Cook and Write: Cooking Session as A Method of Improving The Ability to Write Procedural Texts

Ditta Mustika Rakhmawati
dittamustika@jagakarsa.ac.id

Cut Ela Hajjah Apriliani
cutelaha@jagakarsa.ac.id

Abstract

This study discusses the function of cooking sessions as a method to improve the ability to write procedural texts. In this research, the researcher showed the students' ability in mastering written English and students' mistakes in using English vocabulary in grade 6 of elementary school. The method used in this research is to improve descriptive writing skills. This research was conducted at Universitas Tama Jagakarsa with a population of 30 students which was an accumulated sample of 30 grade 1 students. In the accumulated sample the authors applied a written test consisting of questions in English and practice. Based on the research respondents found several errors in the applied dialogue, namely the description of the conversation, fluency in writing.

Keywords : *Recipla Teaching Method, Pronunciation, English writing, Fluency of procedural text and students' confidential.*

INTRODUCTION

Having the ability to communicate proficiently and skilfully in the era of globalization is everyone's need. Therefore, the ability to master the mother tongue and foreign languages is increasing rapidly, from children to adults, the similarities in English are used in everyday communication, both spoken and written. To support the ability to communicate with our environment, we must be able to master language skills.

Discussing communication skills using language, there are four language skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing) that people must develop to master English. In this study, researchers focused on writing skills. As a language skill, writing is an important medium for expressing ideas. Heaton (1975:138) states that writing skills are complex and difficult to teach, requiring mastery of not only grammatical and rhetorical devices but also conceptual and judgmental ones. Based on the statement above, the English teacher must have several variations in teaching writing. Writing is one way to improve students' ability to express their ideas, stories, and memories in written form.

Therefore, writing and speaking are held all the time for students at the 13 year level. That is, writing a procedure text for a cooking class might be an interesting way of transferring grammatical styles, in this case the simple present tense. This study is very important to gather information about items that will affect the writing ability of 1st grade junior high school. In fact, learning to write is as important as other language skills.

Nowadays, writing that is fun and enjoyable may be difficult to find in our local schools. Schools may more often provide lessons in the form of copying, dictating, composing free stories and various other writing activities which may be boring for children to remain in class with the same pattern. For example, in textbooks for sixth grade, the contents are about reading the passages and then

proceed to other exercises, such as questions that must be answered by students according to the text, building vocabulary from guessed words and of course. about grammar (adjective, adverb, tenses, translate, spelling, etc.).

In addition, Jeremy Harmer stated in his book *"development need not be an act of transformation or the result of engagement with a community or communities. So the first point about it comes from its difference from learning. Development can take place within a certain period of time. It is the result of a combination of any of the separate development strands that we have previously characterized."* In cyberspace there are many learning activities to improve writing skills. One of them is learning to write procedural texts through cooking sessions.

English teacher by providing various materials. In accordance with the technical based on the age of students. In addition, this will encourage students in the process of learning to write and speak. In this case all the teacher's creativity and initiative will be the main factor. In this study, the authors identified the problem of how effective the cooking session method can improve students' understanding of writing procedure texts in Universitas Tama Jagakarsa in the 2018/2019 academic year. The objective of this study is to find out the effectiveness of cooking sessions to improve students' understanding on writing a procedural text in Universitas Tama Jagakarsa in the 2018/2019 academic year.

The benefit of this research is that students can use cooking sessions to memorize and understand lessons in their minds so that they will study harder and master writing skills well; for teachers, they can use the cooking session as a reference when they want to improve their skills in teaching writing; In general, this research can be used to improve writing skills and can provide more information and increase knowledge. Based on this explanation, the researcher put forward two problems. First, what types of texts did grade 1 students of Universitas Tama Jagakarsa usually make in the 2018/2019 academic year. on their cooking sessions, and secondly, what typical sources are in the student texts.

METHOD

In research, research design has a very important role. This is because the quality of research is very dependent on design. In this study, researchers used a form of quantitative approach to analyse data. According to Michael J Wallace, quantitative is broadly used to describe what can be counted or measured and therefore can be considered objective. 1 Experimental research involves two groups: an experimental group and a control group. The experimental group received a new treatment while the control group received the usual treatment. According to Nunan, experiments are designed to collect data in such a way that threats to the reliability and validity of the research can be minimized. This research uses pre-test and post-test.

The experimental design can be described as follows:

Where:
E = experimental group
C = control group
01 = pre-test for experimental group
02 = post test for experimental group
03 = pre-test for control group
04 = post test for control group
X = treatment by using cooking sessions
Y = treatment without cooking sessions

From the design above, it can be seen that the research subjects were grouped into the experimental group (top line) and the control group (bottom line). The quality of the subjects was first checked by pre-testing them (01 and 03). Then, the experimental treatment (taught

using cooking sessions) was applied to the experimental group, while the control group was taught without cooking sessions. The test is held in the form of a composition. Post-test results (02 and 04) were then calculated statistically.

Population and Sample

In his book, Arikunto says that the sample is a part that can represent the entire population being observed. It is called sample research when we want to generalize the results of sample research. Researchers chose two groups of students from the population as samples in this study. The total population is 30 students. The selection process will be discussed in the sampling technique. If the population is more than 100 people, the researcher can take 10-15% or 20-25% or more of the population. Therefore, researchers took 18% of 30 students as a sample of this study as many as 30 students. Then, the sample was divided into two groups; experimental group and control group. Each group consists of 15 students.

Research Variable and Scoring Technique

- **Variable**

According to Fred D. Kerlinger as cited by Arikunto, that all experiments have one fundamental idea behind them; to test the effect of one or more independent variables on a dependent variable (it is possible to have more than one dependent variables in experiments). This research, that used silent demonstration as a method in the teaching of procedure, had two variables. Those variables were: the independent variable, and the dependent variable.

- **Scoring technique**

To score the test paper, the researcher used analytic scale which categorized by some categories. O'Malley and Pierce state that analytic scale separates the features of a composition into components that are each scored separately. This analytic score has five

items and each item scores five. So, the maximum score is 25. The items are: grammar, vocabulary, mechanics, relevance, and fluency (style and ease of communication).

Data Collection Technique

The researcher must use instrument in order to get the better data. The instrument of the research is a tool or facility that is used by researcher for collecting the data in order to get better result; it can be occurred complete and systematic. To make this research successful, the researcher used some instruments to collect data: Test (a method of measuring a person's ability, knowledge, or performance in a given domain), observation (non-systematic observation, which was done by the researcher without using instrument; and systematic observation which was done by the researcher using instrument as the guide of the research). The observation focused on teacher and students activity in classroom. In this part, the researcher used checklist as instrument to take information related to the activity in the class room.

Document is a piece of written or printed material that provides a record of evidence or event an agreement, ownership, identification etc. Documentation is the accumulation, classification, and dissemination of information. It refers to the archival data that help the researcher to collect the needed data. In this study, this method was used to get the data that related to the object research such as students name list were included in the population. In this case, the data was gained by the help of the English teacher.

Data Analysis Technique

There are several steps to conducting research; One of the most important steps is collecting data. It affects the research results. Before the test is used to collect data, it is tested first and then analysed. In the experimental group

activities there is a pre-test given before treatment.

In activities in experimental group, the post-test was some activities in experimental group to measure students' achievement after they were given treatments. Then in the activities of control group, pre-test was given before the treatment. First, the researcher came to the class. Then, explaining to the students what they had to do. Finally, the researcher distributed the instruments and asked them to do the test.

There were some activities in control group: Teacher tells the students that they will learn procedure text using cooking sessions, Teacher gives explanation about cooking sessions, Teacher explains about the generic structures and language features of procedure texts, Teacher gives an example of procedure using cooking sessions, Asking the students to see the teacher and identify what the teacher does in front of class, Asking some students to repeat what the teacher does in front of class learn procedure text using cooking sessions, Teacher gives explanation about cooking sessions, Teacher asks students to write their procedure texts depend on the teacher demonstration, Teacher asks students to share their text in pair, Teacher asks students to analyse their partner's writing and take note error writing, Teacher reminds students about previous lesson, Teacher asks students to write a procedure text depends on their own. Then there is post-test, the test that was held after all treatments were conducted. This test was used to measure students' ability after they were given treatments. The result of test was analysed statistically.

In analysing the data, after testing, data analysis was carried out to determine the normality of the data and the homogeneity of the sample. This is intended to find out whether the research results meet the requirements of good research or not. Data analysis discusses two main points, namely the data normality test and homogeneity test.

The last, analysing the test results. First, tests were conducted on both groups, the experimental and control groups. Second, the score of the test results uses an analytical scale. Third, the mean scores of the two groups were determined. Finally, the two averages are compared using the t-test formula. The t-test was used to distinguish whether the students' results in writing procedure text using a cooking session and without using a cooking session were significant or not.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

This chapter presented the data that were collected during the experimental research. First analysis focused on the validity, reliability, index difficulty, and discriminating power of instruments. Second analysis presented the result of pre-test and post-test which were done both in experimental and control group.

The experimental group was given a pre-test on April 7, 2018. They were asked to make a procedure text by arranging a jumble text of procedure. Test of normality was used to find out whether data of control and experimental group which had been collected from the research come from normal distribution normal or not. The result computation of Chi-quadrate (X_{2score}) then was compared with table of Chi-quadrate (X_{2table}) by using 5% alpha of significance. If $X_{2score} < X_{2table}$ meant that the data spread of research result distributed normally. Based on the research result of VI students in the control group before they were taught procedure text without cooking sessions, they reached the maximum score 76 and minimum score 40. The stretches of score were 36. So, there were 7 classes with length of classes 6. From the computation of frequency distribution, it was found ($\sum f_i x_i$. S) = 2224 and ($\sum f_i S_f x$) = 100.9778 So, the average score (X) was 61.78 and the standard deviation (S) was 10.05. After counting the

average score and standard deviation, table of frequency distribution was needed to measure Chi-quadrate (X_{2score}).

Table of the Frequency Distribution of Control Group.

Class	Bk	Z_i	$P(Z_i)$	Ld	Ei	Oi	$\frac{(O_i - E}{E_i}$
	39,5	-2,22	0,4867				
40 – 45				0,0393	1,415	3	1,774
	45,5	-1,62	-0,4474				
46 – 51				0,1006	3,621	1	1,894
	51,5	-1,02	0,3468				
52 – 57				0,1820	6,551	7	0,031
	57,5	-0,43	0,1648				
58 – 63				0,2329	8,384	8	0,018
	63,5	0,17	0,0680				
64 – 69				0,2109	7,591	9	0,263
	69,5	0,77	0,2789				
70 – 76				0,1497	5,387	8	1,267
	76.50	1.47	0.4286			36	
						X^2 =	5.248

Based on the Chi-quadrate table (X_{2table}) for 5% alpha of significance with df $6 − 3 = 3$, it was found $X_{2table} = 7,815$ Because of $X_{2score} <_{2table} X$, so the initial data of control group distributed normally. While from the result of VI students in experimental group, before they were taught procedure text by using cooking sessions, was found that the maximum score was 76 and minimal score was 40. The stretches of score were 36. So, there were 7 classes with length of classes 6. From the computation of frequency distribution, it was found ($f_{ii} x . S) = 2160$, and ($Sf x_{2i. i}) = 87.7714$ So, the average score (X) was 60,0and the standard deviation (S) was 9.37. After counting the ($EO E_i$) 2 -average score and standard deviation, table of frequency distribution was needed to measure Chi-quadrate (X_{2score}).

Table of the Frequency Distribution of Experimental

Class	Bk	Z_i	$P(Z_i)$	Ld	Ei	Oi	$\frac{(O_i - E_i)^2}{E_i}$
	39,5	-2,19	0,4857				
40 – 45				0,0465	1,675	2	0,063
	45,5	-1,55	0,4392				
46 – 51				0,1213	4,366	2	1,282
	51,5	-0,91	0,3179				
52 – 57				0,2127	7,656	10	0,718
	57,5	-0,27	0,1052				
58 – 63				0,2509	9,031	6	1,017
	63,5	0,37	0,1456				
64 – 69				0,1991	7,167	10	1,120
	69,5	1,01	0,3447				
70 – 75				0,1063	3,826	4	0,008
	75,5	1,65	0,4510			34	
						=	4.209

Based on the Chi-quadrate table (X_{2table}) for 5% alpha of significance with df $6 − 3 = 3$, it was found $X_{2table} = 7.815$. Because of $X_{2score} <_{2table} X$, so the initial data of experimental group distributed normally.

Test of homogeneity was done to know whether sample in the research come from population that had same variance or not. In this study, the homogeneity of the test was measured by comparing the obtained score (F_{score}) with *table F*. Thus, if the obtained score (F_{score}) was lower than the *table F* or equal, it could be said that the Ho was accepted. It meant that the variance was homogeneous. The analysis of homogeneity test could be seen in table below.

Table. Test of Homogeneity (Pre-test)

Variant Sources	Experimental G	Control G
Sum	2160	2224
N	36	36
$\overline{X}$	60,00	61,78
Variance (s^2)	87,7714	100,9778
Standard deviation (s)	9,37	10,05

By knowing the mean and the variance, the writer was able to test the similarity of the two variants in the pre-test between experimental and control group. The computation of the test of homogeneity as follows:

$$F = \frac{Biggest\ Variance}{Smallest\ Variance}$$

$$= \frac{100,98}{87,7}$$

$$= 1.1505$$

On a 5% with df numerator (nb - 1) = 36 − 1 = 35 and df denominator (nk − 1) = 36 − 1 = 35, it was found $_{table}\,F$ = 1.96. Because of $_{score}\,F \leq\,_{table}\,F$, so it could be concluded that both experimental and control group had no differences. The result showed both groups had similar variants (homogenous).

Test of difference two variants in pre-test between experiment and control group After counting standard deviation and variance, it could be concluded that both group have no differences in the test of similarity between two variances in pre-test score. So, to differentiate whether the students' results of writing a procedure text in experimental and control group were significant or not, the writer used t-test to test the hypothesis that had been mentioned in the chapter two. The writer used formula:

$$t = \frac{\overline{x}_1 - \overline{x}_2}{s\sqrt{\dfrac{1}{n_1} + \dfrac{1}{n_2}}}$$

Where:

$$S = \sqrt{\frac{(n_1 - 1)s_1^2 + (n_2 - 1)s_2^2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2}}$$

Based on the table, first the writer had to find out S by using the formula above:

$$S = \sqrt{\frac{(36-1)87.77+(36-1)\,100.98}{36+36-2}}$$

$$= 9.71466$$

After S was found, the next step was to measure t-test:

$$t = \frac{60.00 \quad - \quad 61.78}{9.71466\sqrt{\dfrac{1}{36} + \dfrac{1}{36}}}$$

$$= -0.776$$

After getting t-test result, then it would be consulted to the critical score of $_{table}\,t$ to check whether the difference is significant or not. For a = 5% with df 36 + 36 – 2 = 70, it was found t table (0.95)(70) =1.67. Because of $_{score}\,t <\,_{table}\,t$, so it could be concluded that there was no significance of difference between the experimental and control group. It meant that both experimental and control group had same condition before getting treatments.

The experimental group was given post-test on April, 7 2018 and control group was given a post test on April, 7 2018. Post-test was conducted after all treatments were done. Silent demonstration was used as method in the teaching of procedure writing to students in experimental group. Meanwhile, the students in control group were given treatment without silent demonstration. Post-test was aimed to measure students' ability after they got treatments. They were asked to make a procedure text based on the theme (for students in control group) and they identify to the teacher demonstration (for students in experimental group).

Test of normality was used to find out whether data of control and experimental group, which had been collected after they got treatments, came from normal distribution normal or not. The formula, that was used, was Chi-quadrate. The result computation of Chiquadrate ($_{2score}\,X$) then was compared with table of Chi-quadrate ($_{2table}\,X$) by using 5% alpha of significance. If $_{2score}\,X <_2 table\,X$ meant that the data spread of research result distributed normally. Based on the research result of VI students in the control group after they got usual treatments (using conventional method) in the teaching of procedure writing, they reached the maximum score 84 and minimum score 56. The stretches of score were 28. So, there were 6 classes with length of classes 4.7. From the computation of frequency distribution, it was found $_{(i\,i}fx\,.\,S\,)$ = 2532,

and ($_{2i.i}Sf x$) = 60.6857 So, the average score (X) was 70.33 and the standard deviation (S) was 7.79 It meant that there was an improvement of students' score after they got treatments. After counting the average score and standard deviation, table of frequency was needed to measure Chi-quadrate ($_{2score}X$).

Table of the Frequency Distribution of Control Group

Class	Bk	Z_i	$P(Z_i)$	Ld	Ei	Oi	$(O_i-$ E
	55,5	-1,90	0,4716				
56 – 60				0,0750	2,699	6	4,0:
	60,5	-1,26	0,3966				
61 – 65				0,1641	5,906	6	0,0(
	65,5	-0,62	0,2325				
66 – 70				0,2411	8,678	6	0,8:
	70,5	0,02	0,0085				
71 – 75				0,2379	8,564	6	0,7(
	75,5	0,66	0,2464				
76 – 80				0,1577	5,676	9	1,9
	80,5	1,31	0,4041				
81 – 85				0,0702	2,526	3	0,08
	85,5	1,95	0,4742			36	
				X²	=	7,6(	

Based on the Chi-quadrate table (X $_{2table}$) for 5% alpha of significance with dk 6 − 3 = 3, it was found X$_{2table}$ = 7.815. Because of $_{2score}X <_{2table}X$, so the data of control group after getting treatments distributed normally. Meanwhile from the result of VI students in experimental group, who were taught procedure text through the use of cooking sessions, was found that the maximum score was 92 and minimal score was 64. The stretches of score were 28. So, there were 6 classes with length of classes 4.7. From the computation of frequency distribution, it was found ($_{ii}fx$. S) = 2792, and ($_{2i.i}Sf x$) = 69.7397 So, the average score (X) was 77,56 and the standard deviation (S) was 8.35 By seeing the average score of students in experimental group, it could be concluded that there was an improvement of students' score after they got treatments by using cooking sessions. After counting the average score and standard deviation, table of frequency distribution was needed to measure Chi-

quadrate ($_{2score}X$).For the complete analysis could be seen in appendix 10.

Table of the Frequency Distribution of Experimental Group

Class	Bk	Z_i	$P(Z_i)$	Ld	Ei	Oi	$\frac{(O_i-E_i)^2}{E_i}$
	39,5	-2,22	0,4867				
40 – 45				0,0393	1,415	3	1,774
	45,5	-1,62	-0,4474				
46 – 51				0,1006	3,621	1	1,894
	51,5	-1,02	0,3468				
52 – 57				0,1820	6,551	7	0,031
	57,5	-0,43	0,1648				
58 – 63				0,2329	8,384	8	0,018
	63,5	0,17	0,0680				
64 – 69				0,2109	7,591	9	0,262
	69,5	0,77	0,2789				
70 – 76				0,1497	5,387	8	1,267

Based on the Chi-quadrate table (X $_{2table}$) for 5% alpha of significance with df 6 − 3 = 3, it was found X$_{2table}$ = 7.815 Because of $_{2score}X <_{2table}X$, so the data of experimental group after getting treatments distributed normally. The writer determined the mean and variance of the students' score either in experimental or control group. By knowing the mean and variance, the writer was able to test the similarity of the two variance in the post-test between experimental and control group.

Table Test of Homogeneity (Post-test)

Variance Sources	Experimental G	Control G
Sum	2792	2532
N	36	36
$\overline{X}$	77.56	70,33
Variance (s²)	69.7397	60.6857
Standard deviation (s)	8.35	7.79

The computation of the test of homogeneity as follows:

$$F = \frac{Biggest\ Variance}{Smallest\ Variance}$$

$$= \frac{69.74}{60.69}$$

$$= 1,1492$$

On a 5% with df numerator (nb - 1) = 36 − 1 = 35 and df denominator (nk − 1)

= 36 – 1 = 35, it was found *table*(0.025)(35:35) $F = 1.96$. Because of *score F ≤ table F*, so it could be concluded that both experimental and control group had no differences. The result showed both groups had similar variance (homogenous).

c. Test of difference two variants in post-test between experiment and control group After counting standard deviation and variance, it could be concluded that both groups have no differences in the test of similarity between two variances in post-test score. So, to differentiate if the students' results of writing a procedure text in experimental and control group after getting treatments were significant or not, the writer used t-test to test the hypothesis mentioned in chapter two. To see the difference between the experimental and control group, the writer used

formula:

$$t = \frac{\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2}{s\sqrt{\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}}}$$

Where:

$$S = \sqrt{\frac{(n_1 - 1)s_1^2 + (n_2 - 1)s_2^2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2}}$$

Based on table IV. 6, first the writer had to find out S by usin the formula above:

$$S = \sqrt{\frac{(36-1)69.74 + (36-1)60.69}{36+36-2}}$$

$$= 8.07544$$

After S was found, the next step was to measure t-test: t = 77.56 – 70338.07544 136 +136= 3.794 After getting t-test result, then it would be consulted to the critical score of *table t* to check whether the difference is significant or not. For a = 5% with df 36 + 36 – 2 = 70, it was found *table*(0.95)(70) $t = 1.67$. Because of *score t > table t*, so it could be concluded that there was significance of difference between the experimental and control group. It meant that experimental group was better that control group after getting treatments. Since the obtained t-score was higher than the critical score on the table, the difference was statistically significance. Therefore, based on the computation there was a significance difference between the teaching of procedure writing using procedural text and the teaching of procedure writing without procedural text. Teaching procedure with procedural text seemed to be more effective than teaching procedure without procedural text. It can be seen from the result of the test where the students taught writing by using procedural text got higher scores than the students taught writing without procedural text.

The data were obtained from the students' achievement scores of the test of writing procedure text. They were pre-test and post-test scores from the experimental and control group. The average score for experimental group was 60.00 (pre-test) and 77.56 (post-test). The average score for control group was 61.78 (pre-test) and 70.33 (post-test). The following was the simple tables of pre and post-test students' average score and students' average score of each writing components.

The Pre-test and Post-test Students' Average Scores

No	Group	The Average Percentage of Pre-test	The Average Percentage of Post-test
1	Experimental	60,00	77,56
2	Control	61,78	70,33

In this study, source of data that was became as control group was class VI. In the control group, there was not a new treatment in a teaching learning process. They were given a usual treatment. They were taught procedure writing using conventional method as they had got. By using conventional method in the teaching learning process, teacher had used a monotonous method that could not increase students' procedure writing. Students could not enjoy in writing and explore their ideas because they had to write what they had listen to the teacher explanation. It was proven with the control group's average in the post-test (70.33) which was lower than the experimental group (77.56); although, the control group's average in the pre-test (61.78) was

higher than the experimental group (60.00).

In the pre-test, students' ability in writing procedure text was low. Sentences which were made by students, were influenced by Indonesian language. Students' ability was in low level when they had to arrange sentences to be a good paragraph by considering main idea. It meant that the idea was not clearly stated and the sentences were not well-organized to support the main idea. Students' word choice (fluency) was also far from being perfect. Not only the sequence of sentences which were made by students was not complete but also there were many difficulties in grammar and mechanic; therefore, students' ability of procedure writing could not be understood. To minimize the number of students' mistakes in their writing, the researcher collected students' writing, gave correction, and returned the paper to them. From the correction of their mistakes, students were supposed to learn more and improve their ability in procedure writing.

Based on the analysis of students' ability, it was found that students' ability after getting treatment improved. In the treatment, students were given silent demonstration that was in line with the function of procedure text, its linguistic features, and its generic structure. The content was complete and relevance to the topic and the ideas were easy to understand.

It could be concluded that the implementation of using silent demonstration as method in the teaching of procedure writing was very effective. It was proven with students' average score in experimental group was higher than control group. By considering the students' final score after getting treatment, the teaching of procedure writing using cooking sessions as method was better than without cooking sessions (conventional method). Based on t-test analysis that was done, it was found that the tscore (3,794) was higher than t-table by using 5% alpha of significance (1.67). Since *score t >table t* , it proved that there was a significant difference between the improvement of students achievement that was given a new treatment (using silent demonstration) and the improvement of students achievement that was given a usual treatment (using conventional method).

CONCLUSION

Based on the finding and discussion, it could be concluded that cooking sessions was very effective to improve students' understanding on procedure writing text. It was proved by the result of t_{test}. The t-test showed that t_{score} 3.794 was higher than t-table 1.67. It means that Ha was accepted and Ho was rejected. Since the t-score was higher than the table, there was a significant difference in the achievement between students in 1st grade who were taught procedure text through the use of cooking sessions and students in 1st grade who were taught procedure text without using cooking sessions (using conventional method). The average score of experimental group was 77.56 and the average score of control group was 70.33. It means that the experimental group

REFERENCES

Anderson, Mark, Kathy Anderson, Text Type in English, South Yara: Macmillan, 1997.

Arikunto, Suharsimi, Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik, Jakarta: Rineka Cipta, 2006.

Brown, Douglas, Language Assessment Principles and Classroom Practices, San Francisco: Longman, 2004.

Brown, H. Douglas ,Teaching by Principle, San Francisco: Longman, 2001.

Blanchard, Karen and Christine Root, Ready to Write, New York: Pearson Education Inc., 2003.

Cambridge, Dictionary of American English, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Celce. M and Murcia Elite Olstain, Discourse and Context in Language Teaching, New York: Combridge University Press, 2000.

Eastwood, John, Concise Oxford Dictionary, 8th Ed. London: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Feez, Susan and Helen Joyce, Text-Based Syllabus Design, Sydney: Macquarie University, 2002.

Halliday, M.A.K. & Ruqaiya Hasan, Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in Social-Semiotic Perspective, Hongkong: Oxford University Press, 1984.

Harmer, Jeremy, How To Teach Writing, England: Longman, 2007.

_____, The Practice of English Language Teaching, England: Pearson

Education Limited, 2001, 3rd Ed.

Hartono, Rudi, Genres of Text, Semarang: UNNES, 2005.

Heaton, J.B, Writing English Language Test, London:Logman Group,1975.

Hornby, A.S, Oxford Advanced Learners' Dictionary of Current English, NY:Oxford University Press, 1987.

Hodge, BJ and William P. Anthony, Organization Theory, United States of

America: Allyn and Bacon, Inc, 1984, 2nd Ed.

Hyland, Ken, Genre and Second Language Writing, US: University of Michigan Press, 2004.

Kern, Richard, Literacy and Language Teaching, New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Mongot Alexander Jaya, et. al, Genre Brilliant Solution, Jepara: Mawas Press, 2006.

Mayers, Alan, Gateways to Academic Writing Effective Sentence, Paragraphs, and Essays, New York: Pearson Education, Inc, 2005.

Nunan, David, Research Method in Language Learning, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

O'Malley, J. Michael and Lorraine Valdez Pierce, Authentic Assessment for English Language Learners. Practical Approaches for Teachers, Great Britain: Longman, 1996.

Oshima, Alice and Ann Hogue, Writing Academic English, New York: Addison Wesley Publishing Company, 1996.

Richards, C. Jack and Theodore S. Rodgers, Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Wallace, Michael J, Action Research for Language Teacher, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Western Michigan University: The Evaluation Centre, " Glossary", http://ec. wmich. edu/glossary/prog-glossary.htm, 16 Oktober 2010.

White, Fred D, The Writer's Art. A Practical Rhetoric and Handbook, (New York: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1986.

W. Santrock, John, Adolescence, Jakarta: Erlangga, 2003, 6th Ed.