

# USING THE GUIDED WRITING TECHNIQUE TO TEACH WRITING OF ANALYTICAL EXPOSITION TEXTS

By  
**Bustami Usman**  
**Zahratur Rizki\***

*University of Syiah Kuala, Banda Aceh*

## ABSTRACT

The objective of this study was to find out whether there was a difference in results from students who were taught analytical exposition text writing through the Guided Writing Technique (GWT) and other students who were taught using a standard way of teaching writing. The English writing skills of the second grade students in a high school in Banda Aceh were unsatisfactory; therefore, it was suggested that a specific treatment or learning process was needed. The study focused on assessment of students being taught to write analytical exposition texts. To achieve the goal of the study, a true experimental design with an experimental group (EG) with 29 students, and a control group (CG) with 28 students was used. The instrument of this study was tests. The data was analyzed through statistics. From the findings of the study, the writing ability of both groups after the treatments was different according to the results from a t-test. These result showed that the t-test was 11.26, whilst the result from the t-table at a level of significance 5% ( $\alpha=0.05$ ) was 2.0211. So, t-test was higher than t-table ( $11.26 > 2.0211$ ). In conclusion, the results from this study showed that there was a significant improvement in skills for writing analytical exposition texts from the EG students taught using the GWT whilst the CG taught by a standard teaching technique for writing did not show such improvement.

Key Words: *Guided Writing Technique (GWT), Writing.*

---

\*Corresponding author: [zahra\\_qq@yahoo.co.id](mailto:zahra_qq@yahoo.co.id)

## **INTRODUCTION**

Writing is one of the English language skills that must be taught extensively by teachers to their students. Morton and Wright (1986:1) have written that “written communication is different. No one can hear your voice rise when you ask a question. No one can hear it fall when you make a statement. A person cannot sense any pauses between thoughts. For instance, in speaking if you use confusing sentences, the listener can stop you and tell you she is confused, but in writing it is different. Another example is if you spell the contraction of “there is” as “theirs” not ‘their’s’ the reader may simply conclude that you are not very smart. So it is very important that you learn to write well and correctly”. Therefore, according to Harmer (2007), in teaching writing teachers can either focus on the writing process itself or on the product of that writing. In order to encourage the students in the study group to write as a process, it has been found important to help them get used to applying the stages of that process. Therefore, the use of various teaching techniques is necessary to motivate students to learn to write English well, especially since they are supposed to be able to write in accordance with their level of proficiency. By mastering good techniques for teaching writing, the teacher will be able to guide their students better. One such technique that can be used is the Guided Writing Technique (GWT).

According to Oczkus (2007), the GWT is an essential component of a balanced writing curriculum, providing an additional supporting step towards independent writing. The teacher may use questions as a technique to develop the ability of students to understand texts. For instance, the students can develop their own ideas freely by answering questions given by their teacher. By doing so, the students can automatically start to express their own ideas in the form of written language and can start to organize their ideas more effectively. This is very helpful to lessen the difficulties that students can have in doing writing exercises. Oczkus (2007) further explains that teachers firstly will model how to write a paragraph, and then the next session will be followed by sharing ideas amongst the students. As a result, students will not waste their time to think for topics themselves and will be able to learn from each other so that their knowledge and imagination are enriched. Moreover, it will give the students more chances to be active in the learning process so that they will not be bored whilst studying.

Furthermore, Frase (2008) states that the GWT allows the teacher to work closely with small groups of students based on a common need. During a guided writing lesson, he might gather a small group and model writing, or maybe he and his students complete a shared writing experience together. Frase (2008) also claims that the GWT gives the teacher the opportunity to bring together students who are struggling with similar skills for a mini-lesson, or a retraining session. This is because GWT is a technique that gives them the opportunity to review a recently taught writing skill in a group or in a whole class setting and to apply new skills through independent writing (Badger & White, 2000). Through the GWT, they are supported during the different stages of the writing process. By applying this technique, they will be trained to practice their skills until they are ready to write independently (Badger & White, 2000).

In the process, GWT normally follows on from modeled writing, shared writing, and practice (Pinnell & Fountas, 2001). Modeled writing requires the teacher to demonstrate the steps of writing while in shared writing students contribute their ideas. After these two activities have been done, the teacher will guide students to make their own paragraphs. The GWT is useful for a range of teaching purposes, and is a short-term step between teacher directed and independent writing (Pinnell & Fountas, 2001). The teacher will provide the students with prompts or clues to use as a basic framework. It allows the students to consider audience, purpose, topic, selection of text type, etc., when planning their writing. It allows the students to focus on conventions such as spelling, punctuation, standard usage and handwriting. The GWT is recognized to promote critical, creative, and reflective thinking on topics (Bachtiar & Sagala, 2012).

Based on the explanation above, the research question for this study is: Is there any improvement in the results from students writing analytical exposition texts who are taught through the GWT by comparison with students who are taught by the standard technique for teaching writing?

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **Definitions of Writing**

Writing is one of the language skills. In the division of language skills, writing is always placed at the end after the abilities for listening, speaking, and reading. Nunan (1985:91) states that writing is clearly

complex, and competence in writing fluently is accepted as being the last language skill to be mastered. Before a student begins to write, they should first master the other language skills. This knowledge will be useful for the students and important for them to be able to express what they actually want to express. As a result, the reader should be easily able to understand either the implicit or the explicit ideas in the writing.

Raimes (1983) mentions some reasons why writing helps students to learn. The first reason is that writing reinforces the grammatical structures, idioms, and vocabulary that the teachers have taught the students. Second, when the students write, they also have chances to be adventurous with the language, to go beyond what they have just learned to say. Lastly, Raimes (1983) further claims that when they write, they necessarily become very involved with the new language: the efforts to express ideas and the constant use of eyes, hand, and brain is a unique way to reinforce learning. Thus, writing is the process of expressing the ideas and thoughts of the writer using knowledge of the structure and vocabulary of language to combine the ideas of the writer as a means of communication.

According to Oshima and Hogue (1991), writing is a progressive activity. They explain that when the writer writes something down, first he has already been thinking about what he is going to say and how to say it. Then after he has finished writing, the writer reads over what he has written and perhaps makes changes and corrections. Therefore, they assert that writing is never a one-step action; it is a process that has several stages such as pre-writing, drafting, and revising, editing, final copy proof-reading and publishing (Oshima & Hogue, 1991; Thomas, 2005).

From these points of views, it can be concluded that writing must be done as a systematic process of actions and thoughts because writing activities are trying to communicate ideas, thoughts, and feelings in written form. The most important aspect that must be considered is whether the writing can dependably communicate the ideas of the writer to her audience before considering any other aspects.

### **The Guided Writing Technique**

According to Oczkus (2007), the GWT is an essential tool in a balanced writing curriculum, providing an additional supporting step towards independent writing. The different stages of the writing process are pre-writing, drafting, and revising, editing and publishing

(or final copy proof-reading) (Thomas, 2005). So, the teacher must always be a guide for the students during the teaching-learning process for writing. Here the role of the teacher as a facilitator will help her students to find what they want to write about and how to write a paragraph clearly, systematically, and interestingly. The aim is to provide support that can help the student to write more.

According to Gibson (2008), guided writing instruction in a small-group context allows the teacher to provide high levels of immediate, targeted support while each student writes his or her own short but complete text. Gibson (2008) further elaborates that a typical format for a 120-minute guided writing lesson might include the following four steps:

1. Engagement in a brief, shared experience that is interesting for the students, including both a linguistically and informationally rich activity and accompanying conversations and expansion of the abilities of each student to talk about content of interest.
2. Discussion of strategic behavior for writing, including a presentation of a think-aloud strategy and/or of cues for strategic activity along with active discussion of ways in which students can integrate such strategies into their own writing.
3. Time for each student to write individually with immediate guidance from his teacher, who “leans in” to interact with each individual student about immediate decisions and strategies and uses prompts to guide the thinking of each student to help solve problems whilst writing.
4. A brief sharing activity in which the immediate work done by the writer is shared with an audience and each writer can experience their newly written text as a whole.

Additionally, Robinson (1967:2) defines the GWT as writing in which one cannot make a serious error so long as one follows directions. From this statement, it seems that the guide is used to avoid any serious error being made by a student with the condition being that they should follow directions. Guided writing is the most powerful technique in teaching writing to students. Within the framework of guided writing, the teacher is continually providing feedback, redirection and expansion of ideas. Any area of writing can be addressed, but a good plan is to put similar needs together and address them all at once (Robinson, 1967).

The GWT is used for guiding a learner to write something. According to Robinson (1967), one of the possibilities for guided

writing is by giving the students some questions by using the 'wh'-questions, so that by answering these questions each student can get ideas which they can follow up and express in writing. Here the teacher provides some questions related to the topic given. Each student can then create ideas by answering the 'wh'-questions and can go on and develop their own answers to create a good composition.

## **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

In this research, the writers used experimental research techniques to obtain information on the results of implementation of the GWT for teaching writing of analytical exposition texts to students in the second year of high school at Madrasah Aliyah Negeri Model, Banda Aceh. The population for this research was all of the 260 second grade students in the school. By using random sampling, XI Science 5 with 29 students was chosen as the experimental group (EG) and XI Science 4 with 28 students was chosen as the control group (CG).

### **Procedure**

In this study, the data was collected through an experimental research process. In evaluating the work done by the students, the writer used tests which included pre-tests and post-tests for both classes. Before conducting the treatments, the pre-test was given to both groups. The pre-test was done at the start of the first meeting to get a baseline for the writing abilities of all the students in the sample. In teaching writing to the EG students, the writer applied the GWT as the treatment to improve the writing ability of the students.

In this teaching-learning research process, the second writer was the teacher who conducted the experimental teaching over six meetings, while the first and the last meetings which were used for the pre-tests and the post-tests were not included as treatments. Following Thomas (2005), the implementation of the GWT was done in seven stages, these were: brainstorming (prewriting), rough draft, peer editing, revising, editing, and publishing (this includes final copy proof-reading and submitting). Meanwhile, the CG students were taught by another English teacher from the school using a traditional method for teaching writing.

In the first meeting, the pre-test was given to the EG students, and this test was similar to the one given to the CG students. The pre-test was asking the students to do a writing task in terms of an analytical

exposition text entitled '*Learning English*'. In the second meeting which started the treatment, the second writer explained the definition of the analytical expository text and the purpose, generic structure, language features and characteristics of such a text to the EG students. Furthermore, she explained about the various aspects of writing namely content, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanics. Then, she explained about the first stage in GWT, which is brainstorming. From the second to the fourth meeting, she continued to explain the further steps in the GWT: about rough drafts, peers editing, revising, editing, final copy proof-reading and publishing/submitting. At the last meeting, the post-test was given. She gave the same tests to both groups. In both tests, the researcher looked at the understanding that the students had about the various aspects of writing (content, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanics). The pre-test task consisted of some ideas and notes that had to be developed into a good analytical exposition text entitled '*Facebook*'. The purpose of the post-test was to find out the writing ability of the students, in particular to find out if those in the EG had improved more after the treatment than those in the CG.

### **Data Analysis**

Before analyzing the scores from the tests using the t-test, tests were done for normality (by using the chi square formula) and variance from a homogenous population. Then, statistical analysis were used in this study to evaluate the results of the tests used to try to validate the research problem, including frequency distribution, range (R), class of data (K), class of interval (I), means, standard deviations and t-tests. The formulas are those as recommended by Sudjana (2002).

## **FINDINGS**

### **Normal Distribution Tests for the Pre-test Scores from the EG**

The writers analyzed the normal distribution of the pre-test scores from EG with the following hypotheses:

H<sub>0</sub>: The scores of the EG are normally distributed

H<sub>a</sub>: The scores of the EG are not normally distributed

The criteria of normality test by using level of significance ( $\alpha=0.05$ ) are:

If  $x^2_{obtain} < x^2_{table}$ , H<sub>0</sub> is accepted

If  $x^2_{obtain} > x^2_{table}$ , H<sub>0</sub> is rejected

Table 1 shows the normal distribution results from the pre-test results of the students from EG.

**Table 1.** Normal Distribution Results from the Pre-tests of the EG.

Score	Fi	Mid score	z-score	Area z	Ei	(fi-Ei) <sup>2</sup> /Ei
		34.5	-2.5485			
35 – 42	2			0.0372	1.0788	0.7866
		42.5	-1.7224			
43 – 50	4			0.1442	4.176	1.1338
		50.5	-0.8963			
51 – 58	5			0.2854	8.2766	1.2971
		58.5	-0.0702			
59 – 66	11			0.3016	8.7464	0.5814
		66.5	0.7559			
67 – 74	7			0.1695	4.9155	0.8839
		74.5	1.5820			
	29				Chi =	4.6828

The data from the Table 1 were used to find out whether the ability of the students in the EG was normally distributed or not by using the chi quadrate formula. The result of the normal distribution test showed that the  $x^2_{obtain}$  was 4.6828. Based on the level of significance  $\alpha=0.05$  and  $df=k-3=6-3=3$ , the distribution label of chi-quadrade was  $x^2_{(0.05)(3)}=7.8147$ . Thus  $x^2_{obtain} < x^2_{table}$  where  $4.6828 < 7.8147$ , which meant that the results from the pre-test of EG were normally distributed.

**Normal Distribution Test for the Pre-test Scores from the CG**

The writers analyzed the normality of the pre-tests with the following hypotheses:

$H_0$  : The scores of the CG are normally distributed

$H_a$  : The scores of the CG are not normally distributed

The criteria of normality from the test using level of significance ( $\alpha=0.05$ ) are:

If  $x^2_{obtain} < x^2_{table}$ ,  $H_0$  is accepted

If  $x^2_{obtain} > x^2_{table}$ ,  $H_0$  is rejected

Table 2 shows the normal distribution results from the pre-test results of the students from CG.



**Table 2.** Normal Distribution Results from the Pre-tests of the CG.

Score	Fi	Mid score	z-score	Area z	Ei	(fi-Ei) <sup>2</sup> /Ei
		37.5	-1.2771			
38 – 42	4			0.0821	2.2988	1.2589
		42.5	-0.9006			
43 – 47	4			0.1174	3.2872	0.1545
		47.5	-0.5240			
48 – 52	5			0.1428	3.9984	0.2509
		52.5	-0.1475			
53 – 57	5			0.1428	3.9984	0.2509
		57.5	0.2289			
58 – 62	2			0.1387	3.8836	0.9135
		62.5	0.6054			
63 – 67	4			0.1107	3.0996	0.2615
		67.5	0.9819			
68 – 72	4			0.075	2.1	1.7190
		72.5	1.3584			
	28				Chi =	4.8092

The data from Table 2 above were used to find out whether the writing ability of the students from the CG was normally distributed or not by using the chi quadrate formula. The result of the normal distribution analysis showed that the  $x^2_{obtain}$  was 4.8092. Based on the level of significance  $\alpha=0.05$  and  $df=k-3=6-3=3$ , the distribution label of chi-quadrate was  $x^2_{(0.05)(3)}=7.8147$ , thus  $x^2_{obtain} < x^2_{table}$  where  $4.8092 < 7.8147$ , which means that the results from the pre-tests from the CG were normally distributed.

### The Homogeneity of Variance Test for Both Groups

The homogeneity of variance was calculated after finding that the data from the post-tests of the EG and the CG were normally distributed. The hypotheses were as follows:

$H_0$ : The variances between both groups are homogeneous

$H_a$ : The variances between both groups are not homogeneous

The criteria of homogeneity from the variance test using a 5% level of significance ( $\alpha=0.05$ ) are:

If  $F_{obtain} < F_{table}$ ,  $H_0$  is accepted

If  $F_{obtain} > F_{table}$ ,  $H_0$  is rejected

Based on the pre-test scores it was found that  $S_1^2=93.7752$  and  $S_2^2=81.8783$ . With a significance level of 5%, the  $F_{\alpha}(n_1-1, n_2-1)$  or  $F_{0.05}(28,27)$ , the result is 1.91. From this calculations,  $F_{\alpha} < F_{obtained}$ ,

where  $1.14 < 1.91$ . This means that  $H_0$  is accepted and that the variance in the results from the pre-tests of both groups was homogeneous.

**Normality Distribution Test for the Post-test Scores from the EG**

The writers analyzed the normality of the results from the post-test of the EG in the same way as set out above. Table 3 displays the normal distribution results from the post-tests from the EG.

**Table 3.** Normal Distribution Results from the Post-tests from the EG.

Score	Fi	Mid score	z-score	Area	Ei	(fi-Ei) <sup>2</sup> /Ei
		69.5	-1.8850			
70 – 75	6			0.1384	4.0136	0.9831
		75.5	-0.9662			
76 – 81	8			0.3155	9.1495	0.1444
		81.5	-0.0475			
82 – 87	8			0.2918	8.4622	0.0252
		87.5	0.8712			
88 – 93	7			0.7703	4.4863	1.4084
		93.5	1.7899			
	29				Chi =	2.5611

The data in Table 3 were used to calculate whether the ability of the students in EG was normally distributed or not using the chi quadrate formula. The result from the normal distribution test above showed that  $x^2_{obtain}$  was 2.5611. Based on level of significance  $\alpha=0.05$  and  $df=k-3=6-3=3$ , the distribution label of chi-quadrate was  $x^2_{(0.05)}=7.8147$ . Thus  $x^2_{obtain} < x^2_{table}$  where  $2.5611 < 7.8147$ , which means that the results from the post-tests from the EG were normally distributed.

**Normal Distribution Test of the Post-test Scores from the CG**

The writers analyzed the normal distribution of the post-test scores from CG in the same way as above. Table 4 displays the results of normal distribution tests of post-test scores from the CG.

**Table 4.** Results of Normal Distribution Tests of Post-test Scores from the CG.

Score	Fi	Mid Score	z score	Area z	Ei	(fi-Ei) <sup>2</sup> /Ei
		29.5	-2.6259			
30-37	2			0.0292	0.8176	1.7099
		37.5	-1.8392			
38-44	2			0.0915	2.5622	0.1232

Table 4 continued...

		44.5	-1.1514			
45-51	3			0.1977	5.5356	1.1614
		51.5	-0.4633			
52-58	8			0.2643	7.4004	0.4857
		58.5	0.2247			
59-65	8			0.2315	5.4921	1.1453
		65.5	0.9128			
66-72	5			0.0862	2.4136	2.7715
		72.5	0.6246			
	28				Chi =	7.397

The data from Table 4 were used to calculate whether the ability of the students in the CG was normally distributed or not using the chi quadrature formula. The result of the normal distribution calculation showed that  $\chi^2_{obtain}$  was 7.397. Based on level of significance  $\alpha=0.05$  and  $df=k-3=6-3=3$ , the distribution label of chi-quadrature was  $\chi^2_{(0,05)(3)}=7.8147$ . Thus  $\chi^2_{obtain} < \chi^2_{table}$  where  $7.397 < 7.8147$ , which means that the results from the post-tests from the CG were normally distributed.

### The Homogeneity of Variance Test for Both Groups

The homogeneity of variance was calculated after finding that the results from the post-tests of both groups were normally distributed. The hypotheses were as follows:

$H_0$ : The variances of both groups are homogeneous

$H_a$ : The variances of both groups are not homogeneous

The criteria for homogeneity using a 5% level of significance ( $\alpha=0.05$ ) are:

If  $F_{obtain} < F_{table}$ ,  $H_0$  is accepted

If  $F_{obtain} > F_{table}$ ,  $H_0$  is rejected

Based on the post-test scores it was found that  $S_1^2=42.6502$  and  $S_2^2=103.4894$ . According to a level of significance of 5%, then  $F_{\alpha}(n_1-1, n_2-1)$  is  $F_{0.05}(28,27)$  and the result is 1.91. From this calculation, it shows that  $F_{\alpha} < F_{obtained}$  where  $0.4121 < 1.91$ . This means that  $H_0$  is accepted and that the variance in the results of the post-tests from both group was homogeneous.

Table 5 illustrates the summary of results from pre-tests from both groups.

**Table 5.** Summary of Results from Pre-tests from Both Groups.

Factor	EG	t-obtain	CG
N (Number of Students)	29	2.28	28
R (Range)	39		30
X (Mean Score)	59		54
S (Standard Deviation)	9.68		13.28

Table 5 shows that the number of students in the EG was 29, and the number in the CG was 28. The range of scores from the EG was slightly larger than that from the CG but the mean scores were similar. The calculation of the range was obtained by subtracting the lowest score from the highest score in the tests. Thus, for the pre-tests from the EG, the range was  $74-35=39$ , whilst for the CG, the range was  $68-38=30$ .

Furthermore, the mean score for the EG was 59, and 54 for the CG. The distribution indicated that the scores from each of the two groups were not widely scattered. The standard deviation for the EG was 9.68 while for the CG, it was 13.28. Then, t-obtain from both groups was 2.28, hence the null hypothesis was accepted and the alternative hypothesis was rejected.

Table 6 illustrates the summary of results from the post-tests of both groups.

**Table 6.** Summary of Results from the Post-tests of Both Groups.

Factor	EG	t-obtain	CG
N (Number of Students)	29	11,26	28
R (Range)	23		40
X (Mean Score)	82		56
S (Standard Deviation)	6,53		10.17

Table 6 shows that the range of the post-test scores from the EG was  $(93-70)=23$  and the range of the post-test scores from the CG was  $(70-30)=40$ . The mean score for the EG was 82 and for the CG, it was 56. The distribution indicates that the scores from the two groups were widely scattered. The standard deviation for the EG was 6.53, while for the CG, it was 10.17.

Moreover, for the score of t-obtain there was a large significant difference of 11.26 between the post-test from the EG and that from the CG. This was outside the limit between -2.02 and +2.02, hence the alternative hypothesis was accepted and the null hypothesis was rejected. Thus it can be concluded that the use of GWT was more

effective than the individual writing technique. In other words, the results from the two groups were significantly different. This meant that the data proved that the treatment had resulted in a positive improvement in the writing achievements from the EG by comparison with the achievements of the CG.

## **DISCUSSION**

The application of GWT resulted in lessons with dozens of examples of student work, reproducible worksheets, student-friendly activities, teacher-friendly guidance and creative ways for students to share their writings. Therefore, these students could start to write with confidence and competence. Moreover, the GWT provided particular guidance that allowed them to focus on conventions such as spelling, punctuation, standard usage and hand writing. Besides, content, grammar and mechanics were also addressed in order to make these students aware that those are important to be considered in writing. Thus they were soon able to produce good writing, and also to understand the process of writing since they did the same activities continuously through the treatments. As a result, there was a significant improvement in their writing competency. This is in line with Oczkus (2007) who stated that the GWT is an appropriate technique to be implemented in the classroom since it could give the students a chance to create a meaningful activity since they are assigned to write by themselves. The activities done are much more meaningful for them because they can learn through their own experiences.

Besides the advantages of the GWT above, in applying the technique the writers also found some difficulties during the peer editing stage. In this stage initially, some of the students did not read and give comments, feedback or suggestions to improve their colleagues' compositions. Even though the second writer had given them training on how to give feedback, they still found it hard to do. This showed their lack of confidence in their writing ability. However, after the teacher encouraged them to try doing the activity, it was then that they found they could give feedback. Giving comments and revising writing allows them to develop criteria for evaluation and to become critical readers. This enhances their ability to evaluate their own work and be more critical revisers of their own writing and mistakes (Rollinson, 2005). Peer feedback boosts confidence and allows students to become more independent and active learners.

By responding critically to the writing of their peers, the students began to exercise critical thinking that they must then apply to their own work (Mendoca & Johnson, 1994). The giving of comments and suggestion in feedback to each other encourages the development of self-esteem and spreads new ideas and information. Furthermore, peer feedback helps create cooperative and collaborative learning. Hirose (2008) has claimed that the results of dynamic interactions between peers during peer feedback sessions covering multiple functions such as asking questions, giving additional related information and making suggestions encourages students to work cooperatively, to benefit from working with each other and to improve their writing, and their communication skills in English.

After analyzing the data of this study, the results from the post-tests from the EG were much better than those from the CG. According to Brown (1996:102), the first aspect that must be considered in a test is the central tendency or mean score since it takes all other scores into account. Therefore, the first measurement that the researchers looked at was the mean score since it is the central tendency of the test. The mean score from the results of the post-tests from the EG was 82 while the mean score from the CG was 56 at a level of significance of 5% (0.05). Then, Brown (1996) further mentions that the second important measurement in a statistical test is variance which is equal to the standard deviation which is the average difference in the individual scores from the mean score. Based on the data analysis, the standard deviation of the post-tests from the EG was 6.53 while the standard deviation from the post-tests from the CG was 10.17. Therefore, it can be concluded that the GWT could improve the writing ability of the students especially for writing analytical exposition texts. The improvement as a result of the application of the GWT was proved by the significant improvement in the scores from the pre-test to the post-test of the EG which did not occur in the CG.

## CONCLUSION

First, referring to the results above, the mean score for the pre-tests from the EG was 59 whereas for the CG, it was 54. From the post-tests, the mean score from the EG, taught by the GWT was higher than that from the CG, taught by a conventional technique. The mean score from the post-test was 82 for the EG and 56 for the CG. The large differences in the post-test mean scores of the EG and the CG was

proven positive that the use of the GWT for teaching writing of analytical exposition texts had a positive result.

Second, the difference between the post-test means from the EG and from the CG was significant. The calculation by t-test and t-table showed that the t-test was higher than the t-table coefficient with limits (-1.91 and +1.91) at the level of significance of 5% ( $\alpha=0.05$ ). If the calculation of t-test value was higher than or lower than (-2.02 and 2.02) at a 5% level of significance, the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) was rejected and the alternative hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) was accepted. Furthermore, based on the homogeneity and normality test, the writers concluded that the data were distributed normally.

Third, the statistical t-test value and the level of significance were above 5%, which means that there was a significant difference between the results from the two groups. This showed that the GWT used as the treatment in this research provided a positive improvement in the abilities to write of the students who received the treatments. In other words, the technique employed with the EG had better results than the conventional technique used with the CG.

Fourth, the findings of this study showed that the GWT used for teaching writing of analytical exposition texts had a positive influence on the ability to write of the students. The technique provided several steps to make it easier to use language more freely which resulted in better writing by the EG students. They were more motivated to learn English especially through writing. Moreover, GWT was very helpful to lessen the difficulties of students in writing. Teachers firstly model how to write a paragraph, then in the next session follows with sharing of ideas among the students and so on step by step.

Lastly, teaching and learning writing through the GWT not only provided the teacher with a range of skills, but also enabled the students to readily follow the steps and processes of this technique.

## **SUGGESTIONS**

Regarding to the teaching of writing analytical exposition texts through the GWT, the writers has some suggestions for better teaching and learning of English, especially for writing.

First, teachers should search for and use suitable techniques or methods in the process of teaching and learning writing. By using better methods and techniques, they can try to increase the writing ability of her students. Second, teachers are the one who are responsible

for choosing the appropriate techniques and materials in the classroom in order to reach the goals of the curriculum. Third, teachers are recommended to try to use the GWT for teaching writing especially for teaching writing of analytical exposition texts. The GWT improved the achievements of the EG students in this study. It gave positive effects to them to understand the processes in the technique. It led the students to pay attention and manage their ideas to achieve a better standard of English writing especially for: content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics.

Finally, when the GWT is implemented in the classroom, the teachers should teach it step by step. This should ensure that all the students understand all of the steps clearly. Teachers should make sure that every step is understood by every student. By doing so, each student will know what they have to do in every step. It will give them a chance to focus on the materials and abandon other distractions while they are work on their writing.

## REFERENCES

- Badger, R. & White, G. (2000). A process genre approach to teaching writing. *ELT Journal*, 54(2), 153-160.
- Brown, J. D. (1996). *Testing in Language Programs*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Frase, L. (2008). *Effective Teaching Solution: Guided Writing*. Retrieved from <http://www.effectiveteachingsollution.com/guidedwritingpdf.pdf>
- Gibson, S. A. (2008). An effective framework for primary-grade guided writing instruction. *The Reading Teacher*, 62(4), 324-334.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Harlow: Longman.
- Hirose, K. (2008). *Cooperative Learning in English Writing Instruction through Peer Feedback*. Retrieved from [jasce.jp/conf05/hirosepaper.doc](http://jasce.jp/conf05/hirosepaper.doc)
- Mendoca C. O., & Johnson, K. E. (1994). Peer review negotiations: Revision activities in ESL writing instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(4), 745-769.
- Morton, C., & Wright, N. (1986). *What You Need to Know about Basic Writing Skills, Letters & Consumer Complaints*. Woodland Hills, CA: National Textbook Company.



- Nunan, D. (1985). *Language Course Design: Trends and Issues*. Adelaide: NCRC.
- Oczkus, L. D. (2007). *Guided Writing: Practical Lessons, Powerful Results*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Oshima, A. & Hogue, A. (1991). *Writing Academic English (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.)*. New York: Addison-Wesley.
- Pinnell, G. S. & Fountas, I. (2001). *Leveled Books for Readers, Grades 3-6: A Companion Volume to Guiding Readers and Writers*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Raimes, A. (1983) *Techniques in Teaching Writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Robinson, L. (1967). *Guided Writing & Free Writing*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Rollinson, P. (2005). Using peer feedback in ESL writing class. *ELT Journal*, 59(1), 23-30.
- Bachtiar, & Sagala, H. (2012). *Improving Students' Achievement in Writing Analytical Exposition Text through Guided Writing Technique*. Retrieved from <http://jurnal.unimed.ac.id/2012/index.php/ellu/article/download/359/166>
- Sudjana. (2002). *Metode Statistika (edisi kelima)*. Bandung: Tarsito.
- Thomas, P. L. (2005). *Teaching Writing Primer*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.