

Teaching the Writing of English as Foreign Language: An Indonesian Context

FELIKS TANS

ORCID No. 0000-0003-1197-2115
felikstansnara@yahoo.com

AGUSTINUS SEMIUN

ORCID No. 0000-0001-5666-5245
agustinussemiun@gmail.com
Nusa Cendana University
Kupang, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

This research, conducted from August to November 2014, aimed at describing how English as a foreign language (EFL) writing is taught and learned in an Indonesian context, that is, three junior schools in the City of Kupang, East Nusa Tenggara Province, Indonesia. The study used instruments such as interviews, observations, and students' English writings. The data were analyzed descriptively using theories of Bogdan and Biklen (2007), Odell (1977), and Ivanc (1995). The results showed that the teachers have traditionally done the teaching of EFL writing in the schools, that is, the teaching of writing aims at improving students' speaking, reading, listening, vocabulary and grammar, but not writing itself. Teachers' treatments of both good and poor student writers were, in general, the same. The students' writings were generally poor although there were some who could write well. The teachers, however, determined to improve their EFL teaching practices, namely, moving from traditional ways to contemporary practices of EFL writing teaching and learning whose aim is to improve students' writing itself and along their processes of writing, their teachers act as learning facilitators right from topic choice to writing to rewriting to publishing.

Keywords: Teaching, learning, writing, and EFL writing

INTRODUCTION

It is a fact that in this modern era still many, even educated people, cannot write well even after many years of long and expensive education. That is, their writing competence is in crisis, a phenomenon known as a “writing crisis” (Jenson, 1992; Diaz-Chamacho *et al.*, 1995; Clark, 2008). The similar phenomenon is also found in Indonesia, where many, if not all educated people find it difficult to write in English (Tans, 1999b; 2015), even in Indonesian, a language predominantly used in Indonesia, a country whose oral tradition is much stronger than written one (Navis, 1997; Sehandi, 1997).

However, writing competence on the other side is crucial. People need it to write many pieces of writing, that is, from simple and informal ones like writing informal and simple notes to those which are formal and complex like writing formal letters, essays or academic articles, written speech, reports, news and other journalistic forms of writing as well as books of any kinds. It is practically needed in every walk of life. In educational institutions, in particular, students need writing competence to write their assignments in such forms as essays, stories, papers, research proposals, research result reports, thesis, and dissertation. In the institutions intended and beyond, those who write well – as shown by their published articles or books – are more powerful than those who can only speak (well) but never write or publish their writing (Martin, 1985; Kress, 1986).

Due to that need, English Foreign Language (EFL) students in tertiary institutions, in particular are also taught how to write in English to prepare them with English writing competence. Various methods or strategies are used to teach the students to express ideas in written forms such as subject-matter assignments, articles for publication, research proposals for thesis, and so forth. However, very few of them can continue writing, for example English articles, for journal publication after their graduation. The question to this phenomenon is on whether the problem is on the methods used to teach the EFL writing, or on writing competence of lecturers who teach writing subject, or on the students’ side.

It is also evident that so many studies have been done about the phenomenon in tertiary institutions. Regarding solving teaching method problem, Seileek and Riyadh (2006) for example have done research on using word processor for teaching writing to EFL students in the University of King Saud. By using experimental design, they found that experimental group did better than control group using word processor. Another research, different from that, is one done by Shuhua *et al.* (2009) on integrating cooperative learning into genre-based teaching

of EFL writing to raise the students' awareness and motivation to write. They report a good contribution of group activities of doing writing to the awareness and motivation of the students to write in English. The other very interesting finding is that of Kiasi and Hemmati (2014), that is, teacher talk plays a special importance during the teaching of EFL writing. According to them, the speech of the writing-teacher is actually the teacher's comments or feedbacks on the students' writing. The comments intended sound pedagogical, differentiated into focal talk (dealing with what to write), remedial talk (responding what has been written by the students), and notional talk (extending topics to write). The study reports the recovery of linguistic and ideational structures of the students by the speech (comments or feedbacks) of the teacher. This particular study is supported by Huang (2011) stating that EFL students' grammatical ability accounts, to a certain extent, their writing ability, and Semiun (2014) highlighting the idea of empowering EFL teachers with general language teaching skills including skill in giving comments or feedbacks to students' learning. Regarding speech of the teacher, Semiun (2009, 2014) has also stressed the importance of the use of English by the teacher viewed from the language learning and language teaching theories. It is impossible for the students to imitate if the teachers do not use English during the teaching. In short, as also argued by experts, learning a language starts from comprehension, so it needs other people to speak it.

The studies presented, and others like those, indicate that university writing-teachers keep on looking for better ways of how to teach EFL writing to university students. This current research is also about the English writing but in junior high schools (SMP) looking at the teachers' way of teaching English writing and the students' writing practice based on what their teachers have taught to them. It is designed to answer the question by focusing on the teaching and learning of EFL writing at junior high school level. The teaching and learning of EFL writing has been chosen because English is an important subject at such level of education and, sooner or later, it will also become a very important subject beyond that – senior high school and tertiary levels – whatever one's major is in. In many cases, one's mastery of English, including their mastery of English writing, determines their future education: a good mastery of EFL (writing) will, of course, make it more possible for them to be more successful, whereas those whose mastery of English (writing) is poor, particularly in a context where English is urgently needed, could then be less successful.

In addition, the influence of language interdependence for children living in a bilingual context (Cummins, 1979; Edelsky, 1982), like junior high school

students in Indonesia in general, in the City of Kupang, East Nusa Tenggara Province, in particular, has been a major reason why the teaching and learning of EFL writing becomes the focus of this study. By understanding the nature of the teaching and learning of EFL, English teachers can then be more effective in helping their students to be not only good student writers in English but also to write in English more actively. If it happens, they can also be better student writers in Indonesian and be more active to write in Indonesian because of what Cummins (1979) calls language interdependence. This, in turn, could help Indonesia become a nation with a very strong tradition of writing and publishing.

In addition to improving writing competence in both languages, the students are also supposed to be more successful in any field of study they are interested in, because in writing there are many things that they can learn and improve as student writers. This is the essence of writing to learn and not simply learning to write: writing constructs how a writer thinks (Langer and Applebee, 1987). Such a way of thinking is supposed to be relatively easier to be developed at junior high school level because at that level of education students have entered their teenage period. This is why the teaching and learning of EFL writing have been chosen as the focus of this research.

FRAMEWORK

The major theories as the bases for this research are those of the teaching and learning of writing in general and theories of writing in EFL in Indonesian context. In the last three decades, there have been three major approaches to the teaching and learning of English designed to replace the traditional ways of teaching EFL writing which simply views writing as a means to help young learners improve their reading, speaking, listening, translating, and structure. The approaches are genre, process, and contextual approaches.

In the process approach, writing is seen as an individual process. In that sense, it is the writer him/herself, including a student writer, who is fully responsible for his/her writing, including in the following activities: 1) pre-writing activities like reflecting to decide his/her writing genre (i.e. writing a piece of creative one like a poem, short story, novel, and drama, or creative one like description, argument, exposition, and factual narrative and/or to choose a topic to write on; 2) writing activities that suit his/her writing habit; 3) rewriting activities; and, 4) post-writing activities like publications (Graves, 1983).

Within those activities, writing teachers' role is minimum, that is they can only

give their comments or they can only edit/revise their student's writing if their students want to or if they ask for it along their writing process. It is, of course, great for writing teachers to have a kind of writing conference like face to face writing (individual) conference or group writing conference when they evaluate their students' writings and answers their questions in writing. It is understood that the final activity of a series of writing activities must be publication. In other words, a student's writing does not end when a teacher has read it and scores it before it is returned to its author; it only ends when it is published in such forms as class presentation/performance, wall magazine, school/classroom walls, school blog/web site, school magazine, radio, and/or local newspapers/magazines.

The second approach is genre approach (Kress, 1994). In this approach, teachers direct their students in writing; determines the type of writing their students have to write. It is, therefore, crucial for them to introduce first certain model of writing and its generic structure as well an example of it before they allow their students to write themselves, that is, by imitating the example given by their teachers. This means that students have no freedom to write on any topic they are interested in; they have to follow their teacher's instruction.

To enrich their writing skill within the genre approach, students are exposed to certain places which are relevant to the writing topic that they are about to write on. If they are supposed to write about procedures of printing a newspaper, for example, they will then go to a local newspaper and watch themselves how a newspaper is printed. After that, they go back to their school and start writing on such topics as steps of producing a piece of newspaper. In their writing process, writing teachers have to be active in revising and/or editing their students' writing whether they ask for it or not.

The third is contextual approach (Tans, 1993). In this approach, writing teachers should understand their students' psychology, that is, students who really need their teacher's help in, for example, finding a topic for their writing in pre-writing, writing, rewriting, and/or post-writing activities, must be helped as suggested by the genre approach. However, students who are pretty active and independent in pre-writing, writing, rewriting, or publishing activities should be taught within the approach process paradigm.

Despite the differences that have been mentioned above, the three approaches have indeed some similarities, namely: they all view writing as process, that is, pre-writing, writing, rewriting, and publishing as a total unity. Prewriting activities must end up in publishing. Along the process, peer conference or group conference must be carried out properly. This makes these three approaches to

writing different from what is called the traditional ways of teaching writing that simply view writing as a means of improving not writing and publishing but other language skills like speaking, reading and listening or language aspects like structure and vocabulary.

Within those paradigms of writing teaching, it is, therefore, relevant to know how English writing teachers of junior high schools in the City of Kupang, ENT, Indonesia, teach EFL writing to their students in their schools. This is important to ensure that those teachers and others will finally find some great ways to teach EFL writing in such a way that they can make their students be more competent and more active in writing in English or in any other language(s).

There have been several studies which are relevant to this study. The first is Tans' study (1999a) of EFL writing in a senior high school in the City of Kupang. He finds that English teachers give positive evaluations to their students' English writings. In correcting their students' writings, they focus on grammar, content, and writing mechanics. In terms of its coverage, that is, evaluation and correction of senior high school students' English writing, Tans's study reflects just a small dimension of EFL writing which is pretty complex. That is why; a further research on this topic is badly needed to broaden our understanding of the nature of the teaching and learning of EFL writing in schools, in junior high schools in particular.

The second is Tans's research (1999b) on English writing development of secondary school students in Indonesian context. Although it focuses more on students' writing development and ignores their teachers' roles, this research has inspired the researcher to focus his study also on factors that are related to teachers – junior high school teachers in this research – in the teaching and learning of English which, in many cases, determines students' failure or success in developing their writing competence in and beyond schools.

The third is Tans' study (2007) analyzing cognitive processes found in an English text written by a university student who was learning EFL then. He finds that the student is able in some cases to develop a comprehensive text in EFL, yet in some cases he fails. Although this study is not directly related to the teaching and learning of EFL, it has inspired the researchers to do some more analyses on the contents of students' EFL writings, junior high school students in particular.

The fourth is Tans's study (2010) on the teaching and learning of writing in a primary school in the City of New York, the USA. He finds that: 1) the teaching and learning of writing in the school is teacher-centered and exam-oriented; 2) teachers are active in pre-writing, writing, rewriting, and publishing activities; 3)

in writing, students who write well are active in writing, they are confident, and their imagination is strong, yet those who are classified as poor student writers are generally inactive, unconfident, and less imaginative in writing. Although it is done at different level (i.e. primary school), in another country (the USA), and in English as a native language, this study has inspired the researchers to work on a topic which is on the same topic but with a different focus, that is, the teaching and learning of EFL writing in three different junior high schools.

The fifth is Tans's (2012) study on the model of the teaching and learning of EFL writing in four senior high schools in the City of Kupang for four months. In this research, it is found that the teaching and learning of EFL writing in the schools are traditionally done and it is also exam-oriented; it is not to improve students' EFL writing. Although its level is different, this research, as his previous research, has inspired him to study how junior high school teachers teach EFL writing in their schools, what their results are, and how they improve their teaching methods/techniques to improve their students' EFL writing in the schools.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Regarding the background, this research was conducted to answer the following questions: 1) how EFL writing is taught and learned in three junior high schools in the City of Kupang, East Nusa Tenggara Province; 2) whether there is some practical difference in teaching and learning EFL writing in those schools and, if any, what their differences are; 3) how EFL teachers treat their students who are considered good and poor EFL writers; 4) what is the result of the teaching and learning of EFL writing in the schools; and, what could be done to ensure that the teaching and learning of EFL writing in those schools will be better and/or more effective and efficient.

METHODOLOGY

In this research, the phenomenon of the teaching and learning of EFL writing at three junior high schools in the City of Kupang is objectively described about the role of teachers', students, learning environment, including cultural environment, and certain documents, that is, students' writings and curriculum. This research is, therefore, included in descriptive research in general, a case study in particular. Since it covers three schools, this research is called multi-case studies aiming at finding out and comparing practices of the teaching and learning of EFL writing in the schools (Bogdan and Biklen, 2007: 69-76).

In such a design, the research framework starts from a research focus with certain instruments that lead to some findings with certain indicators as shown in the following Table 1.

Table 1. Research Framework

Problem/Focus	Instruments	Results	Indicators
Practices of the teaching and learning of EFL writing	Observations and Interviews	Traditional and non-traditional	Writings are published or not
Differences of practices of the teaching and learning of EFL writing	Observations and Interviews	Similar or different	Different or similar treatments of teachers to their students
Results of the teaching and learning of EFL writing	Students' writings	Good or bad	Content, language, organization and mechanics of writing by the students are scored within the range of 1 (the worst) to 10 (the best).
Changes of practices that could be models	Observations and Interviews	contextual	The teaching and learning of EFL writing is done based on students' characteristics

The researchers did this research from August to November, 2014, in three junior high schools, chosen purposively, that is, two private schools and one state school, in the City of Kupang, East Nusa Tenggara Province. The three schools have met the criteria of the office of education as good schools regarding their education quality. The data were collected using three major instruments, that is, interviews, observations and documentations, i.e. students' writings during and/or before the research. The researchers used three instruments to meet the triangulation aspects of the research by using multi methods. So, more objective data could be obtained as suggested by Borg and Gall (1989: 393). This study discusses the three instruments further below.

The interviews with (EFL writing) teachers aim at finding out how they teach EFL writing in their schools, the problems they face, and their efforts to create more active and effective EFL teaching and learning in their classrooms.

Interviews with some good and poor student writers aim at knowing their behavior to EFL writing and their own efforts to improve their writing in English. Non-participative observations aim at getting some data related to the EFL writing teaching and learning in the schools, including the teaching and learning of English in and beyond the students' schools.

Documentary studies focus on students' EFL writings done during or before this research. Their writings, of course, reflect the results of the teaching and learning of EFL writing in the schools. In addition to the students' writing, the researchers will also focus on the English syllabus and the teaching materials used in the schools are also part of the documentary studies.

The research subjects are students of EFL teachers teaching in grade VII and VIII – excluding students and teachers of grade IX as they are busy preparing themselves for the coming final school examinations. Class and school learning environments are also data sources, particularly to get any data related to (students') publications.

The researchers classified the data based on the research questions, namely how the teachers taught EFL writing and how the learners in the research schools. Besides that, the researchers, how it is different from one school to another. It also deals with how teachers treat good and poor student writers in their schools, and what is the result of EFL teaching and learning in the schools. Finally, what needs to be done to improve the teachers' EFL writing teaching performances. The data are then analyzed descriptively using the principles of descriptive data analysis system as proposed by Borg and Gall (1989) and content analysis of writing by Odel (1977) and Ivanic (1995).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

As they are related to the previously stated research questions, the results of this research are divided into four parts. The first is how EFL writing is taught and learned in the research school. Since there have been no different methods applied, in this section there is no discussion of such methodical differences. The second is about EFL writing teachers' different treatments of good and poor student EFL writers. The third is about students' writings as the results of the teaching and learning of EFL writing in the research schools. The fourth is about things to be done by the EFL writing teachers to improve their EFL writing teaching methods/techniques that, in turn, can improve EFL writing competence of their students. This study will discuss all these four questions further below.

Teaching and Learning of EFL Writing in the Research Schools

It is found that the teaching and learning of EFL writing in the research schools can be classified as traditional. It is the teaching and learning of EFL writing which are not to improve students' writing ability. Instead, it is to improve their mastery of other language skills, namely, reading, speaking, and listening. It is also to improve students' mastery of other language aspects like grammar, translation, English games, and vocabulary as well other teaching materials in general. The teacher supported such finding. For example, a teacher said that he teaches EFL writing to improve his students' mastery of English vocabulary. He said that to improve my students' EFL writing; he introduced new words to his students by writing them on the whiteboard (Int.1, Lns.1-4, p. 3).

Another teacher added that to improve my students' writing competence in English, he focused on vocabulary as they had to know many words. After that, he focused on grammar or English sentence structures and good ways of translating (Int.2, Lns.1-6, p. 1). Also, another teacher said that he also gave some opportunities to his students to write short and simple paragraphs so that they could show him whether they understand or did not understand the teaching materials that he had taught on a particular day. He also asked his students to write some dialogues or monologs individually and/or collectively. He regards it as a writing task (Int.3, Lns.12-19, p.2).

It is found that such ways of teaching EFL writing are common in the research schools. Therefore, it shows that there is no pedagogical difference in the teaching and learning of EFL writing in the research schools: it is naturally traditional.

Such a traditional way of EFL writing teaching is also characterized by an incomplete writing activity which is without post-writing activity (publication). The students simply gave their writings to their EFL teachers to revise and score. The students, actually did not want to publish their writings. In other words, the students did not mean their results of writing for publication which should be the goal of whole process of writing class (O.1, Lns.1-2, p. 01). The researchers supported this fact during the observation that in a state school. There was a wall magazine but there was no writing in English, whereas two other private schools had no wall magazine at all.

In addition to the absence of publication, EFL writing teaching and learning in the schools is also characterized by the fact that the students have no initiative to write although the students interviewed like writing in English (O.6, Ln.4, p.1). This means that they write in English if their teachers ask them to. Meanwhile

their teachers rarely ask their students to write. For Grade VII students, for example, it was during the research that they had written for the first time in English. Such activities though were done because of the researchers' request, and when the students wrote, they were generally on their own: no individual conference, no classical conference, and free-topic writing, no writing model, and no field exposure to inspiring the students in their writing.

The above condition is in contrast with the syllabus of 2013 Curriculum, the curriculum implemented in the schools during the time of this research . The 2013 Curriculum is indeed comprehensive regarding its balanced focus on the four language skills (i.e. reading, writing, speaking and listening) and other aspects of language teaching and learning (e.g. structure, vocabulary, and translation). For grade VII, for example, there are 28 basic competences that a student has to master, 12 of which are students' writing activities or, indirectly related to students' writing activities. The 4.1 basic competence, for example, the basic competence is writing simple texts like greetings, expressing good bye, thanking and apologizing while taking into account their social functions, text structure, and any linguistic elements which are contextually correct (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2014/a: 3). However, in practice, this competence is mainly oral. The students are encouraged to speak and listen, but not to write.

In comparison, grade VIII has 38 basic competencies, 11 of which are writing activities or related to students' writing activities (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2014/b: 23-26). In practice, however, these activities are mainly ignored; the teachers focus their teaching in general on speaking and listening as well as reading.

Such practices are common in the research schools. This means that there is no different approach to the teaching and learning of EFL writing in the schools. In other words, the method of teaching and learning of EFL writing in the school are the same or traditional. The teaching and learning of EFL writing is not to improve students' EFL writing but to improve students' speaking, reading, listening, grammar, vocabulary, and translation.

Treatments to Good and Poor Student Writers

The English teachers in the schools say that there are different treatments of the good and poor student writers in the schools. An English teacher, for example, says:

There is specific treatment of students who can write well, namely: a) I ask them to help other students who cannot write well; b) I ask them to write on different topics,

namely, the topics which are more challenging for them to write about or the topics which are more difficult to write compared to the topics that I assign to the students who cannot write well; and, c) I ask them to learn independently and to continually train themselves although they are already good at writing in EFL (I.2, Lns. 22-31, p.1).

It is observed, however, such a different treatment is not common; the students who can write well do not write any additional writing tasks assigned by their teachers. Yet, all teachers in the schools say that they would do the following things to their good student writers: 1) giving more guidance, motivation, and encouragement; 2) appreciating and applauding the students; and, 3) giving the students some tips how to write well.

There are some teachers, however, who did not have any special treatments of good student writers in their classes. A teacher said that he had not provided any specific guidance to students whose writing is good (W.4, Lns. 8-10, p. 1).

About students whose writing is not good, a teacher said that she usually did three things, namely:

First, I ask my students who cannot write well to keep consistently trying their best to write in English until they are able to write well. Second, I provide some simple topics or easy topics for them to write about. Third, I always guide them in such a way that they know some strategies to write fluently and to use correct and good English (W.3, Lns.32-39, p. 1).

Like their treatments of good student writers, what the teacher says is not what she basically practices in her class. In other words, what is said by the teacher is not always seen in her teaching practices. It is not uncommon to see, for example, the simple topics that she has provided and the written exercises or assignments in English she has given to her students in her class. Hence, the products the students have produced as the results of those assignments/exercises or of their teachers' special treatments of them are not available.

The researchers generalized that the teachers usually did not treat well the students whose' writing are not good. This treatment includes 1) guiding their students in relation to word choice (choosing suitable words for suitable contexts), good sentence building, and good paragraph development. 2) Frequently guiding their students to write and pay more attentions to their students' writings. 3) Encouraging their students to write more. 4) Providing simple topics to write about. 5) Asking their students why they cannot write well. And, 6) telling their students some great tips to write well.

Results of the Teaching and Learning of English Writing in Junior High Schools

Within the traditional paradigm of the teaching and learning of English writing, the three teachers are optimistic to say that the results of their teaching of English writing in their schools are good as the students are quite a diligent in learning EFL (writing). It is poor for those who are lazy or absent minded in learning in their classrooms. It indicates that the teacher said her students who can concentrate well can apply certain games, write new vocabulary on board, and be motivated to write well and fluently as their teacher is pretty objective in scoring her students' writing (W.5, Lns. 14-16, p.1). On the other hand, she says, students with poor concentration find it difficult to memorize and to write well and fluently (W.5, Lns.17-19, p. 1).

Two other teachers, however, believe that despite their great enthusiasm for writing in English, the results of their teaching English writing are not that good. This is due to such as (1) their students' mastery of good English sentence structure is poor (2) their English chance to practice English is poor so that their English is quite limited in general, in vocabulary in particular; and (3) they are not used to write in English.

Within that kind of tradition, some students can write well in EFL, yet some others write poorly based on the standards of grades VII and VIII of junior high schools. The following examples of the students' writings prove the point:

Text 1

Name: MV

Class: VII (L)

Obed is my Father

He is 40 years old

He likes Pleyfoboll

Carles is my brother

He is 23 years old

He likes singing

Semsi is my brother

Her is 16 years old

He likes reading book

Martha is my mother

He is 35 years old

He likes cooked

Rini is mys sister

He is 21 years old

He likes singing

Nofi is my sister

He is 14 years old

He likes bat minton

Text 2
Name: RAL
Grade: VIII
MY EXPERIENCE

Hello, my name is Riky. I am eleven years old. I live in Tompello street number seventeen. I want to tell you my interesting experience. It's about one year ago when graduation day. That is on 27 July 2013, Me with: Bryan, Dirga, Yudha, Septia,

Lia, Lisa, Felicia, Aiko, Gwyneth, Tiffany, and Reza. We don't patient for hear our result . They say the third champion is ... "Jeremy F. William", second champion for primary is "Reza N. Rompas", and the first champion or the best graduation student for Parumary is ..."Riky A. Lerrick". I'm very proud to my self because

I be the best graduation student for Primary. Thanks for hear my short story. Thanks God for everything that you have do to me. And I also give thanks very-very much to my teacher for everything that they do to me, teach me, counselling me, and many more. This is the end of my story. Thanks

Of course, both texts can consists of two good pieces of writing for grade VII and VIII students of junior high school. The texts have such strengths as fluency and great content. However, both texts also have their weaknesses like their poor organizations and their mechanics and structures (grammatical aspects) that need improving. Despite those weaknesses, the writers of those texts are potentially great; they have basic competence to be good writers. In that sense, they can be definitely good writers if the teachers guided the students well in English writing.

Towards a Better English Teaching and Learning at Junior High School Level

The teachers involved in this research state that they had changed their strategies in teaching writing in their schools. It was as the result of the discussion with the researchers. The teacher said that he thought it was necessary for him to change his style of teaching English writing in his class. In his future teaching of English writing, he has to give more writing assignments to his students. He has to improve his ability to review their writing and how they write. And, he has to improve his strategies to develop the students' writing and their ideas in writing (W.5, Lns.21-26, p.1).

In short, they want to make changes such as (1) asking the students to diligently, critically, and carefully read any English texts they have in general, their English textbooks in particular (2) asking the students to write and publish regularly (3) encouraging them to be more active in joining English classes (4)

teachers act more as English writing learning facilitators in their classrooms (5) improving their teaching methods and avoiding word per word translations (6) teaching good translational method from Indonesian into English or vice versa. And, (7) teachers are more creative in teaching English by, for example, using games in their teaching to make it more interesting for their students.

In fact, teachers' creativity in guiding their students when they write must be implemented thoroughly based on the theories of the teaching and learning of English – Be it in a mother tongue context, foreign language situation, and/or second language condition – that is, the genre/model, process, and contextual approaches. This has been digested from the English teachers' ideas in the research schools who believe that they have to improve their approaches, methods, and techniques in the teaching and learning of English writing in their schools. Although they do not really understand them, the three approaches are, indeed, what they need to improve the teaching and learning of English writing because these are writing theories that have helped to improve the teaching and learning of writing in schools worldwide. The above condition referred to what Bernie Neville calls the power of sub consciousness in teaching and learning (2005. *Educating Psyche: Emotion, Imagination, and Subconscious in Learning*. Melbourne: Flatchat).

In those three approaches, the path of writing generally moves from pre-writing to writing to rewriting to publishing activities – some activities that the teachers in the research schools fail to act comprehensively. Along the series of activities, creating a conducive environment for the teaching and learning of writing in English is crucial. In the three research schools, it is observed, such a support for the teachers have created environment for writing quite well. For example, there are exclusive pictures of Pope in two out of three schools. In those pictures, Pope Francis looks inspiring and so are some sentences stuck on the wall of the schools written as follows. The art of teaching is the art of assisting discovery and St. Peter: Upon the rocks I build good schools.

In another school, the following sentences have on its walls the following. Four Pillars of Education; Learning to know, learning to do, learning to live together, and learning to be a good person; If a child is honestly treated, he/she will appreciate truth; Make this as your habit: smiling, saying hello, living in peace, being polite, and being humble; narcotic drugs No, achievement Yes.

It is, therefore, concluded that the learning environment in the schools is supportive. However, since the teachers did not introduce English writing actively in the schools, their students are quite passive in writing in English because of the fact that their teachers rarely ask them to write and when they

write. The teachers are less active in guiding their students in their writing. As a result, the students' writings in English are not always well written as seen in Text 1 and Text 2. The students have never done Writing in English for publication as the two schools have no wall magazine. One school has a wall magazine but there is no publication of students' writings in English.

CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, it is necessary to restate here that the teaching and learning of writing in the three research schools have been traditionally done, that is, writing is taught to improve other language skills (that is, reading, speaking, listening) and other language aspects like mastery of grammar/structure of English and vocabulary, instead of writing itself. The teachers in the schools treat good and poor student writers more or less the same. Also, writing in English for publication is never done. This is quite contradictory to the 2013 Curriculum whose content, learning media, and a series of competencies to be achieved by students is indeed a great curriculum.

Within the teaching and learning paradigm, the results of teaching and learning of English writing is generally poor, yet some students can indeed write well. The teachers' willingness to improve their teaching methods indicates that the teaching and learning of writing in the schools can be improved.

In the context of this research, the best methods to be implemented in the school are those based on the process approach, model approach, and contextual approach in which writing is a series of activities whose final activity is publishing within the contexts of a junior high school level (Years VII, VIII, and IX). The publication itself starts with a conducive environment for writing, students' willingness to write, teachers' readiness to facilitate their students' writing, prewriting, writing, and rewriting, and publishing activities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results of this research, it is suggested that the government, that is, the office of education, should give English teachers more opportunities to join training on the teaching and learning of English writing. In other words, teachers are suggested to follow more training on the teaching and learning of writing so that they can then be more effective in their teaching of English writing and/or their students can then be more capable and productive to write

and publish in English.

Also, a further research on this topic is done at primary school level as it is a good basis for secondary school writing. In this sense, a strong collaboration with a university which is good at theoretical and practical aspects of the teaching and learning of English writing should be done to better the teaching and learning practices of English writing in schools. Such collaboration is also necessary for publication as universities usually have some journals that can publish students' writings.

Writing for publication should also be regularly promoted in schools. It is, therefore, important for English writing teachers to assign their students writing tasks which are intended to be published and not simply to be read and scored by their teachers. In that context, each school should have, at least, a wall magazine in which students and teachers can then publish their writings, in English or Indonesian. In this era of the Internet, it is also a good idea for a school to have its own web site or blog in which their students and teachers can publish their writings in English or Indonesian.

To encourage the students to write in English, it is also a good idea to have a regular writing competition in each school. Writing competition can indeed motivate to write more and better. Governments, local and central, or any parties that have a great care of education should be active in conducting those kinds of writing competitions.

Finally, it is also a good idea to establish a good library in each school. A library with great books, newspapers, and magazines suitable for junior high school students is always good for students and teachers as they can then have some inspirations to write about. At the same time they can also go to the library to read any sources of information so that they can improve their knowledge, skills in general, writing skill in particular, values and any things that are necessary to write, rewrite, and publish. By doing that, it is hoped that more great writers can be born and, through their writings, the lives of everybody and our environmental condition can then be made better. This is why writing is crucial indeed.

LITERATURE CITED

Bogdan, R.C. & Biklen, S.K.

2007 *Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theories and Methods.*
Boston: Pearson Education.

Borg, W.R. & Gall, M.D.

- 1989 Educational Research: An Introduction. New York: Longman. Clark, I.L.
 2008 Concepts in Composition: Theory and Practice in the Teaching of Writing. New Jersey: Taylor and Francis.

Cummins, J.

- 1979 Linguistic Interdependence and the Educational Development of Bilingual Children." Review of Educational Research, 49(2), pp. 222-251.

Diaz-Chamacho, C., Foley, C.L., & Petty, J.A.

- 1995 A Comparison of Imagery Dialogue and Drawing Prewriting Strategies with Second-Grade Students in Guam." Educational Research, 37(2), pp. 177-184.

Edelsky, C.

- 1982 Writing in a Bilingual Program: The Relation of L1 and L2 Texts. *Tesol Quarterly*, 16(2), June, pp. 211-228.

Graves, D.

- 1983 Writing: Teachers and Children at Work. London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Huang, Y. H.

- 2011 Does EFL Students' Grammatical Ability Account for Writing Ability? A Case Study. *Chia-Nan Annual Bulletin* Vol. 37, pp.500-515.

Ivanic, R.

- (n.d) "Writer Identity." *Prospect*, Vol. 10(1), pp. 8-31.

Jenson, R.M.

- 1992 Can Growth in Writing be Accelerated? An Assessment of Regular and Accelerated College Comparison Course." *Research in the Teaching of English*, 26(2), hlm. 194-211.

Kiasi, M.A. & Hemmati, F.

- 2014 The Importance of "Teacher Talk" in Teaching EFL Writing. *Porta Linguarum* 22, Junio, 95 – 108.

Kress, G.

1994 Learning to Write. London: Routledge.

Langer, J.A. & Applebee, A.N.

(n.d.) How Writing Shapes Thinking: A Study of Teaching and Learning.
Urbana, Il.: National Council of Teachers of English.

Martin, J.R.

1985 Factual Writing: Exploring and Challenging Social Reality.
Deakin University Press: Geelong

Ministry of Education and Culture

2014/a Teachers' English Book: When English Rings the Bell for Grade VII.
Jakarta: Book and Curriculum Center.

Ministry of Education and Culture

2014/b English: When English Rings the Bell for Grade VIII. Jakarta:
Book and Curriculum Center

Navis, A.A.

1997 Lebih Jauh Dengan A.A. Navis (An Interview with A. A. Navis).
Kompas Newspaper, 7 December, p. 2.

Odell, L.

1977 Measuring Changes in Intellectual Processes as One Dimension of Growth in Writing." In C.R. Cooper and L. Odell (Ed.), *Evaluating Writing: Describing, Measuring, Judging*. New York: National Council of Teachers of English, pp. 139-154.

Sehandi, Y.

1997 Kuliah Bahasa Kuliah Menulis (Teaching Indonesian Means Teaching Writing).
Pos Kupang Newspaper, 16 October, p. 4.

Seileek A.F.A & Riyadh

2006 The Use of Word Processor for Teaching Writing to EFL Learners in King Saud University. *J.King Saud University*., Vol 19, Edu. Sci. & Islamic Stud. (2), pp. 1-15.

Semiun, A.

- 2009 The Use of English as a Medium of Instruction by Senior-High School EFL Teachers in NTT A Dissertation. Malang: State University of Malang.

Semiun, A.

- 2014 Empowering EFL Teachers for Future Classroom Teaching: In Relevance with EFL Practicing Teachers of East Nusa Tenggara Province. Kupang: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan Bahasa (JIPB), Vol. 01, No. 01 January 2014

Semiun, A.

- 2014 The Importance of the Use of English by EFL Teachers Viewed from the Theories of Language Learning, Language Teaching, and Classroom Interaction. Kupang: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan Bahasa (JIPB), Vol. 01, No. 03 September 2014

Shuhua, T., *et al.*

- 2009 Integrating Cooperative Learning into Genre-Based Teaching of EFL Writing. CELEA Journal (Bimonthly) Feb. Vol. 32 No. 1

Tans, F.

- 1993 Some Recent Approaches to Teaching Writing: With Particular Reference to Writing in a Second language. Melbourne: M.Ed. Thesis, Graduate School of Education, La Trobe University.

Tans, F.

- 1994 Some Recent Approaches to Teaching Writing: With a Particular Reference to Writing in a Second Language. An Unpublished Thesis. Graduate School of Education, La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia.

Tans, F.

- 1999a Evaluating and Correcting EFL Compositions in Indonesia. Journal The Weaver: A Forum for New Ideas in Education. Nomor 3, ISSN 1329-881X, <http://www.latrobe.edu.au/www/graded/Fted3.html>. Downloaded 13 July 1999.

- Tans, F.
1999b EFL Writing of Indonesian Grade 11 Students: An Inquiry into Becoming a Writer. Disertasi yang Tidak Dipublikasikan. Graduate School of Education, La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia.
- Tans, F.
2007 Writing in EFL: An Analysis of Developing Cognitive Processes. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, Volume14(3), October, pp. 166-174.
- Tans, F.
2010 Teaching and Learning to Write: A Case Study of a Primary School in the City of New York.” In A. Bandur, M. Erb, S. Hastjarjo, K.A. Sugeng, dan L.P. Artini (Ed.), *Proceedings of the First Multidisciplinary International Conference on Education and Culture di STKP St. Paulus, Ruteng, Flores, NTT*, pp. 27-44.
- Tans, F.
2012 Model Pembelajaran Menulis dalam Bahasa Inggris di SMA di Kota Kupang, NTT (English Teaching Models in Senior High Schools of Kupang City, East Nusa Tenggara Province). An Unpublished Research Report. School of Teachers Training and Education, The University of Nusa Cendana, Kupang.
- Tans, F.
2014 Writing: An Introduction. Kupang: Lima Bintang.