



PRESENTATION-PRACTICE-PRODUCTION METHOD ON THE LEARNING OUTCOMES OF WRITING PROCEDURE TEXT

Muhammad Hasyimsyah Batubara¹, Cut Novita Srikandi², Mar'ah Sophiyah Anwar³

^{1,3}IAIN Takengon, Aceh Tengah, Aceh, Indonesia, ²Faculty of Education, Universitas Muhammadiyah Sumatera Utara, Medan, Indonesia

Email: muhammad.hasyimsyahbatubara@gmail.com¹, cutnovita@umsu.ac.id², sophiyahanwar1203@gmail.com³

Abstract: This research destination is to determine the effectiveness of the PPP methods in improving the ability to write procedural texts for learning English. The students of class X SMK N 3 Takengon are the population. The sampling technique used by the researcher is divided into two groups: The researcher made classes X TKJ 1 as many as 28 students as an experimental class and X TKJ 2 as many as 28 as the control class. This research is designed with an experimental study in a quantitative method approach. The researcher used observation and tests (pre and post-test) to gather data. After the test was conducted, the next stage was the validity, reliability, hypothesis, and N-Gain tests. Based on statistical calculations, the score Tscore is higher than the Ttable ($33.51 > 1.67$). The N-Gain test is 0.9 in the experimental and 0.8 in the control classes. Ultimately, the study hypothesis (H_a) is accepted and indicates that the hypothesis (H_o) is rejected. It concluded that applying the PPP method ascertainable affects the ability to write procedural texts for research samples.

Keywords: PPP Method, Procedure Text, Learning, Writing

Abstrak: Tujuan penelitian ini adalah untuk mengetahui keefektifan metode PPP dalam meningkatkan kemampuan menulis teks prosedur pembelajaran bahasa Inggris. Populasinya adalah siswa kelas X SMK N 3 Takengon. Teknik pengambilan sampel yang digunakan peneliti dibagi menjadi dua kelompok yaitu peneliti menjadikan kelas X TKJ 1 sebanyak 28 siswa sebagai kelas eksperimen dan kelas X TKJ 2 sebanyak 28 siswa sebagai kelas kontrol. Penelitian ini dirancang dengan penelitian eksperimen dengan pendekatan metode kuantitatif. Peneliti menggunakan observasi dan tes (pre dan post-test) untuk mengumpulkan data. Setelah dilakukan pengujian, langkah selanjutnya adalah uji validitas, uji reliabilitas, uji hipotesis, dan uji N-Gain. Berdasarkan perhitungan statistik, Tscore lebih tinggi dari Ttabel ($33,51 > 1,67$). Uji N-Gain adalah 0,9 di kelas eksperimen dan 0,8 di kelas kontrol. Pada akhirnya hipotesis penelitian (H_a) diterima dan menunjukkan bahwa hipotesis (H_o) ditolak. Disimpulkan bahwa penerapan metode PPP berpengaruh terhadap kemampuan menulis teks prosedur sampel penelitian.

Kata Kunci: Metode PPP, Teks Prosedur, Pembelajaran, Menulis

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.37249/assalam.v7i1.443>

Received: 11 September 2022; **Revised:** 28 March 2023; **Accepted:** 27 June 2023

To cite this article: Batubara, M. H., Srikandi, C. N., & Anwar, M. S. (2023). PRESENTATION-PRACTICE-PRODUCTION METHOD ON THE LEARNING OUTCOMES OF WRITING PROCEDURE TEXT. *Jurnal As-Salam*, 7(1), 72–84. <https://doi.org/10.37249/assalam.v7i1.443>

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.

INTRODUCTION

Education is a measurable and conceptual endeavor to realize a learning climate or activities, so learners can enthusiastically expand their self-power and potential (Law No. 20, 2003). Further education goals to foster and evolve the human person spiritually and physically. Therefore, the nature of education is normative diligence to develop humane

nature utilizing the basic concepts of education. In order to compose an appropriate educational atmosphere and support the learning activity, a method is needed that supports the learning process, particularly the English learning activity (Richard, 1985; Richard, 1990; Sardiman, 1996; Nunan, 1997; Wang, 2010; Xiaona, 2016; Nilson, 2016).

As we know, English is part of an important subject in school because it is the language of globalization or English as an international language (EIL) that is widely used in major countries in the universe (Crystal, 1997; Graddol, 1997; 1999; Komin, 1998; McKay, 2012; Kirkpatrick, 2014; Marlina, 2014; Agusta, 2015). One dexterity that should be understood in learning English is writing. The capability to write is one language skill that should be mastered because it is instrumental. By writing, a person can pour his thoughts, memory, ideas, and creativity. Furthermore, writing is developing ideas applied to writing, ordinarily made by someone into an article. Writing is also referred to as a person's intellectual process and effort (White and Arndt, 1991; Nunan, 2003). In addition, writing is likewise one of the language skills applied for indirect communication. The definition of writing competence is directly related to teaching approaches concluded by experts, such as; free-writing, controlled-to-free, grammar syntax, discourse organization, paragraph pattern, communicative, academic-purposed writing approach, current-traditional rhetoric, controlled composition, social constructionist view, writer and reader-oriented (Raimes, 1983; Johns, 1990; Silva, 1990; Tribble, 1996; Nunan, 1999; Hyland, 2002 cited in Yi, 2009).

Suyanto (2008) said that writing capabilities are considered highly challenging language competence, implicating the prowess or expertise in spelling, grammar, and vocabulary. In addition, thinking and logic skills combine words into meaningful sentences (Suyanto, 2008). The most problematic part of students' difficulties in writing are sections, such as diction and vocabulary (Meslissorgou & Frantzi, 2015; Zhan, 2015; Nugraheni & Basya, 2018; Toba et al., 2019; cited in Bulqiyah et al., 2021). While other findings that mention learners' impediments in writing are in the grammatical features section (Meslissorgou & Frantzi, 2015; Zhan, 2015; Hasan & Marzuki, 2017; Ariyanti & Fitriana, 2017; Nugraheni & Basya, 2018; Hajeid, 2018; Toba et al., 2019 cited in Bulqiyah et al., 2021).

Some research findings mention that students' writing difficulties can also be generating and exploring ideas (Hosseini et al., 2013; Asadifard & Koosha, 2013; Nugraheni & Basya, 2018; Ceylan, 2019). Meanwhile, students' difficulties in organizing writing are also prioritized in students' ability to write (Nugraheni & Basya, 2018; Hajeid, 2018; Toba et al., 2019). Moreover, difficulties in the teaching process and the ability of teachers to teach writing are significant matters also in the difficulties and abilities of students in writing (Jebreil et al., 2015; Hajeid, 2018; Ceylan, 2019, cited in Bulqiyah et al., 2021). The inference drawn through the findings of the studies mentioned above explains that the most fundamental challenges and difficulties for students in writing are in the vocabulary and grammar sections (Bulqiyah et al., 2021).

From the theory above, writing is not an easy process. Writing competence needs to be studied because these skills are vital for language learning and beneficial for students.

Therefore, writing training must be given from the start through a process that requires time and patience from the teacher (Suyanto, 2008). Likewise, in writing texts, there are many genres of texts in English, such as procedure, recount, report, descriptive, narrative text, and others. Teachers and students sometimes have difficulty learning it. Therefore, teachers must know the right techniques and methods in the learning and teaching process to get the desired learning targets. In addition, the teacher must provide something different so that students can experience a fun learning process. Maybe because the method is boring, students' interest in learning writing material in English is lacking. The learning process only focuses on the instructor and does not offer opportunities for learners to develop their abilities. It will affect the low learning outcomes of learners so that it will cause the achievement of learning to write to be not optimal (not yet reached the KKM) in English subjects.

Grounded on the researcher's sighting of the internal method applied at SMKN 3 Takengon and seeing that the KKM standard was still below the KKM standard, the researcher wore the PPP method to increase the scores of students who were previously below the KKM standard. This method has never been used before at SMK N 3 Takengon. From the predicament mentioned above, the investigators are very fascinated with conducting the quantitative investigation with the title Presentation-Practice-Production Method On The Learning Outcomes Of Writing Procedure Text. With this research, the authors hope to provide solutions and contribute to improving students' writing skills at SMK N 3 Takengon in particular and for readers in general.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Writing

Writing is primarily a social activity delivering ideas, messages, emotions, and intentions to readers utilizing letters, words, phrases, sentences, paragraphs, text, and punctuation (Flower & Hayes, 1981; Hayes, 1996, Brown, 2001; Boardman, 2002; Nunan, 2003; Harmer, 2004 in Nasution et al., 2021). Even it can distribute information or knowledge to the reader. It is an activity of delivering intentions through language in the form of graphic symbols such as letters or words for words written and punctuation symbols. Furthermore, write down or depict graphic symbols that portray the language understood by someone so that he can understand graphic symbols. The goal of writing is the delivery of messages to the reader and the expressiveness of ideas. So the notion themselves must be seen as enormously significant aspects of writing (Penny, 1996).

According to Penny (1996); Raimes (2002); Seow (2002), there are several stages to the writing process: a) Prewriting (browsing topics freely, choosing your topic, and starting to gather and organize details before you write). b) Drafting (making ideas or drafting what you want to put into an article). c) Revising (correcting significant mistakes and improving the form and content of writing better). d) Editing (writing errors to improve grammar, spelling, and mechanics). e) Publishing and Presenting (the process of sharing your writing).

Procedure Text

Procedure text indicates how something must be done based on a particular action (Anderson & Kathy, 1998; Derewianka, 2004). The steps are sequences that must be taken in a series of activities that cannot be placed randomly (Penny, 1996).

Presentation, Practice, and Production

PPP can also be interpreted as a method of structuring teaching in a foreign language. PPP is divided into three phases, moving from strict teacher control to greater freedom of learning (Harmer, 2007). Characteristics of PPP are: a) New material is presented in the form of a dialogue, b) There are thinking activities, memorizing predetermined phrases, c) Structures are sorted using contrast analysis and taught one by one, d) The patterns are taught using repetitive exercises, e) Vocabulary needs to be remembered and studied in context, f) There is a lot of use of tapes in language labs and other visual aids (Setiyadi, 2006).

The stages of PPP are: a) Presentation: Presentations are made by the English teacher. Here the teacher explains what material they want to convey to their students. The presentation is representative of an introduction to the learning and teaching activity. It can be achieved through pictures, dialogue, and so on. In presentations, there are usually two steps of introductory activities, such as warnings or directions to increase students' intentions in the learning and teaching activity. b) Practice: Practice is an activity where students try to understand what they understand about the material from the teacher. Here the teacher also still provides instructions to help his students. Classrooms at this stage begin to center on learners. c) Production: Production is an activity that allows students to declare their ideas in a writing test. In this section, students create text to build upon the teacher's topic. It also determines how far students understand what has been explained (Willis and Willis, 2007; Richards & Rodgers, 2001; Harmer, 2007).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The design was carried out using an experiment-based quantitative approach. In this study, the researchers used the type of group comparison, namely the control and experimental classes. Researchers use quantitative because researchers will see the development of student's abilities. Then the researcher will see the distinction between the experiment and control classes using the pre and post-test designs. Researchers chose experimental research to determine student learning outcomes after learning procedure text using the PPP method. Data aggregation techniques with sighting and tests. The population of this study is 117 students, all of whom are class X students of SMK N 3 Takengon in the 2021/2022 academic year. The sample is part of the amount owned by the population (Sugiono, 2017). The researcher made classes X TKJ 1 as many as 28 students as an experimental class and X TKJ 2 as many as 28 as the control class. After the investigator held the test, the next stage was the validity test, reliability test, hypothesis testing, and N-Gain test.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Finding of Research

1. The Result of Observation of the Teacher

There are three stages carried out during this research process, namely the process before the activity (observation), during the activity (research), and the final result of the research (conclusion). In addition, observations of the activities of the English teacher, and it was found that the teacher came on time to present the learning activities. The teacher continued by greeting the students and taking attendance before entering the material, but the teacher did not appropriately convey the learning objectives before entering the learning material.

In addition, the teacher's capability to convey learning material is prominent and detailed so that learners easily comprehend the learning process. Besides that, the teacher also uses language that learners handily understand. However, in the learning activities, the teacher does not explain the proper steps and does not give conclusions at the end of the learning process.

Then in using strategies and methods in learning, the teacher uses general/conventional strategies to deliver the material. Sometimes teachers only give assignments to students based on learning package books. Then the teacher gives general illustrations and examples without variations so that students can understand them, but sometimes it makes them bored because students cannot develop their ideas to make procedure texts according to their abilities.

2. The Result of Observation of the Student

In addition, the results of student activities can be seen as the observations of student activities that students are fascinated by learning English. It could be seen in the enthusiasm of learners who enter class on time and greet the instructor when the instructor is in class, besides that learners also pay attention to the teacher when the teacher tries to repeat last week's material, and they also respond to the teacher's questions related to last week's material even though some students are unable to answer the teacher's questions. Then in the post-activity, students are interested in learning English, but some obstacles may create it difficult for them to follow the learning activities. It makes them less active in performing the learning activities because it also makes them feel bored and unable to conclude and answer the teacher's questions.

Based on these observations, the researcher concluded that the learners' ability in writing procedure texts was steadfastly in the low category. So, according to researchers, this is very important to explore further. In this case, the investigator uses the PPP method to sharpen the competence to write procedure texts for SMK N 3 Takengon students.

From the two observations above, we can conclude that teachers or students do not carry out several stages, such as delivering learning objectives at the beginning of class and using standard methods so that students are bored as well as students, they have not been able to be active in the learning activities and have not been capable of simulating text in general.

3. Result of Test

The conclusion of the test data can be seen in the following table:

Table 1. The differences in pre and post-test scores in the experimental class

No	Name	Pre-test (X)	Post-test (Y)	Gain (d) = Y-X	d ²	Deviation (Xd = (d- Md)	Deviation ² = X ² d
1	IR	58	86	28	784	-6,6	44,13
2	LA	58	98	40	1600	5,4	28,70
3	NH	61	96	35	1225	0,4	0,13
4	RU	58	88	30	900	-4,6	21,56
5	SRF	68	96	28	784	-6,6	44,13
6	T	61	96	35	1225	0,4	0,13
7	WA	58	88	30	900	-4,6	21,56
8	RSB	61	96	35	1225	0,4	0,13
9	IL	60	95	35	1225	0,4	0,13
10	NR	58	87	29	841	-5,6	31,84
11	SF	59	86	27	729	-7,6	58,41
12	SW	60	90	30	900	-4,6	21,56
13	IA	61	95	34	1156	-0,6	0,41
14	RA	61	96	35	1225	0,4	0,13
15	NU	58	95	37	1369	2,4	5,56
16	RI	58	94	36	1296	1,4	1,84
17	AL	59	96	37	1369	2,4	5,56
18	NHN	60	97	37	1369	2,4	5,56
19	UR	60	96	36	1296	1,4	1,84
20	FS	61	96	35	1225	0,4	0,13
21	TF	58	95	37	1369	2,4	5,56
22	AW	57	96	39	1521	4,4	18,98
23	BS	56	97	41	1681	6,4	40,41
24	II	60	98	38	1444	3,4	11,27
25	MA	61	97	36	1296	1,4	1,84
26	IM	59	96	37	1369	2,4	5,56
27	SI	61	97	36	1296	1,4	1,84
28	AW	61	98	37	1369	2,4	5,56
Total		1671	2641	970	33988		384,43

Mean (Md) 34,64

DEVSQ 384,43

STDEV 3,77

Table 2. The differences in the pre and post-test scores in the control class

No	Name	Pre-test (X)	Post-test (Y)	Gain (d) = Y-X	d ²	Deviation (Xd = (d- Md)	Deviation ² = X ² d
1	BW	58	73	15	225	-0,54	0,29

2	FR	68	71	3	9	-12,54	157,14
3	FTL	61	71	10	100	-5,54	30,64
4	DA	58	77	19	361	3,46	12,00
5	AF	58	74	16	256	0,46	0,22
6	GA	61	80	19	361	3,46	12,00
7	A	58	78	20	400	4,46	19,93
8	MF	58	71	13	169	-2,54	6,43
9	BF	60	76	16	256	0,46	0,22
10	FD	61	75	14	196	-1,54	2,36
11	DF	59	78	19	361	3,46	12,00
12	GA	61	78	17	289	1,46	2,14
13	AR	61	71	10	100	-5,54	30,64
14	BR	60	80	20	400	4,46	19,93
15	RT	61	78	17	289	1,46	2,14
16	LA	58	76	18	324	2,46	6,07
17	DG	58	75	17	289	1,46	2,14
18	FG	61	74	13	169	-2,54	6,43
19	RR	58	76	18	324	2,46	6,07
20	AND	58	71	13	169	-2,54	6,43
21	MBS	58	78	20	400	4,46	19,93
22	FM	61	78	17	289	1,46	2,14
23	MM	58	75	17	289	1,46	2,14
24	DH	68	80	12	144	-3,54	12,50
25	WGA	61	76	15	225	-0,54	0,29
26	WU	58	75	17	289	1,46	2,14
27	NH	61	76	15	225	-0,54	0,29
28	NHK	60	75	15	225	-0,54	0,29
Total		1681	2116	435	7133		374,96

Mean (Md) 15,54
 DEVSQ 374,96
 STDEV 3,73

4. The Testing Hypothesis

The hypothesis is a temporary answer to the questions sought in research, and it is accepted if $t_{score} > t_{table}$.

M_x 34,64 M_y 15,54
 X^2 384,43 Y^2 374,96
 N_x 28 N_y 28

$$t = \frac{M_x - M_y}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\sum x^2 + \sum y^2}{N_x + N_y - 2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{N_x} + \frac{1}{N_y}\right)}} \quad t = \frac{34,64 - 15,54}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{970 + 435}{28 + 28 - 2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{28} + \frac{1}{28}\right)}} \quad t = \frac{19,1}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{435}{54}\right)\left(\frac{2}{56}\right)}} \quad t = 33,51$$

$$Df = n_1 + n_2 - 2 \quad Df = 28 + 28 - 2 \quad Df = 54$$

$$T_{tabel} = 1,67$$

$T_{score} = 33,51$

$T_{tabel} = 1,67$

5. N-Giant Test

To know the significantly affected from the understanding student by using PPP method, the researcher used the N-Gian test as follows:

Table 3. N- Gain scores in the experimental class

No	Name	Pre-test (X)	Post-test (Y)	Gain (d) = Y-X	skor maksimum - skor pretest	N- Gain scores
1	IR	58	86	28	40	0,70
2	LA	58	98	40	40	1,00
3	NH	61	96	35	37	0,95
4	RU	58	88	30	40	0,75
5	SRF	68	96	28	30	0,93
6	T	61	96	35	37	0,95
7	WA	58	88	30	40	0,75
8	RSB	61	96	35	37	0,95
9	IL	60	95	35	38	0,92
10	NR	58	87	29	40	0,73
11	SF	59	86	27	39	0,69
12	SW	60	90	30	38	0,79
13	IA	61	95	34	37	0,92
14	RA	61	96	35	37	0,95
15	NU	58	95	37	40	0,93
16	RI	58	94	36	40	0,90
17	AL	59	96	37	39	0,95
18	NHN	60	97	37	38	0,97
19	UR	60	96	36	38	0,95
20	FS	61	96	35	37	0,95
21	TF	58	95	37	40	0,93
22	AW	57	96	39	41	0,95
23	BS	56	97	41	42	0,98
24	II	60	98	38	38	1,00
25	MA	61	97	36	37	0,97
26	IM	59	96	37	39	0,95
27	SI	61	97	36	37	0,97
28	AW	61	98	37	37	1,00
	Average	60	94	35	38	0,9

Table 4. N- Gain scores in the control class

No	Name	Pre-test (X)	Post-test (Y)	Gain (d) = Y-X	skor maksimum - skor pretest	N- Gain scores
1	BW	58	73	15	22	0,68
2	FR	68	71	3	12	0,25
3	FTL	61	71	10	19	0,53
4	DA	58	77	19	22	0,86
5	AF	58	74	16	22	0,73
6	GA	61	80	19	19	1,00
7	A	58	78	20	22	0,91
8	MF	58	71	13	22	0,59
9	BF	60	76	16	20	0,80
10	FD	61	75	14	19	0,74
11	DF	59	78	19	21	0,90
12	GA	61	78	17	19	0,89
13	AR	61	71	10	19	0,53
14	BR	60	80	20	20	1,00
15	RT	61	78	17	19	0,89
16	LA	58	76	18	22	0,82
17	DG	58	75	17	22	0,77
18	FG	61	74	13	19	0,68
19	RR	58	76	18	22	0,82
20	AND	58	71	13	22	0,59
21	MBS	58	78	20	22	0,91
22	FM	61	78	17	19	0,89
23	MM	58	75	17	22	0,77
24	DH	68	80	12	12	1,00
25	WGA	61	76	15	19	0,79
26	WU	58	75	17	22	0,77
27	NH	61	76	15	19	0,79
28	NHK	60	75	15	20	0,75
	Average	60,0	76	15,54	19,96	0,8

Discussion

After the experimental research analysis was carried out from the experimental and control classes, the authors found that using the PPP method contributed to students' understanding of writing procedure texts. Therefore, the researcher agrees that the use of the PPP method provides benefits for students, especially in students' writing skills. The test result of this research is the gap investigation of the average post-test score amongst the experimental and control classes to ensure that the method is used effectively. The experimental class's score is Mean (Md): 34,64, DEVSQ: 384,43, STDEV: 3,77, and the

control class's is Mean (Md): 15,54, DEVSQ: 374,96, STDEV: 3,73. The explanation of the difference between the two classes shows that the student's writing ability in the experimental class is preferable to the student's capability in the control class. Students got good scores on the post-test after the researcher used the PPP method. The PPP method can significantly improve the ability to write procedural texts for class X TKJ SMK N 3 Takengon students.

The findings above show that the role of the teacher must present an excellent atmosphere to improve the communicative learning process. The teacher also plays a role in choosing media to attract students' attention, and the teacher must also use the proper method, such as the PPP method can help students feel interested in learning a language in English and encourage them to master procedural texts without worrying about making mistakes. Teachers can develop the PPP method with various easily implemented activities in class.

CONCLUSION

The use of the PPP method can significantly increase the ability to write procedure texts for class X TKJ students of SMK N 3 Takengon. The test process results before and after teaching writing using the PPP method in procedure text showed that it could improve students' writing ability. It can be known as $T_{score} > T_{table}$ and rejected if $t_{score} < t_{table}$. Then from the results of this study, it was found that the T_{score} is higher than the T_{table} ($33.51 > 1.67$). It showed that (H_a) research is accepted, and (H_0) is rejected. In addition, this study also uses the N-Gain test. In the results of this study, it was found that in the experimental class, the N-Gain test is 0.9, so that is a high effect, and the N-gain test is 0.8 in the control class.

REFERENCES

- Agusta, D. (2015). *Improving Student Ability in Writing Narrative Teks Using Short Animated Stories at Class VIII C Of SMPN 2 Sanden, Buntul in the Academic Year of 2013/201*. Yogyakarta: UNY.
- Anderson, M., and Anderson, K. (1998). *Text Type in English 3*. South Yarra: Macmillan Education Australia PTY LTD.
- Ariyanti, A., & Fitriana, R. (2017). EFL students' difficulties and needs in essay writing. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research. International Conference on Teacher Training and Education 2017 (ICTTE 2017)*, 32-42. Surakarta, Indonesia.
<https://doi.org/10.2991/iccte-17.2017.4>
- Asadifard, A., & Koosha, M. (2013). EFL instructors and student writers' perceptions on academic writing reluctance. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(9), 1572–1578.
<https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.3.9.1572-1578>
- Boardman, A. (2002). *Writing to communicate*. New York: Longman.
- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy (second edition)*. New York: Longman.

- Bulqiyah, S., Mahbub, M. A., & Nugraheni, D. A. (2021). Investigating writing difficulties in essay writing: Tertiary students' perspectives. *English Language Teaching Educational Journal*, 4(1), 61–73.
<https://doi.org/10.12928/eltej.v4i1.2371>
- Ceylan, N. O. (2019). Student perceptions of difficulties in second language writing. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 15(1), 151–157.
<https://doi.org/10.17263/jlls.547683>
- Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Derewianka, B. (2004). *Exploring How Texts Work*. Australia: Primary English Teaching Association.
- Dong, X. (2016) Research on the Teaching Methods of College English. *Creative Education*, 7(9), 1233-1236.
DOI: 10.4236/ce.2016.79129.
- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 32(4), 365-387.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/356600>
- Graddol, D. (1997). *The Future of English*. London: The British Council.
- Graddol, D. (1999). *The decline of the native speaker*. In D. Graddol & M. Ulrike (Eds.), *English in a Changing World*. AILA Review 13, 57-68.
Retrieved from http://www.academia.edu/1299723/The_decline_of_the_native_speaker
- Hajeid, M. R. (2018). Developing students' essay writing. *Canadian Center of Science and Education*, 11(12), 101–105.
<https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v11n12p101>
- Harmer, J. (2004). *How to teach writing*. Essex, UK: Pearson Education.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The Practice of English Language Teaching Fourth Edition*. Cambridge UK: Longman.
- Hasan, J., & Marzuki, M. (2017). An analysis of students' ability in writing at Riau University Pekanbaru Indonesia. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 7(5), 380–388.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0705.08>
- Hayes, J. R. (1996). A new framework for understanding cognition and affect in writing. In C. M. Levy & S. Ransdell (Eds.), *The science of writing: theories, methods, individual differences, and applications*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Hosseini, M., Taghizadeh, M. E., Abedin, M. J. Z., & Naseri, E. (2013). In the importance of EFL learners' writing skill: Is there any relation between writing skill and content score of English essay test? *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences*, 6, 1–12.
<https://doi.org/10.18052/www.scipress.com/ILSHS.6.1>
- Hyland, K. (2002). *Teaching and researching writing*. London: Longman.
- Jebreil, N., Azizifar, A., & Gowhary, H. (2015). Investigating the effect of anxiety of male and female Iranian EFL learners on their writing performance. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 185, 190–196.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.03.360>
- Johns, A. M. (1990). L1 composition theories: implications for developing theories of L2 composition. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: research insights for the classroom (pp. 24-36)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kasihani K. E. S. (2008). *English For Young Learners, Cet.2*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

- Kirkpatrick, A. (2014). Teaching English in Asia in Non-Anglo Cultural Contexts: Principles of Lingua Franca Approach. In Marlina, R., Ashish Giri R. (Eds.), *The Pedagogy of English as an International Language* (pp. 12-19). New York: Springer International Publishing.
- Komin, S. (1998). *English Language Learning in the 21st Asian Century*. In W.A. Renaldya (Ed). *Learners and Language Learning*. Singapore: Seameo Relc.
- Koosha, M, and Yakhabi, M,. (2013). *Problems Associated with the Use of Communicative Language Teaching in EFL Contexts and Possible Solutions*. Iran: Department of English, Khorasgan Branch, Islamic Azad University.
- Marlina, R. (2014). The Pedagogy of English as an International Language (EIL): More Reflections and Dialogues. In Marlina, R., Ashish Giri R. (Eds.), *The Pedagogy of English as an International Language* (pp. 12-15). New York, NY: Springer International Publishing.
- McKay, S. L. (2012). Principles of teaching English as an international language. In L. Alsagoff, S.L. McKay, G. Hu, & W.A. Reandya (Eds.), *Principles and Practices for Teaching English as an International Language* (pp.28-46). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Meslissorgou, M. N., & Frantzi, K. T. (2015). Testing writing in EFL exams: The learners' viewpoint as valuable feedback for improvement. *Procedia -Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 199, 30–37.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.483>
- Nasution, D. S., Batubara, M. H., and Rahmayana, R. (2021). Increasing Students' Ability in Writing Procedure Text Through Learning Model Pictures and Pictures. *Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Language Teaching (JLLLT)*, 1(1), 8-19.
<https://doi.org/10.37249/jllt.v1i1.302>
- Nilson, L. B. (2016). *Teaching at Its Best: A Research-Based Resource for College Instructors (Fourth)*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Nugraheni, D. A., & Basya, D. (2018). Exploring EFL Students' Writing Difficulties: from Dimensions to Errors. *Jurnal Educazione: Jurnal Pendidikan, Pembelajaran Dan Bimbingan Dan Konseling*, 6(2), 51–59.
Retrieved from <http://ejurnal.uij.ac.id/index.php/EDU/article/view/573>
- Nunan, D. (1997). *Syllabus Design*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nunan, D. (1999). *Second language teaching and learning*. Boston, Mass: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Nunan, D. (2003). *Practical English Language Teaching*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Raimes, A. (1983). *Techniques in teaching writing*. Oxford: Oxford American English.
- Raimes, A. (2002). Ten Steps in Planning a Writing Course and Training Teachers of Writing. In J. C. Richards, & Willy A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in Language Teaching* (pp.306-314). USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Richard, J. C. (1985). *The Context of Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Richard, J. C. (1990). *The Language Teaching Matrix*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Sardiman, A. M. (1996). *Interaksi dan Motivasi Belajar Mengajar*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.

- Scrivener, J. (1996). ARC: A descriptive model for classroom work on language. In J. Willis, & D. Willis, (eds.), *Challenge and change in language teaching* (pp. 79-92). Oxford: Macmillan Heinemann English Language Teaching.
- Seow, A. (2002). The Writing Process and Process Writing. In J. C. Richards, & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in Language Teaching* (315-327). USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Setiyadi, B. (2006). *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*. Yogyakarta. Graha Ilmu.
- Silva, T. (1990). Second language composition instruction: developments, issues, and directions in ESL. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: research insights for the classroom* (pp. 11-23). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sugiono. (2017). *Metode Penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Toba, R., Noor, W. N., & Sanu, L. O. (2019). The current issues of Indonesian EFL students' writing skills: Ability, problem, and reason in writing comparison and contrast essays. *Dinamika Ilmu*, 19(1), 57–73.
<https://doi.org/10.21093/di.v19i1.1506>
- Tribble, C. (1996). *Writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Undang-undang (UU) RI. (2003). Undang-undang (UU) Nomor 20 Tahun 2003 tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional. Jakarta: Tambahan Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2003 Nomor 4301.
- Ur, Penny. (1996). *A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Wang, X. J. (2010). Investigation and Analysis of the Burnout Status of College Female English Teachers. *Journal of Jinan Vocational College*, 1, 37-38, 41.
http://caod.oriprobe.com/articles/23608830/Research_and_Analysis_on_Job_Burnout_of_College_English_Mistresses.htm
- White, R., & Arndt, V. (1991). *Process Writing*. London: Longman.
- Willis, D., & Willis, J. (2007). *Doing task-based teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yi, Jyi-yeon. (2009). Defining writing ability for classroom writing assessment in high schools. *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, 13(1), 53-69.
<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ921024>
- Zhan, H. (2015). Frequent errors in Chinese EFL learners' topic-based writings. *Canadian Center of Science and Education*, 8(5), 72–81.
<https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v8n5p72>