

THE USE OF SOCIAL INTERACTIVE WRITING FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (SWELL) METHOD TO DEVELOP THE STUDENTS' ABILITY TO WRITE NARRATIVE TEXT

Penggunaan Menulis Sosial Interaktif untuk Metode English Language Learners (SWELL untuk Mengembangkan Kemampuan Siswa dalam Menulis Teks Naratif

St. Asriati. AM

English Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education
Muhammadiyah University of Makassar
asri006@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

This research aimed to find out the development of the students' ability to write narrative text viewed from both generic structure and language use at XI IPA of SMA Muhammadiyah Sungguminasa, Gowa. The type of this research was a Classroom Action Research consisted of two cycles. One cycle consisted of four meetings. Thus, that there were eight meetings for two cycles. This classroom action research was done at XI IPA of SMA Muhammadiyah Sungguminasa, Gowa. The research subjects were the students of class XI in 2012/2013 academic year with 26 students. Those consisted of 10 men and 16 women. The instruments of this research were writing test and observation. The research findings indicated that the Use of SWELL Method could develop the students' ability to write narrative text viewed from generic structure and language use. It was proved by the students' mean score in cycle 2 test result was (77.81) which developed 16.31 % from the cycle 1 mean score (66.98). It was highly developed from diagnostic test (D – test) mean score (58.69). The students' development in cycle 2 indicated that it had met the researcher score target (75), and considered to be successful criteria in developing the students' ability to write narrative text covering generic structure and language use.

Keywords: *writing, development, social interactive writing*

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui perkembangan kemampuan siswa untuk menulis teks naratif dilihat dari kedua struktur generik dan menggunakan bahasa di XI IPA SMA Muhammadiyah Sungguminasa, Gowa. Jenis penelitian ini adalah Penelitian Tindakan Kelas terdiri dari dua siklus. Satu siklus terdiri dari empat pertemuan. Dengan demikian, bahwa ada delapan pertemuan selama dua siklus. Penelitian tindakan kelas ini dilakukan di XI IPA SMA Muhammadiyah Sungguminasa, Gowa. Subyek penelitian adalah siswa di kelas XI tahun akademik 2012/2013 dengan 26 siswa. Mereka terdiri dari 10 laki-laki dan 16 perempuan. Instrumen penelitian ini menulis tes dan observasi. Temuan penelitian menunjukkan bahwa Penggunaan Metode SWELL bisa mengembangkan kemampuan siswa untuk menulis teks naratif dilihat dari struktur generik dan penggunaan bahasa. Hal itu dibuktikan dengan nilai rata-rata siswa dalam hasil tes siklus 2 adalah (77,81) yang dikembangkan 16,31% dari siklus 1 berarti nilai (66,98). Itu sangat maju dari tes diagnostik (D - test) berarti skor (58,69). Siswa pembangunan di siklus 2 menunjukkan bahwa mereka telah mencapai target skor peneliti (75), dan dianggap sebagai kriteria sukses dalam mengembangkan siswa kemampuan untuk menulis teks naratif meliputi struktur generik dan penggunaan bahasa.

Kata Kunci: *menulis, pengembangan, menulis interaktif social.*

When thinking about writing, it is helpful to make a distinction between writing for learning and writing for writing. In the case of the former, writing is used as a practice tool to help students practice and work with language they have



been studying. In fact, providing with opportunities to write not only improves their writing but also promotes second language acquisition. In helping the students to write, we need to introduce the process of writing. Process writing allows students to concentrate on one task at a time and to experience the value of peer feedback in developing their ideas for effective written expression (Boyle, 1982b, 39-44). According to the information, the researcher got the real fact of the situation in learning at SMA Muhammadiyah Sungguminasa from the English teacher by interview and from the observation. Which in fact, class XI IPA of SMA Muhammadiyah Sungguminasa had some problems in writing skill. The first problem is that the students' writing is not comprehensible, because the composition is not relevant to the topic, the ideas are not clearly stated, the ideas and sentences are not logic and communicated. The second problem is that there are many errors in pronoun and tense, the student are confused in use past tense. Another problem is the students have low motivation and are not interested in doing the task since the writing activities are not interesting. Usually, the students are asked to write paragraphs without being given instruction so that it is difficult for them to express their ideas on a piece of paper.

THE ADVANTAGES OF SWELL METHOD

The advantages of SWELL Method can be seen from the modifications of the SWELL Method to the Topping's Method. The modifications are described below:

1. Use students' linguistic and cultural knowledge in L1 SWELL method allows the students to use their L1 for discussion activities during each step of SWELL and encouraged them use bilingual dictionaries for translation purposes.
2. Provide timely, explicit, and direct intervention. Adopting a balanced approach that focuses on writing fluency and explicit instruction in mechanics, simplifying the steps of the writing process by making them more concrete top the students, and providing the teacher intervention in the final step of the writing process as one way to increase interaction with the students at a crucial stage in the process.
3. Other modifications

Other SWELL modifications to Topping's method are as follows:



- a. Where Topping uses single-word questions (e.g. *Who? Do? What?*) to generate ideas, SWELL uses complete structured and directive questions beginning with *wh*-words, such as “Who did what to whom?” This modification helps learners generate ideas for their writing and provides the temporary support, or “scaffolding,” that Peregoy and Boyle (2001: 277) believe is necessary to permit learners to participate in a complex process before they are able to do so unassisted.
- b. Topping’s Paired Writing method has the *students* choose among five stages of support for writing on their own during Step 2 (Drafting). SWELL has the *teacher* choose the appropriate stage for the pair.
- c. Topping’s method has the Helper in Step 3 serve as a reading model for the less proficient peer. To help novice writers, SWELL has the Writer read the draft with as much expression and attention to punctuation as possible while both the Helper and the Writer look at the text together.
- d. In Topping’s Paired Writing method, the words *meaning*, *order*, *spelling*, and *punctuation*, which are the editing criteria, are listed in the box in Step 4 (Editing) as a reference for the students as they edit their own and their peer’s writing.
- e. SWELL adds the editing criterion *style* to the four described above. Style is defined as “the clarity of sentences,” which includes making appropriate word choices and using correct sentence structure.

PROCEDURES

Step 1: Ideas

To help students understand important component such as character, setting, problem, and solution in narrative writing SWELL provides complete questions, most of which begin with *wh*-words.

During the writing process, students with higher writing levels assign as the role of Helper, and those with lower writing skills assign as the role of Writer.

The Helper stimulates the Writer by raising the questions stated at the flowchart above. As the writers respond verbally to the questions asked by the Helper, the Writer also makes a note of key words. The Writer might also add to the notes any relevant information he/she wants to write about.



The pair then reviews the keywords in the notes and determines if the order or organization should be changed. This could be indicated by numbering the ideas. Alternatively, the ideas may seem to fall into obvious sections, which can be dealt with in turn.

Step 2: Draft

In this step, there are five different stages as shown in the flowchart above. The teacher chooses one specific stage from the five stages given to the students before they move on to writing. However, the teacher should rely on the students' writing development. In other words, teachers may choose a higher stage for the pair to work on when the students progress in their writing. They may also go back one stage (or more) when they find that their students encounter a particularly difficult stage.

After the teacher chooses a stage, the paired writers will receive instruction from the teacher regarding what they are expected to do in that particular stage. The pair then proceeds to write. The teacher should emphasize that the Writer does not have to worry too much about spelling when he/she is writing a draft.

Step 3: Read

The Writer reads the writing aloud. If he/she reads a word incorrectly, the Helper may provide support if he/she is capable of doing so.

Step 4: Edit

In this step, the Helper and Writer look at the draft together, and the Writer considers whether improvements are necessary. At the same time, the Helper also considers if there are any improvements the Writer might want to make. The problem words, phrases or sentences could be marked with a colored pen, pencil or highlighter. There are five edit levels in this step. They are *meaning*, *order*, *style*, *spelling*, and *punctuation*. The Writer and Helper should inspect the draft more than once, checking on different criteria on each occasion. To provide scaffolding to the students, teachers should encourage the Writer to ask himself/herself the questions stated in the flowchart above at the Step 4.

Step 5: Best Copy



The Writer then copies out a neat or best version of the corrected draft. The Helper provides help when necessary, depending on the skill of the Writer. The best copy is a joint product of the pair and is then turned in to the teacher.

Step 6: Teacher Evaluate

Teacher Evaluates is the final step. In this step, students will have an opportunity to receive comments and instructive feedback directly from the teacher. When the Writer and the Helper turn in their best copy, the teacher will meet with them and provide them with explicit writing and grammatical instruction as well as corrective feedback. The teacher's comments focus on *meaning/idea, order, style, spelling, and punctuation*, which are the five editing criteria stated in Step 4. The writers are then expected to review the correction and feedback together as a pair.

TYPES OF NARRATIVE

Narrative writing can be divided into two types namely fictive and non fictive narration (Keraf, 2001: 141)

a. Fictive narration

Fictive narration is a narration illustrates events or conditions that do not take place in the real life. It is just based on the author's imagination and feeling. Nevertheless, it still has something to do with human life because it also reflects human's experience, feeling, idea, and so on. Writings involved in fictive narration are novel, short story, drama, and myth.

b. Non-fictive narration

Non-fictive narration is a narration illustrated real events and concession. Something illustrated in non-fictive narration is based on reality. Writings involved in this narration are history, biography, autobiography, incidence, and profile.

1. Language Features of Narrative

Narrative text has its own language features, such as below:

a. The use of past tenses.

The formula of simple past as follows:

Subject + verb II

b. Focus on specific and individualized participants.



- c. The use of material process (action verbs).
- d. The use of some behavioral and verbal processes.
- e. The use of relational and mental processes.
- f. The use of temporal conjunctions and circumstances.

2. Generic Structure of Narrative

According to Thalib (2004: 1) narrative text has generic structures; they are orientation, complication, and resolution.

a. Orientation

It introduces the participants and the characters of the story with the time and place set. Orientation actually exists in every text type though it has different term. In this kind of text, it is clearly seen to introduce the participants of the story.

b. Complication

Complication is such the crisis of the story. If there is not the crisis, the story is not a narrative text. In a long story, the complication appears in several situations. It means that some time there is more than one complication. The complication can be Major Complication and Minor Complication.

c. Resolution

Resolution is the final series of the events which happen in the story. The resolution can be good or bad. The point is that it has been accomplished by the characters. Like complication, there are Major Resolution and Minor Resolution.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This classroom action research was held in two cycles. Those were first and second cycle and each cycle was the series of activities which had a closed relation. Where the realization of the second cycle was continued and repaired from the first cycle. The research variables consisted generic structure and language use. The indicators of generic structure were orientation, complication, and resolution; while the indicators of language use were past tense and pronoun. Orientation introduces the participants and the characters of the story with the time and place set; Complication is a series of events in which the main character attempts to solve the problem; Resolution is the final series of the events that can be good or bad; Past Tense talks about something happened in the past which is divided into verbal and



nominal; Pronoun is the word used to replace the noun. It is divided into personal pronoun (nominative case and objective case), possessive pronoun, possessive adjective, reflexive pronoun.

Research subjects in this classroom action research were XI IPA of SMA Muhammadiyah Sungguminasa Kabupaten Gowa which consisted of 26 students, 10 men and 16 women. the researcher used two instruments namely test was designed to measure the students' ability in English writing and observation sheet was checklist format whether the students were actively participated or not, how is the students' behavior, attitude, and motivation in teaching and learning process. There were two components that concerned of the researcher in this research to measure. Those were generic structure and language use which used criteria as follows:

1. Generic Structure

a. Orientation

Table 1. Score Classification of Orientation

Classification	Score	Criteria
Excellent	90-100	Complete to identify and set the scene and introduce the participant (it answer the questions: who, when, and where)
Very Good	80-89	Identify and set the scene and introduce the participant enough (it answer the questions: who, when, and where incomplete)
Good	70-79	Cannot incomplete to Identify and set the scene and introduce the participant.
Fairly Good	60-69	Not relevant to Identify and set the scene and introduce the participant.
Fair	50-59	No answer of concept

b. Complication

Table 2. Score Classification of Complication

Classification	Score	Criteria
Excellent	90-100	Complete to Identify the crisis' of problem arises. When the problem developed.
Very Good	80-89	Identify the crisis' of problem arises. When the problem developed is enough
Good	70-79	Cannot incomplete to identify the crisis' of problem arises. When the problem developed.
Fairly Good	60-69	Not relevant to identify the crisis' of problem arises. When the problem developed.
Fair	50-59	No answer of problem.



c. Resolution

Table 3. Score Classification of Resolution

Classification	Score	Criteria
Excellent	90-100	Complete to find a way or solution to solve the problem
Very Good	80-89	To find a way or solution to solve the problem is enough.
Good	70-79	Cannot incomplete to find a way or solution to solve the problem
Fairly Good	60-69	Not relevant to find a way or solution to solve the problem
Fair	50-59	No answer to solve the problem.

(Harmer, Jeremy 1987: 336)

2. Language Use

Table 4. Past tense and pronoun

Classification	Score	Indicator
Excellent to very good	86-100	Effective complex construction, few errors of agreement, tense, number, word/order function, article, pronoun and preposition
Good to average	70-85	Few errors of agreement, tense, number, word/order function, article, pronoun, preposition but meaning confused or obscured
Fair to poor	60-69	Dominated by errors of grammar, cannot be understood and evaluated.
Very Poor	50-59	Virtually no mastery of sentence construction rules, etc.

(Depdikbud in Yakkob, 2006: 29)

DATA ANALYSIS

The data analysis in the Classroom Action Research from the test was analyzed with:

1. To find out the mean score of the students' writing test through SWELL Method, researcher used the following formula:

$$\bar{X} = \frac{\sum X}{N}$$

Where:

\bar{X} = Mean Score

$\sum X$ = The sum of all score

N = The total number of sample

(Gay, 1981: 298)

2. From the basic standard above the researcher used the standard score for the total value of the students' writing by calculating the standard score given, as follows:



- a. Scores 90-100 is classified as excellent.
- b. Scores 80-89 is classified as very good.
- c. Scores 70- 79 is classified as good.
- d. Scores 60-69 is classified as fair.
- e. Scores 0-59 is classified as poor.

(Depdikbud in Saleha, 2008: 22)

3. To know the students' participations in teaching and learning process through SWELL Method, researcher used percentage formula as follows:

$$P = \frac{FQ}{4 \times N} \times 100$$

Where:

P = Percentage

FQ = Sum of all the student's score

N = Total students.

(Sudjana, 1990: 36)

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter particularly presents the findings of the research and discussion.

A. Findings

1. The Development of the Students' Ability to Write Narrative Text Viewed from Generic Structure

The students' ability to write narrative text viewed from generic structure has been developed; it is indicated by the difference mean score and development between D-test, cycle 1 and cycle 2 tests. The following table shows the students' development in narrative text which consists of three indicators; orientation, complication, and resolution:

Table 5. The Students' Development in Generic Structure

Indicators	Mean score			Development		
	D-Test	Cycle I	Cycle II	DT-C I (%)	CI-CII (%)	DT-CII (%)
Orientation	70.92	74.96	82.46	5.70	10.01	16.27
Complication	65.65	73.54	82.42	14.18	12.08	25.54
Resolution	55.27	62.31	72.27	12.74	15.98	30.76
$\sum X$	191.84	210.81	237.15	32.62	38.07	72.57
\bar{X}	63.95	70.27	79.05	10.87	12.69	24.19



The data in the table above shows the students' ability to write narrative text viewed from generic structure as the calculating result of the diagnostic test and students' test at the students' writing ability through SWELL Method, where the students' score in diagnostic test is different from the students' test in cycle I and cycle II. The mean score in diagnostic test is 63.95, the students' test in cycle I is 70.27 and cycle II is 79.05. The achievement of cycle II is greater than cycle I and diagnostic test ($79.05 > 70.27 > 63.95$) and classified as good.

Based on the percentages above there are significant developments of the students' ability to write narrative text viewed from generic structure through SWELL Method. The Development of the Students' Ability to Write Narrative Text Viewed from Language Use.

The application of SWELL Method as one of the teaching methods of English writing can assess the students' progress of writing ability to the good language use with the writing test as indicated by the significant differences between the mean score of the diagnostic test and the result of cycle I to cycle II as shown in the following table.

Table 6. The Students' Development in Language Use

Indicators	Mean score			Development		
	D-Test	Cycle I	Cycle II	DT-C I (%)	CI-CII (%)	DT-CII (%)
Past Tense	53.15	64.50	76.62	21.35	18.17	44.16
Pronoun	53.69	62.88	76.50	17.17	21.66	42.48
$\sum X$	106.84	127.38	153.12	38.52	39.83	86.64
\bar{X}	53.42	63.69	76.56	19.26	19.92	43.32

The table above shows the students' mean score of students' ability to write narrative text viewed from language use, where the students' mean score in diagnostic test is different from the students' test in cycle I and cycle II. The mean score in diagnostic test is 53.42, the students' test in cycle I is 63.67 and cycle II is 76.56. The achievement of cycle II is greater than cycle I and diagnostic test ($76.56 > 63.69 > 53.42$) and classified as *good to average*. And then, the development from D – test to cycle II is higher than D – Test to cycle I ($43.32\% > 19.27\%$).

Based on the percentages above there are significant developments of the students' ability to write narrative text viewed from language use through SWELL Method.



B. Discussion

The discussion aims at describing the students' writing ability to write narrative text viewed from generic structure and language use through SWELL Method.

1. The development of the students' ability to write narrative text viewed from generic structure through SWELL Method

The indicators of generic structure of narrative text deal with orientation, complication, and resolution. The first, the mean score of students' ability to write narrative text viewed from generic structure in orientation before using SWELL Method (Diagnostic Test) is 70.92. It is classified as a *good* category, but after using the SWELL Method in cycle I, the mean score becomes 74.96. It is greater than diagnostic test ($74.96 > 70.92$), it is classified as a *good* category. Although, there is a development of the students' ability to write narrative text viewed from generic structure in orientation (5.70%). But, after doing action again in cycle II, the students' mean score becomes 82.46. It is greater than Cycle I and D-test ($82.5 > 74.96 > 70.92$) and it is classified as a *very good* category. It means that there is a development of students' ability to write generic structure of narrative text in orientation from cycle I to cycle II (10.01%) and from D-test to cycle II (16.27%). The second, the mean score of the students' ability to write narrative text in complication before using the SWELL Method (Diagnostic Test) is 65.65. It is classified as a *fairly good* category, but after using the SWELL Method in cycle I, the mean score becomes 73.54. It is greater than diagnostic test ($73.54 > 65.65$), it is classified as a *good* category. Although there is a development of the students' ability to write narrative text viewed from generic structure in complication (14.18%). But, after doing action again in cycle II, the students' mean score becomes 82.42. It is greater than Cycle I and D-test ($82.42 > 73.54 > 65.65$) and it is classified as a *very good* category. It means that there is a development of students' ability to write narrative text viewed from generic structure in complication from cycle I to cycle II (12.08%) and from D-test to cycle II (25.54%). The last, the mean score of the students' ability to write narrative text in resolution before using the SWELL Method (Diagnostic Test) is 55.27. It is classified as a *fair* category, but after using the SWELL Method in cycle I, the mean score becomes 62.31. It is



greater than diagnostic test ($62.31 > 55.27$), it is classified as a *fairly good* category. Although there is a development of the students' ability to write narrative text viewed from generic structure in resolution (12.74%). But, after doing action again in cycle II, the students' mean score becomes 72.27. It is greater than Cycle I and D-test ($72.27 > 62.31 > 55.27$) and it is classified as a *good* category. It means that there is a development of students' ability to write narrative text viewed from generic structure in resolution from cycle I to cycle II (15.98%) and from D-test to cycle II (30.76%).

The development of the students' ability to write narrative text viewed from generic structure through SWELL Method has an effective effect. Where, the teacher finds the students' mean score in diagnostic test is 63.95. It is far from the target, but after implies the SWELL Method; the students get mean score 70.27 in the cycle I. It means the students' development from diagnostic test to cycle I is 10.87%. After doing action again in cycle II, the students' mean score becomes 79.05. It means the students' development from cycle I to cycle II is 12.69%. And the students' development from diagnostic test to cycle II is 24.19%.

From the explanation above the researcher analyze that SWELL Method can develop the students' ability to write narrative text viewed from generic structure, where the students' mean score in cycle I and cycle II is higher than d-test.

2. The development of the students' ability to write narrative text viewed from language use through SWELL Method

The indicators of language use are past tense and pronoun. The first, the mean score of the students' ability to write narrative text viewed from language use in past tense before using the SWELL Method (Diagnostic Test) is 53.15. It is classified as a *very poor* category, but after using the SWELL Method in cycle I, the mean score becomes 64.50. It is greater than diagnostic test ($64.50 > 53.15$), it is classified as a *fair to poor* category. Although, there is a development of the students' ability to write narrative text viewed from language use in past tense (21.35%). But, after doing action again in cycle II, the students' mean score becomes 76.62. It is greater than Cycle I and D-test ($76.62 > 64.50 > 53.15$) and it is classified as a *good to average* category. It means that there is a development of



students' ability to write narrative text viewed from language use in past tense from cycle I to cycle II (18.17%) and from D-test to cycle II (44.16%). The second, the mean score of students' ability to write narrative text viewed from language use in pronoun before using the SWELL Method (Diagnostic Test) is 53.69. It is classified as a *very poor* category, but after using the SWELL Method in cycle I, the mean score becomes 62.88. It is greater than diagnostic test ($62.88 > 53.69$), it is classified as a *fair to poor* category. Although there is a development of the students' ability to write narrative text viewed from language use in pronoun (17.17%). But, after doing action again in cycle II, the students' mean score becomes 76.50. It is greater than Cycle I and D-test ($76.50 > 62.88 > 53.69$) and it is classified as a *good to average* category. It means that there is a development of students' ability to write narrative text viewed from language use in pronoun from cycle I to cycle II (21.66%) and from D-test to cycle II (42.48%).

The development of students' ability to write narrative text through SWELL Method has effective effect. In the analysis of students' language use the researcher finds that before the use of SWELL Method the students' mean score is 53.42 (*very poor*). After using SWELL Method in cycle I the students' mean score is 63.69 (*fair to poor*) and in the cycle II the students' mean score is 76.56 (*good to average*). The development of the students' ability to write narrative text viewed from language use can be seen from the mean of language use from d-test to cycle I is 19.27%, whereas the development of students' score from d-test to cycle II is 19.92 % and from cycle I to cycle II is 43.32%. From the explanation above, the researcher analyze that the students' ability to write narrative text viewed from language use by using SWELL Method is developed.

CONCLUSION

Based on the research findings in the previous chapter, the researcher puts the following conclusions:

1. SWELL Method is one of the good methods in writing narrative text. It indicates that this method have succeeded to develop the students' ability to write narrative text at XI IPA of SMA Muhammadiyah Sungguminasa Gowa.
2. The mean score of students' ability to write narrative text viewed from generic structure component in d-test is 63.95 (*fairly good*). In cycle I it is developed



become 70.27 (*good*), whereas in cycle II the students' mean score is 79.05 (*good*).

3. The mean score of students' ability to write narrative text viewed from language use component in d-test is 53.42 (*very poor*). In cycle I it is developed become 64.69 (*fair to poor*) whereas in cycle II the students' score is 76.56 (*good to average*).
4. The students' score in writing narrative text in d-test is 58.69 (*poor*). In cycle I, the students' score is developed 66.98 (*fair*) and in the cycle II the students' score become 77.81 (*good*). The students' progress from d-test to cycle I is 15.07%, cycle I to cycle II is 16.31 %, and d-test to cycle II is 33.76%.

Based on the conclusion above, the researcher has suggestions as follows:

1. It is suggested to the English teachers that they apply this SWELL Method as one of alternative ways to develop the students' writing ability.
2. The students are expected to develop their writing ability through SWELL Method.
3. Teachers should invite and raise the students' learning motivation by manipulating various methods in presenting productive skill, including writing skill.
4. The teachers should create fun atmosphere in order that the students enjoy learning writing activity.
5. The research findings can also be used as an additional reference or further research with different discussion for the next researcher.
6. It is suggested to the next researchers that they apply SWELL Method to develop the students' ability in other disciplines of material.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adelstein, M. E and Pival, G. J. 1980. *The Writing Commitment 2nd Edition*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
- Oyle, O. F. 1986. Teaching and assessing writing: Recent advances in understanding, evaluating, and improving student performance. *Quarterly of the Center for the Study of Writing*, 8 (3), 36-43.
- Gay, L. R. 1981. *Education Research: Competencies for Analysis and Applicant*. Columbus : Clurles E. Marril Publishing Company.



- Hasani, Aceng. 2005. *Ihwal Menulis*. UNTIRTA PRESS.
- Keraf, Gorys. 2001. *Argumentasi dan Narasi*. Jakarta: PT.Gramedia.
- Kusumaningsih. 2001. *The Teaching of Writing at Secondary School*. Banjarmasin: Departemen Pendidikan Nasional
- Little, McDougal. 1999. *Basic Skill in English*. United States of America: McDougal, Little & Company.
- Marrahamin, Ismail. 1999. *Menulis Secara Popular*. Jakarta: Pustaka Jaya.
- Oshima, Alice and Hogue, Ann. 1997. *Introduction to Academic Writing*. London and New York: Longman Group UK Limited.
- Peregoy, S. F., and Boyle, O. F. 2001. *Reading, Writing, and Learning in ESL: A Resource Book for K-12 Teachers*. New York: Longman.
- Sudjana. 1990. *Metode Statistika*. Bandung: PT. Gramedia.
- Teo, Adeline. 2007. SWELL (Social-Interactive Writing for English Language Learners). *English Teaching Forum*, (Online), No. 4 (<http://exchanges.state.gov/english-teaching/forum/archives/docs/07-45-4-d.pdf>, retrieved on 02nd June 2012).

