predicate + object + adverb. It usually takes into account the meanings and functions in the overall system of the language. If the learners can make the pattern of language, it means she/he has a competence. Chomsky has proposed the theory of linguistic competence and performance. Competence is the speaker-hearer's knowledge of language while performance is the actual behaviour of a speaker-hearer. Chomsky added, the term competence is the speaker-hearer's tacit, rather than conscious or even cognitively accessible, knowledge of the language-system [1].

The problems of the students in the field when they are studying writing as a target language is an interlanguage, a term suggesting the half way position it holds between knowing and not knowing the target language [2]. The students always make mistakes and errors in their writing in a second language acquisition, for example in grammatical and lexical errors. Richards and Schmidt [3] stated it is the type of

language produced by second and foreign-language learners who are in the process of learning a language. In language learning, learner language is influenced by several different processes: 1) language transfer (borrowing patterns from the mother tongue, 2) overgeneralization (extending patterns from the target language, 3) communication strategy (expressing meanings using the words and grammar which are already known. In communication strategy, Dulay, Burt and Krashen also stated that making second language learning, the learners often carry out "word-for-word translation of native language surface structure when producing written or spoken utterances in the target language (misordering) [4]. The development of phonology, lexis, grammar, and pragmatic knowledge, but has been largely confined to morphosyntax.

The term "second language acquisition" refers to the subconscious or conscious processes by a language other than the mother tongue is learnt in a natural or a tutored setting. It covers the development of phonology, lexis, grammar, and pragmatic knowledge, but has been largely confined to morphosyntax. The process manifests both variable and invariable features. The study of SLA is directed at accounting for the learner's competence, but in order to do so has set out to investigate empirically how a learner performs when they use a second language [5].

In studying second language acquisition, learners should have motivation. Suparman [6] stated motivation is perhaps the most frequently used term to explain the success or failure of

almost any difficult task. In L2 learning, it is easy to declare that a learner will be successful with sufficient motivation. To avoid the student's problem and to get success in learning writing, it is implemented the lesson study which the purpose to raise the quality in the study and give the motivation to the students. This research will focus on the ability to study writing for the student of English education by implementing on lesson study. The research question is how to improve the students' writing competence in a second language learning through the implementation of lesson study.

Source of Error (Theories)

Students of a second learner always do some errors in making sentences. Why are certain errors made?. What cognitive strategies and styles or even personality variables underlie certain errors? While the answers to these questions are somewhat speculative in that sources must be inferred from available data in such questions lies the ultimate value of learner language analysis in general. By trying to identify source we can take another step towards understanding how the learner's cognitive and affective process relate to the linguistic system and formulate an integrated understanding of the process of second language acquisition.

Many things will influence some mistakes and errors done by students. Over the years, many studies [2]-[7]-[8]-[9] have shown that error analysis fails to account for the strategy of avoidance. A learner who for one reason or another avoids a particular sound, word, structure, or discourse category may be assumed incorrectly to have no difficulty therewith[6]. Corder associate errors with failures in competence and mistakes with failures in performance [2].

Interlingual Transfer

The interlingual transfer is a significant source of error for all learners. The beginning stages of learning a second language are especially vulnerable to interlingual transfer from the native language or interference. In these early stages before the system of the second language is familiar, the native language is the only previous linguistic system upon which the learner can draw. We have all heard English learners say 'sheep' for "ship", or "the book of Jack" instead of "Jack's book". All these errors are attributable to negative interlingual transfer. While it is not clear that an error is the result of the transfer of native language, many such errors are detectable in learner speech. Fluent knowledge or even familiarity with a learner's native language of course aids the teacher in detecting and analysing the errors [6].

From Brown stated above it can be understood that the first native language can help the learner to know the system of the target language. One learner should understand the system of her/his first language before she/he learns the second language.

Intralingual Transfer

One of the major contributions of learner language research has been its recognition of the source of errors that extend beyond interlingual errors in learning a second

language. It is stated by Brown that Intralingual transfer (within the target language itself) is a major factor in second language learning. Researchers have found that the early stages of language learning are characterized by a predominance of interference (interlingual transfer), but once learners have begun to acquire parts of the new system, more intralingual transfer-generalization within the target language is manifested [10]. As learners progress in the second language, their previous experience and their existing subsumers begin to include structures within the target language itself. Negative intralingual transfer, or overgeneralization, is the counter part of intralingual transfer as, "Does Jhon can sing?", "He gone", "I don't know what time is it, they abound utterances.

Barry Taylor's (1975) in Brown [6] stated that there are class of errors in producing the main verb namely past-tense form of verb following a modal, present -tense -s on a verb following modal, -ing on a verb following modal, are (for be) following will, past-tense form of verb following do, present-tense -s on a verb following do, -ing on a verb following do, past-tense form of a verb following be (inserted to replace a modal or do), present-tense -s on a verb following be (inserted to replace a modal or do). The errors happen when the learners apply the system of patterns in writing, it is caused they do not understand the systems are.

His research is not exhaustive in describing the errors, but it is enough for the readers to understand some of the errors commonly encountered in English learner from disparate native language background.

Stages of Learner Language Development

There are many different ways to describe the progression of learners' linguistic development as their attempts at production successively approximate the target language system. Indeed, learners are so variable in their acquisition of a second language that stages of development defy description. Corder (1973) in Brown [6] stated based on his observations of what the learner does in terms of errors.

1. Random errors (presystematic) in which the learner is only vaguely aware that there is some systematic order to a particular class of items. The example utterance "The different city is another one in the another two", "Jhon can sing", "Jhon can singings". Those utterances did by one learner which indicate a stage of experimentation and inaccurate guessing.
2. Emergent, stage of learner language finds the learner growing inconsistency in linguistic production. The learner has begun to discern a system and to internalize certain rules. These rules may not be correct by target language standards, but they are nevertheless legitimate in the mind of the learner. This stage is characterized by some "backsliding" in which the learner seems to have grasped a rule of principle and then regresses to some previous stage.

Here the conversation between a learner (L) and a native speaker (NS) of English.

L :I go to New York
 NS :You are going to New York?
 L : (doesn't understand) What?
 NS :You will go to New York?
 L :Yes.
 NS :When?
 L :1972
 NS :Oh, you went to New York in 1972.
 L :Yes, I go 1972

The learner cannot correct his errors, even though the native speaker has changed his utterance in good structure but he cannot discern any error in his speech.

3. Systematic, the learner is now able to manifest more consistency in producing the second language. While those rules that are store in the learners' brain are still not all well-formed, they are internally self-consistent and, of course, they more closely approximate the target language. The most salient difference between the second language and third stage is the ability of learners to correct their errors when they are pointed out-even very subtly-to them. Here are the conversation between the native speaker and the learner in a popular resort area.
 L : Many fish are in the lake. These fish are serving in the restaurants near the lake.
 NS : (laughing) The fish are serving?
 L : (laughing) Oh no, the fish are served in the restaurants.
4. Stabilisation (post-systematic), here the learner has relatively few errors and has mastered the system to the point that fluency and intended meanings are not problematic.

The four stages of systematicity can be used to assess the ability of the learner to understand a second language learning. The learners also make errors in the use of articles.

II. RESEARCH METHOD

The steps of Diagram Lesson Study Process are: the lesson study team meets to plan a lesson design, agree on which team member will teach the lesson design and in which classroom it will be taught, decide what data the team will collect and how to collect it, this phase happens one day to one to make the lesson design through the lecturers collaboration (plan), to improve student learning based on observations and write some notes (do), students learn a lot in the lesson, teachers also learn many things, get fresh and more fun ideas. For the findings, the team can redesign the lesson: how to make a deeper learning system, share what had been learnt from the students, and listen to or learn from other lecturers (see or reflection and redesign).

The Lesson Study has brought about a change on the students and the lecturer, they are:

A. On Observers

- 1) The lecturer model came on time;

- 2) Explained the material based on the lesson design;
 - 3) made good interaction to all students: checked all groups when she worked;
 - 4) Used LCD in the class;
 - 5) Students-lecturers made good interaction;
 - 6) All students were active in the class, only four were lazy, less of motivation;
 - 7) Groups discussion helped them to be more active.
- ### B. On students
- 1) Happy learning writing based on lesson study approach;
 - 2) More understood;
 - 3) Had good experiences;
 - 4) Satisfied and existing;
 - 5) Could change ideas;
 - 6) The lecturer were friendly: showing the way how to solve the problem.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The team made the lesson plan, here they chose the materials and discussed the research lesson and in which classroom would be taught. When the lecturer model performed, the observers collected the data: they watched, assisted, and also wrote in the process of doing lesson study. The lecturer firstly explained the material, the students in the group asked questions and the lecturer answered clearly. She asked the students to make sentences into a paragraph in groups, and directly checked it in the class. There were 7 groups in the class, most of the students were active but some of were not. The cause of error made by the students was intralingual factor. and it will influence the development of second language learning. They made overgeneralization, example for group 2 made error in clause "we likes" for "we like", for group 6 and 7 they were wrong to use verb phrase "talks" for "is talked", and to infinitive: "to finished" for "to finish", "to made" for "to make", "to booking" for "to book".

From data analysis, the lecturer model and the observers hold a debriefing meeting to discuss and analyse the lesson. During the debriefing, observers offered their observations, interpretations and comments on the lesson. The purpose was to analyse and evaluate the lesson thoroughly in terms of student learning, thinking and engagement. After the debriefing, the team holds additional meetings to further organize and analyse their findings. As a result of their analysis, the observers stated that the way of the lecturer teaches was good it could be seen by commented all the students they liked the way of teaching. The observers made some notes that there were four students less of attention in the discussion, for example they were busy playing hand phone, did not give pay attention to the discussion, busy with his own business. After researching the first cycle, the team went to the second research cycle in which the team revised the lesson design. The lecturer may also modify the strategies for

collecting evidence to align them more effectively with the revised lesson.

In doing the second research cycle, the lecturer tried to teach more detail about the material. The students remained in groups and everybody used the name tag in order the observers easy to know the name of the students when they did the identification. The lecturer again asked them to write a paragraph with free title. In the second cycle, the groups seemed more seriously to discuss and wrote on the white board when they had done. The data found that the students still made overgeneralization in verb phrase, for group 1 they wrote “can makes” instead of “can make”, for group 6 in clause “the taste very delicious” instead of “the taste is very delicious”.

In reflection, the lecturer model and the observers hold a debriefing meeting to discuss and analyze the lesson for the second cycle. During the debriefing again observers offered their observations, interpretations and comments on the lesson. The purpose is to analyze and evaluate the lesson thoroughly in terms of student learning, thinking and engagement. After the debriefing, the team holds additional meetings to further organize and analyze their findings. As a result of their analysis, the observers stated that the way of the lecturer teaches much better, the students asked question if they didn't know, they were serious to study and no one seemed sleepy or lazy: they concentrated and enjoyed the subject very much even they still made some errors, that is the process of study in a second language acquisition. The way of teaching was very good, it could be seen by commented all the students they liked the way of studying in lesson study approach.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In studying writing, the students always use interlanguage. They generalize a special rule or item in L2 beyond legitimate bounds. Lecturers should understand about the students' learning difficulties. To make teaching better, the team will spend time on preparation of lesson design. However, the lesson design is designed to have a more concrete and interesting. It is hoped to solve the students' difficulties and the teaching will be effective (plan). The lecturer performs well and the observers assist the students (do). The lecturer has experiences and discusses with the observers about teaching and for the second circle of LS, the teaching is much better (see). For the result of the first and second circles, the students

feel enjoy because they study together with groups, the lecturer assists them and knows their problems. Pooling the brains together allowed good teaching ideas to be shared. One-man battle can achieve a little. To overcome some difficulties in teaching, seldom can much be achieved by individual effort. The lesson study provided lecturers lots of sharing chances. This is the main key to successful teaching.

REFERENCES

- [1] B. Kumaravadivelu. *Understanding Language Teaching from Method to Post Method*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. Publisher, 2008.
- [2] C. James. *Errors in Language Learning and Use: Exploring Error Analysis*. New York: Routledge, 2013.
- [3] J.C. Richards and R. Schmidt. *Longman Dictionary of Applied Linguistics and Language Teaching*. Harlow: Longman, 2002.
- [4] R. Ellis. *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- [5] U. Suparman. *Psycholinguistics: The Theory of Language Acquisition*. Bandung: Arfino Raya, 2010.
- [6] H.D. Brown. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching, Fourth Edition*. New York: Pearson Education, 2000.
- [7] E. Tarone. “Some Thoughts on The Notion of Communication Strategy”. *TESOL quarterly*, vol. 15, pp. 285-295, Sep. 1981.
- [8] H.H. Kleinmann. “Avoidance Behavior in Adult Second Language Acquisition.” *Language learning*, vol. 27, pp. 93-107, Jan. 1977.
- [9] J. Schachter. An Error in Error Analysis. *Language learning*, vol. 24, pp. 205-214, Dec. 1974.
- [10] K. Jaszczolt. “Typology of Contrastive Studies: Specialisation, Progress and Applications.” *Language teaching*, vol. 28, pp. 1-15, Jan. 1995.