USING PQP (PRAISE – QUESTION - POLISH) TECHNIQUE TO IMPROVE THE SMA SANTA MARIA PEKANBARU SECOND YEAR STUDENTS' ABILITY IN WRITING HORTATORY EXPOSITION TEXT

Herni Lestari, Rumiri R. Aruan, Hadriana

Abstract

The research entitled "Using PQP (Praise – Question – Polish) Technique to Improve The SMA Santa Maria Pekanbaru Second Year Students' Ability in Writing Hortatory Exposition Text. The necessity of revitalizing and renewing the teaching technique to enhance students' writing ability was highly demanded. Students' ability in writing was still unsatisfactory as 78.79% of them could not reach the Minimum Standard Achievement at the given pre-test. This research is aimed to investigate and analyze whether there was any improvement on the ability of the second year students of SMA Santa Maria Pekanbaru in writing hortatory exposition text. The participants of this study were 33 students of XI IPA 1, academic year 2011/2012. The research was conducted for two (2) cycles. The quantitative and qualitative data was gained by using writing test, observation sheets, and field notes. A crucial improvement on the students' ability in writing hortatory exposition text was appeared after implementing PQP technique. This was proved by the increasing average score of pre-test from 63 to 82 for post-test 1 and 86 for post-test 2. The students' interest and motivation in writing were increased as their enthusiasm and excitement in learning process were also uplifted as shown in the increasing of the average score of students' activities from 76.46% in cycle 1 to 93.33% in cycle 2. Besides, all aspects of writing could be improved well. As the conclusion, the application of PQP technique was successfully improved the XI IPA 1 students' ability and activeness in writing hortatory exposition text. They were highly motivated to PQP their friends for they learned to maintain a positive attitude toward the critique process.

Keywords: PQP technique, writing ability, and hortatory exposition text.

Abstrak

Penelitian ini berjudul "Penerapan Teknik PQP ((Praise – Question – Polish) untuk Meningkatkan Kemampuan Siswa Kelas XI SMA Santa Maria dalam Menulis Teks Hortatory Exposition". Penelitian ini bermula dari latar belakang perlunya pembaharuan dan kreatifitas guru dalam mengelola proses pembelajaran di dalam kelas serta perlunya variasi dalam proses belajar mengajar agar siswa dapat termotivasi untuk menulis secara terarah. Kemampuan menulis siswa masih kurang memuaskan terlihat dari 78,79% peserta didik yang mendapatkan nilai pre-test di bawah Kriteria Kelulusan Minimum (KKM) yang pada saat itu ditetapkan yakni 72. Teknik pembelajaran PQP (Praise – Question – Polish) bertujuan untuk menginvestigasi dan menganalisa perkembangan siswa-siswi kelas XI SMA Santa Maria dalam menulis teks hortatory exposition. Objek penelitiannya adalah tiga puluh tiga (33) siswa-siswi XI IPA 1 tahun pembelajaran 2011/2012. Penelitian dilakukan dengan dua (2) siklus. Data kualitatif dan kuantitatif diperoleh dari hasil tes tertulis dan lembar observasi siswa. Perkembangan yang signifikan dalam penulisan teks hortatory exposition tampak secara jelas setelah pelaksanaan teknik PQP. Hal ini terbukti dari peningkatan nilai rata-rata sebesar 63 pada ulangan harian kesatu (sebelum penggunaan teknik PQP) menjadi rata-rata 82 pada ulangan harian kedua dan menjadi rata-rata 86 pada ulangan harian ketiga (setelah penerapan teknik PQP). Dari hasil observasi, aktivitas siswa meningkat dari 76.46% pada siklus 1 menjadi to 93.33% pada siklus 2. Selain itu, seluruh aspek dalam menulis juga meningkat. Dari pelaksanaan penelitian tindakan kelas ini, dapat disimpulkan bahwa penerapan teknik PQP dapat meningkatkan kemampuan dan aktivitas siswa kelas XI IPA 1 SMA Santa Maria Pekanbaru dalam menulis teks hortatory exposition. Para siswa termotivasi untuk meng"PQP" teman mereka seiring dengan bagaimana mereka belajar untuk menumbuhkan sikap positif dalam mengomentari hasil tulisan teman mereka.

Kata Kunci: teknik PQP, kemampuan menulis, dan teks hortatory exposition.

INTRODUCTION

Students' ability in oral communication can be visibly notice from their fluency in speaking the target language. Nevertheless, the fluency in writing is also one of the values in communication purpose. Writing is an essential skill in communicative language teaching which means writing is a system of communication, not only an object of study (Taselin, 2010:103).

Strandness (1988:26) emphasized that communicative writing is rather difficult to be assessed because we must consider whether or not the writing is understandable and communicative, in spite of the perfect grammar and various vocabularies. Therefore, we should concern the content of the writing instead of only identify what the students have produced, e.g. grammatical accuracy, mechanics of writing, proper format, good organization, etc. (Mandal, 2009:96).

Writing was, traditionally, remarked as a tool for the practice and reinforcement of specific grammatical and lexical patterns, where accuracy was all important but content and self-expression are not necessary (Paraskevi, 2001:3). Writing taught and tested mainly in isolated linguistic elements - such as fill in the blanks, vocabulary, and grammar – which does not show the ability of someone's writing according to communication view (Shohamy, 1984:188). We must realize that the function of writing is to be clear and coherent in something in spite of grammatically fashionable.

As Ghaith (2002:2) defined writing as a complex process that allows writers to explore thoughts and ideas, and make them visible and concrete. Writing encourages thinking and learning by expressing our thought down into a piece of paper so that it can be examined, analyzed, edited, revised, and even changed Ghaith (2002:1).

Paraskevi (2001:3) believed that when we learn English either as a foreign or second language, we learn to communicate with other people, to understand them, to talk to them, read what they have written and write to them. Johnson cited in Strandness (1988:23) emphasized that we will write best when our purpose is to communicate something to someone. Writing is a uniquely individual responsibility

and the same individual may use different methods to express him or herself (Kamehameha Schools, 2007:3).

The second year students of SMA Santa Maria Pekanbaru did not excel in writing hortatory exposition text as 78.79% of them could not reach the Minimum Standard Achievement (72 for English subject) in their pre-test. In addition, the interview with the English teacher and students revealed that: (1) teaching this genre was rather difficult as the complexity of hortatory exposition text required analysis and critics on the topic given; (2) Passive teaching and learning process which shun the students in elaborating their ideas and creativity; (3) Students did not obtain any benefits in writing despite the score they got; (4) The teaching method did not bring a lively atmosphere in learning; (5) A lack of motivation to write, both internal (from students) and external (from teacher and friends). As a result, students felt bored and restless to write.

Hortatory exposition is one of the texts that should be learned at the second semester by second grade students of senior high school. Hortatory exposition text is the type of the text to persuade someone to take some more action (Athanasopoulos and Sandford, 1997:2).

The purpose of hortatory text is to propose, suggest, and command (Morin, 2003:1). It also aims to persuade the reader or listener by presenting one side of argument that is the case for or the case against (Anderson, 1977:122).

In Kangguru Radio English (2001:54), hortatory exposition is also called persuasive writing. Persuasive writing intends to convince the reader to accept our recommendation and/or take a specific action. According to Glatthorn (1980:145), persuasion is the way we tell about what we should do or think by reporting facts, expressing opinion, persuading, propagandizing, brainwashing, etc. Persuasion is more forceful than opinion and more honest than propagandizing if we analyze the definition.

Utami (2010:17), Cahyono and Purnama (2006:204) stated the language features of hortatory exposition text: (a) Use mental verb: what writer think / feel about; (b) Use present and present perfect tense; (c) Use modal verb: can, may, will;

4

(d) Use subjective opinion: I and we; (e) Use words to link argument: however, therefore, etc; (f) Focusing on the writer; (g) Use modal adverb: certainly, surely, etc; (h) Use temporal connective (enumeration): firstly, secondly, etc; and (i) Use evaluative words: important, valuable, trustworthy, etc.

Moreover, Utami (2010:9) explained the generic structures of hortatory exposition text that consists of: (a) Opening (a thesis) to guide and tell the reader about the general summary concerning the topic or logical conclusion of the argument in the essay; (b) Main body (arguments) to explain and elaborate the idea(s) and the reason(s) concerning the issue; and (c) Conclusion (a recommendation) to summarize the overall idea and to persuade or recommend the reader to do or not to do something.

The researcher intended to help students to improve their writing ability. PQP is one of the techniques used to enhance their writing skill. The objectives of the research are: (1) To find out whether or not the score of students' writing ability is increased by using PQP technique; (2) To analyze the factor(s) caused the improvement of the writing.

Neubert and McNelis (1990:52) defined PQP technique as one of the techniques regarding group work. It requires students' critical thinking and good interaction among members in group. PQP technique (Neubert and McNelis, 1986:57) gives students an organizational technique in responding their peers' writing and focusing on content features of writing (as opposed to grammatical features). It helps students focus on their writing as well as maintain a positive attitude toward the critique process (Neubert and McNelis, 1990:52).

Students must be able to justify their comments in order to evaluate someone's papers effectively. Ultimately, they demonstrate more confidence in writing and decrease their anxiety towards writing. The students work with partners, ask and help each other, show high level of enthusiasm, curiosity and involvement through cooperative learning tasks. Thus, the integration of these activities will be of great benefit to the students and help them enhance their writing skill (Neubert and McNelis, 1990:52).

PQP is a framework used to assess understanding and evaluate learning. It has three columns for student responses to specific lessons, texts, topics, or focus studies (Anchin, 1979:8). PQP technique (Neubert and McNelis, 1986:57) gives students an organizational technique in responding their friends' writing and focusing on content features of writing (as opposed to grammatical features).

According to Lyons (1981:42) and Anchin (1979:87), this PQP technique consists of: **(a)** *Praise* – What do you like about my paper? **(b)** *Question* – What questions do you have about my paper? **(c)** *Polish* – What kind of polishing do my paper need before it published? Lyons (1981:42) believed that the answer to "praise" will identify the strength of the writing, boost writer's ego and prepare the writer for the following critique. The answer to "question" will guide the writer to think critically about their writing; whether it is clear, organized, fluent, and specific enough. Finally, the answer to "polish" will help the writer for a better proofreading. The writer will be encouraged to polish their writing in a painless way (Lyons, 1981:43).

The students would use the PQP form to fill in any compliments, comments, and feedbacks in order to help the writer in improving his/her writing from many aspects. There were many forms of PQP technique but the one which was appropriate in this case was the form as the following:

Neubert and McNelis (1986:58) highlighted the advantages of PQP technique are: (a) Provide focused, informative, specific feedback. (b) Emphasize use of specific content or process language. (c) Describe what was done and not done. (d) Reinforce, encourage, and support personal writing. (e) Establish relationships of mutual respect. In short, PQP technique offers time to analyze what they understand, evaluate their learning critically, identify and clarify problematic areas, and provide a structure for feedback.

Otherwise, we could not avoid the problems appeared in the PQP technique. As Youngblood (1999:5) mentioned the problems such as: (a) Imbalanced participation may occur while some students may not be active; (b) Dominant students may take most of the part in the group. (c) Some students may not respect other's writing and be unresponsive with their job as a peer editor. (d) Students remark the peer response as a place to defeat one each other and to show who is better, rather than supporting. (e) It may occur come misconceptions about the revision, conflict about text ownership and unwillingness to offer evaluative feedback for their friends. (f) Only sixty percent of their time on task in peer response groups; the rest of their attention was allocated to social talk. (g) It is very time-consuming to reproduce papers for exchanging and sharing.

METHODOLOGY

This research is a classroom action research. This research was intended to improve the second grade students' ability of SMA Santa Maria Pekanbaru, particularly XI IPA, 1 in writing hortatory exposition text by using PQP technique.

As Bogdan and Biklen (1998:209) defined action research as a type of applied qualitative research that is explicitly used to make practical decisions about, or improvements in, programs and practices. Moreover, Wiriaatmadja (2009:13) stated Classroom Action Research (CAR) as the way of teacher in organizing their teaching and learning process by their own experience and innovation. Later they will see how these ideas influence the learning process.

Kunandar, 2011:65 mentions that the output of CAR: (a) improve students' learning ability and competence; (b) repair the quality of teaching and learning process in classroom; (c) improve the procedure quality and the use of learning media; and (d) solve the students' problem in learning.

The researcher gave students pre-test initially and after each cycle, a post-test was held to analyze their writing ability before and after applying PQP technique in classroom as the quantitative data.

There are five aspects involved in writing English (Hughes, 1989:91): (1) **Grammar** should remain a place in the language because of its value as a strong monitoring system and its function as an academic context (Heilenman, 1979:11). (2) A good mastery of **vocabulary** is essential for ESL and EFL learners in order to bring a right perception and to avoid a misinterpretation among interlocutor for the reader or listener (Wu and Wang, 2005:1). (3) **Mechanic** is related to punctuation and spelling (Hughes, 1989:92). (4) The **organization** of the whole paragraphs is crucial. The unity of the paragraph will build a good paragraph (Walters, 2000:3). (5) **Fluency** is related to coherence, which according to Walters (2000:1), refers to a certain characteristic or aspect of writing. grammar, vocabulary, mechanics, fluency, and organization. Besides, the observation sheets provided the qualitative data of students' activity during learning process.

In this research, the researcher applied the procedures for PQP technique by Kaminski (2011:10) as follows:

1. Arrange the desks in circle to ease the communication. Each group consists of 3 to 5 students.
2. Each person will play as the writer and read his paper aloud to the group. The rest may get the copy of his writing.
3. Each member should be polite and attentive while listening.
4. In the '*praise*' part, responders must be supportive and appreciative as there is always something can be praised from the writing.
5. The responders are supposed to find the weaknesses of the writing by asking what they do not understand from it in the '*question*' part.

6. In the '*polish*' part, give any feedback and suggestion for better writing.
7. Discuss the feedback with teacher.

There were two kinds of data that had collected; the quantitative and the qualitative data. For quantitative data, the writer collected the data by distributing the test to the students. The pre-test was conducted to compare the students' writing ability before PQP technique was applied. A post-test was done to compare the achievement of the students after the technique was applied. The writing test would show the students' further ability in communicating in written. The researcher used scoring technique of Harris in Hughes (1989:91-93) for assessing the test. Students chose one of the topics given and wrote the hortatory exposition text in maximally 60 minutes.

For qualitative data, observation sheets were required to collect the qualitative data. There were two observation sheets: teacher's activities sheets and students' activities sheet. The writer assisted by an observer to record the teaching and learning process by putting a check (√) on the sheets with minimally 1 to maximally 4 for the score range. They would then discuss the result to arrange further actions. Besides, a field note was required to specify the performances and activities of both students and teacher, which could not be explained in the observation sheets, such as the class circumstances, material mastery, interaction between teacher and students, interaction among students, and other important activities.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

Based on the result of the pre-test, it can be informed that there were 9.09% of students were in *Poor* level; 24,24% were in the *Mediocre* level; 54,54% were in *Good* level; and only 12,12% were in the *Excellent* level. It can be inferred that the second year students of SMA Santa Maria Pekanbaru required an improvement in writing hortatory exposition text regarding their poor achievement in writing skill.

In teaching writing through PQP technique at the first cycle, it could be described that at the first meeting, all students participated well in the learning

process. They could write hortatory exposition text in monologue individually or were in group after the researcher applied PQP technique. Meanwhile, at the second meeting, they were another topic of hortatory exposition text and the students could wrote better. The average percentage of students' activities in the first cycle was 76.46%.

At the second cycle, all students participated best in the learning process and they were excited in writing hortatory exposition text in form of letter to editor. They could reach 93,33% for the average of students' activites in two meetings.

In addition, the result of test in each cycle showed a massive improvement from the post –test 1: 22 students or 66,7% in *Excellent* level, 10 students or 30,3% in *Good* level and 1 student or 3% in *Mediocre* level. There were 6 students remained or 18,2% of them got remedial in this test so that the second cycle were applied for a better improvement.

At post-test 2, there was a significant improvement on students' writing score as many as 29 students or 87,9% were in *Excellent* level and only 4 students or 12,1% were in the *Good* level. None of the students had remedial.

The Average Scores of the Students' Level of Ability

Score	Level of Ability	Pre-Test (%)	Post-Test 1 (%)	Post-Test 2 (%)
81 – 100	Excellent	12,1	66,7	87,9
61 – 80	Good	54,5	30,3	12,1
41 – 60	Mediocre	24,2	3,0	0
21 – 40	Poor	9,1	0	0
0 – 20	Very Poor	0	0	0

Among five writing aspects of pre-test score, it could be seen that the highest average score was in the aspect of '*Vocabulary*' and '*Mechanic*' for 4 points; '*Organization*' was 3,9; '*Fluency*' was 3.6; and '*Grammar*' was 3.4. The average

score of aspects assessed was 3,78 (63%) and it required a treatment to get a higher achievement.

Among five writing aspects of post-test 1 score, it could be seen that the highest average score was in the aspect of '*Mechanic*' and '*Fluency*', that is 5.1; followed by '*Organization*' was 5; '*Grammar*' and '*Vocabulary*' were 4.7. The total average score of aspects of writing was 4.92 (82%).

Otherwise, at post-test 2, the average score increased to 5.14 in terms of 'Mechanic' and 'Fluency' were 5.3; followed by 'Grammar' was 5.1; and 'Vocabulary' and 'Organization' were 5.

It can be seen distinctively that the students' ability in writing had been improved by the time they applied the PQP technique. The students got much feedback from their friends which led them to an excellent writing ultimately. The improvement could be seen clearly at the following:

The Average Scores of the Students' Writing Skill

Aspects of Writing	Pre-test	Post-Test 1	Post-Test 2
Grammar	3,4	4,7	5,1
Vocabulary	4	4,7	5
Mechanic	4	5,1	5,3
Organization	3,9	5	5
Fluency	3,6	5,1	5,3
Average	3.78	4.92	5.14

Based on the foregoing analysis, it revealed there is an increasing in the level of students' ability after they got treatment by using PQP technique. The use of PQP technique in teaching and learning process at classroom could increase the SMA Santa Maria Pekanbaru XI IPA 1 students' ability in writing hortatory exposition text. The factors that influenced the students' improvement in writing is the distinctive steps in writing PQP form for we realized the importance of giving compliments to someone before criticizing and suggesting what needed by the writer.

CONCLUSION

From the analysis of the data, we conclude that: (1) Students' activities in the classroom influenced their achievement in writing ability. The higher the average score they obtained in the observation sheets, the higher their achievement in writing ability; (2) The PQP technique helped the students in increasing all aspects of writing. They became more critical of their own writing as they were used to criticize and analyze their friends'; (3) The use of PQP technique in classroom has improved students' ability in writing hortatory exposition text and also students' activeness in teaching and learning process as seen from the increasing average score of the pre-test (63) to the post-test 1 (82) and to post-test 2 for (86); (4) The students' curiosity and awareness in writing were getting better as shown in the increasing of the average score of students' activities from 76.46% in cycle 1 to 93.33% in cycle 2; (5) All aspects in writing could be improved well after implementing PQP technique. The average of writing aspects in pre-test was 3.78 (63%) and increased to 4.92 (82%) in post-test 1 and 5.14 (86%) in post-test 2.

SUGGESTION

From the foregoing conclusion, the writer concerned: (1) The crucial point in teaching that is how to develop and modify teaching technique to upgrade students' learning; (2) In teaching English as a Foreign Language (EFL), particularly, further classroom action research is entailed to engage and improve students' ability in English; (3) Teacher is supposed to explore and analyze students' interests and ways of learning; (4) Selecting current and hot topics will arise students' interest in learning; (5) Teacher should become a good partner for the students, a facilitator in group work, and a motivator in maintaining a positive attitude while PQP their friends; (6) It will be inevitably challenging if the PQP technique can be applied in other text types (genres) and other learning skills such as reading, speaking, and listening.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anchin, David C. 1979. *Learning Strategies Resource Guide*. Tampa: University of South Florida.

Athanasopoulos, Vicki and Debby Sandford. 1997. *Teaching the Argument Genre in a Year 6/7 Class*. South Australian ESL Teachers' Association Journal.

Bogdan R. and Biklen S. 1992. *Quality Research for Education*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Cahyono, Kristiawan Dwi and Eka Purnama.2006. *Communicative Competence 2B: A course in Acquiring English Communicative Competence, For Senior High School Level, Grade XI Semester 2*. Jombang: CV Karunia \ Agung.

Ghaith, Ghazi. 2002. *Writing*. American University of Beirut. http://www.nadasisland.com/ghaith-writing.html#approaches. Retrieved on 6th February 2012.

Glatthorn, Allan A. et. al. 1980. *Composition Skills (2)*. Chicago: Science Research Associates,Inc.

Glatthorn, Allan A. et. al. 1980. *Composition Skills (3).* Chicago: Science Research Associates,Inc.

Heilenman, Laura K. 1979. *A Realistic Look at the Function of Grammar in the Foreign Language Classroom*. http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/search/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_ &ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=ED184361&ERICExtSearch_SearchType _0=no&accno=ED184361. Retrieved 8th February 2012.

Hughes, Arthur. 1989. *Testing for Language Teachers*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Kangguru Radio English. 2011./ http://www.kangguru.org/ausaidprojects/. Retrieved on 20th July 2011.

Kamehameha Schools . 2007. *The Writing Process: An Overview of Research on Teaching Writing as a Process*. Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools.

Kaminski, R. 2011. *PQP: Praise-Question-Polish*
http://teachers.greenville.k12.sc.us/sites/vbeineke/Shared%20Documents/PQ
P.ppt. Retrieved on 8th February 2012.

Kunandar. 2011. *Langkah Mudah Penelitian Tindakan Kelas*. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.

Lyons, Bill. 1981. *The PQP Method of Responding to Writing*. The English Journal,
Vol.70, No.3 (p.42-43)

Mandal, Rita Rani. 2009. *Cooperative Learning Strategy to Enhance Writing
Skills*: A Journal.

Morin, Izak. 2003. *Six Phases in Teaching Interpretation*.
http://www.translationdirectory.com/articles/article1287.htm. Retrieved on 18
November 2011.

Neubert, Gloria A. and Sally J. McNellis. 1986. *Improving Writing in the
Disciplines*.http://www.ascd.org/ASCD/pdf/journals/ed_lead/el_198604_neub
ert.pdf. Retrieved 8th February 2012.

Neubert, Gloria A. and Sally J. McNellis. 1990. Peer Response:
Teaching Specific Revision Suggestions: An Article. T*he National Council of
Teachers of English.*

Paraskevi, Andreoloupolo. 2001. *The Use of Process Writing Approach as Means
to Facilitate the Scripts of Adult EFL Learners.*
http://www.scribd.com/doc/16199701/Writing-Skills-Assignment.   Retrieved
8th February 2012.

Shohamy, Elana. 1984. *A Practical Handbook in Language Testing for the Second
Language Teacher*. Israel: Tel-Aviv University

Strandness, T. Benson. 1988. *Language Form, and Idea*. New York : McGraw-
Hill.

Taselin, Maria. 2010. *Interactive Activities for Improving Students' Writing Skills.*
Malang: State University of Malang Press.

Utami, Ellisabet Tiyas. 2010. *Teaching Materials XI: Developing Reading and
Writing Skills*. Yogyakarta: SMA Bopkri 2.

Walters, F. Scott. 2000. *Coherence and Unity*.
http://lrs.ed.uiuc.edu/students/fwalters/cohere.html. Retrieved on 8th August
2012.

Wu, Jiang wen and Wang, Bin bin. 2005. *The Role of Vocabulary in ESP Teaching and Writing*. China: Guandong College of Finance. http://www.celea.org.cn/pastversion/lw/pdf/wujiangwen.pdf. Retrieved on 8th August 2012.

Wiriaatmadja, Richiati. 2009. *Metode Penelitian Tindakan Kelas.* Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya.

Youngblood, Jackson Alecia. 1999. *Peer Response Groups Using Electronic and Traditional Communications: A Portraiture of a Class.*