

THE INFLUENCE OF TAD ORGANIZER, JOURNAL WRITING STRATEGY, AND WRITING APPREHENSION LEVEL ON RECOUNT WRITING ACHIEVEMENT OF THE TENTH GRADE STUDENTS OF SMA BAKTI IBU 8 PALEMBANG

Kurnia Valentina

*Senior High School Bakti Ibu 8, Palembang, South Sumatera
kurniav@gmail.com*

Abstract: This study aimed at investigating whether or not there was a significant difference in recount writing achievement of the tenth grade students of SMA Bakti Ibu 8 Palembang who were taught by using Transition Action Detail (TAD) Organizer and those who were taught by using Journal writing. This study also aimed at investigating whether or not there was significant interaction among the strategy (TAD Organizer and Journal writing), apprehension level and writing achievement. There were 78 students as the sample which were divided into two groups equally. Each of the group consisted of 13 high level apprehension, 13 average level apprehension and 13 low level apprehension students. The levels of apprehension were determined by giving Writing strategy Apprehension Scale (WSAS) questionnaire. Both TAD and Journal group were given a pretest and a posttest. To collect the data, a recount writing test was used. The data obtained were analyzed by using independent t test and two-way ANOVA. The result showed that there was significant difference in writing achievement between TAD and Journal group (mean difference= 4.20, p -value= 0.054) and there was not significant interaction effect of the strategy and the level of apprehension on students' writing achievement. To conclude, TAD Organizer and Journal writing strategies were effective for improving students' recount writing achievement.

Key Words: *Recount, Transition Action Detail (TAD), Journal Writing*

The quality of education of a country contributes to the quality of its human resource. Based on the data from Global Competitiveness Report 2009-2010, in terms of quality of primary education and the quality of education system, Indonesia was at number 51 and 39, respectively, out of 134 countries in the world (World Bank, 2010, p.200).

One of the elements that plays a very important role in improving the

quality of education is teacher. Therefore, English teachers play a very important role in helping students with their English. Madya (2002) states that in the Indonesian context, a good mastery of English will indeed help accelerate the development of the country of two major reasons. First, the development should be supported by the mastery of science and technology. Second, English is one of the international languages used for

various international communication purposes trading, diplomacy, politics, and education. Therefore, English teachers have a very important role in helping students to improve their English skill.

Based on 2006 English curriculum, students of senior high school are expected to understand the information provided around their surrounding through English to prepare themselves to get their higher education level. They have to be able to express their oral and written ideas. It means that, besides reading and listening, as the skills to respond information, speaking and writing are also become very important.

Generally, many researchers agree that the ability to write competently is a non-inherited skill. Hadley (1993) argued that writing should be seen as a continuum of tasks ranging from mechanical aspects to more sophisticated actions of composition writing in the final stage. This implies that writing skills should be practiced and mastered via experiences.

Although English writing skill is important for the students, but it is also a complicated skill to learn. Mostly, students get difficulties when the teacher instructs them to write in English. Based on the survey done by Alwasilah (2006) at UPI found that 179 of 485 EFL students see that writing in English is the most neglected subject at school and is the most difficult language skill to learn by students and to teach by teachers; students do not only lack of practices in generating the ideas for their writing, but also lack of good writing instructions from the teachers. English writing is also considered difficult, because writing class is time consuming.

For the purpose of this study, the writer did a preliminary investigation to the tenth grade students of SMA Bakti Ibu 8 Palembang, by asking them to write a recount writing with the topic *childhood*. There were 114 tenth grade students. The result showed that eight students got B; they had made detail and organized recounts. Twenty three students got C score, because they made a quite enough organized writing, but the details were simple, and the rest eighty three students got D because their writing were very poor, unorganized and no details at all. The information from the tenth graders English teacher also revealed that some of the students in the school were not interested in learning English, especially writing because they felt anxious that their writing composition would not be good. This condition made them see writing negatively.

Alnufaie and Grenfell (2013) argue that writing is an emotional as much a cognitive activity because its affective constituents strongly influence all stages of the writing process. Affect includes emotions, feelings, attitudes, and motivation. This condition enables students who are not in the good feelings and motivation to become apprehensive. Hanna (2010), found that highly apprehensive writers yielded low quality papers as their output, avoided writing assignment and even procrastinated compared to those students who with low apprehensive feelings.

Alnufaie and Grenfiel (2013) also state that writing apprehension is 'the abnormally high level of an anxious, nervous, agitated or stressful feeling in a writing-strategy-related situation. The current study's definition, therefore, views

apprehension as a situational, strategy-based affective construct. An apprehensive writer worried or nervous about writing per se or about something that he is going to do in writing.

Based on some theories above, it is assumed that some tenth grade students of SMA Bakti Ibu 8 may also suffer from writing apprehension. And this factor may influence their achievement in writing, in this case writing recount text. It is hard for them to join one sentence to another and give details to each of the events. The result of their writing in recount text is just some simple sentences without details and sometimes do not connect to the next sentences.

Therefore it is worth saying that in order to help the students explore and organize their ideas in writing, teachers should apply certain method. Peha (2003) developed Transition Action Details (TAD) strategy that described the sequence of events in writing. According to Peha (2003), the TAD strategy is very useful because the opportunities to describe a sequence of events come up all the time such as in narrative fiction and non-fiction writing, in plot summaries for reading, in the steps of solving a Math problem, in Social Studies when students recount an Historical event, and in Science when studying chemical processes.

TAD takes the form of graphic organizer because it uses a visual graphic to present an idea. According to Sharrock (2008), a graphic organizer is a visual and graphic display that relates ideas within a text. TAD has columns and rows that shows a sequence of event. Specifically, there are three columns that must be filled by the students: such as transition columns, action

columns, and details columns; each column can be filled by several rows. Another method is Journal Writing. According to Kinsella (1985), Journal is a special notebook in which the daily events in life, impression, and thought can be written down. The students can write their daily activity in the form of journal. and, the journal can be written in recount form.

Referring to the explanation above, the writer conducted a research by focusing on the following research questions: 1) Was there any significant difference in recount writing achievement between the tenth grade students of SMA Bakti Ibu 8 Palembang who were taught by using TAD Organizer strategy and that of those who were taught by journal writing strategy?, 2) Was there any significant interaction effect of TAD Organizer and writing apprehension level on recount writing achievement? If there was a significant effect, was there any significant difference in recount writing achievement between students who had high level of apprehension and those who had low level apprehension? and 3) Was there any significant interaction effect of Journal Writing strategy and writing apprehension level on students' recount writing achievement? If there was a significant effect, was there any significance difference in recount writing achievement between students who had high level of apprehension and those who have low level apprehension?

METHODOLOGY

This study applied experimental research method with '2x3' factorial design since there were two groups: TAD Group (N=39) and Journal writing group (N=39) which were measured in three levels of writing

apprehension; high, average and low. In TAD group, the students were given the treatment of TAD organizer strategy and in journal group the students were treated with Journal writing strategy.

The TAD group was given treatment for 16 meetings, 90 minutes for each. The procedures of the TAD was adopted from Peha (2013) and modified as needed. TAD was a kind of graphic organizer in the form of chart which was used as a frame or outline in writing.

TAD had three columns: transition, action and detail column. The students filled up the outline to develop their idea in writing. The teaching procedures are as follows: (1) the students filled out the TAD chart by starting from the "action" column first. They filled in the first box with the first thing that happens. Then, they went to the last "Action" box and wrote the end. (2) They filled in everything in between. After finishing the "Action" column, the students added a couple of details for each action. The details could also be elaborated from the class discussion by asking students to make questions about the action column made before. (4) they came up with simple phrases in the "Transition" column that introduce each action.

The Journal group was given the treatment by using Journal writing strategy. The procedure was very simple and did not need much instruction. Only by letting the students express their recount writing in the form of journal or diary. The teaching procedure was as follows: (1) the teacher decided the moment or time that the students had to remember, (2) the students wrote in their diary or journal book, (3) through a class discussion, the students

changed their journal into recount writing by using the generic structure of a recount text.

The population of the research was all the tenth grade students of SMA Bakti Ibu 8 Palembang in academic year 2014-2015 with the total number 125 from 3 classes. To sample the students, first, the writer gave the questionnaire of WSAS (Writing Strategy Apprehension Scale) developed by Alnufaie and Grenfell (2013) to determine a writing apprehension level to population. The result of the questionnaire categorized the students into three levels of writing apprehension: high, average and low. 78 students were randomly chosen from each of the three levels of writing apprehension groups (high, average and low) and they were assigned randomly to both TAD group and Journal group as the sample. The result showed that there were 39 students in TAD group (high=13, average =13 and low=13) and 39 students in Journal group (high=13, average=13 and low=13).

To collect the data, the writing test was administered to all the students before (pretest) and after (posttest) the treatment. Two kinds of instruments were used to collect the data: 1). Questionnaire, was used in order to know the level of students writing apprehension. 2). Writing test, which was given as the pretest and the posttest.

In order to find out the validity of the writing test, first, content of the writing test was in line with the teaching materials based on the curriculum and the syllabus used for the tenth grades students who were the sample of the study. A lecturer of English Education Study Program who taught writing for many years in Sriwijaya University had judged the

content of writing instruction test and the topic in order to see whether the test instruction represented the measurement in the intended content area. After several time of revision, the expert judged that the choice of topic and writing instruction had been suitable for the test. Based on the result of the try out to non sample students, the writer obtained the estimation of the length of time that the students had to write. It was decided that the students did the writing test for 60 minutes.

Before using WSAS Questionnaire to know the students level of writing apprehension, the writer tried out the questionnaire in order to see whether the items in the questionnaire were valid. The result showed that all of the items in the questionnaire were found valid. The reliability was 0.992.

To check the reliability of the writing test result, the writer was helped by two raters. The raters were two English teachers of Senior High School and both of them have experience in teaching English in Senior H

School for more than ten years and their TOEFL score were above 525. The result of the mean score was judged by using Inter-rater reliability test. The calculation was done by SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Science) and the reliability statistic program (Cronbach's Alpha). The result showed that the correlation coefficient score was 0.809. It meant that the writing test results checked by these two raters were assumed reliable.

To assess the students' writing achievement, the students were assigned to write a short essay of a 100 words recount text in 60 minutes. The result of the writing test was

scored by the raters using a recount writing rubrics. The rubrics used is an analytical scoring rubrics adapted from DR Widiatmoko. The scores were got by adding up the points of the aspect of content, main point, organization, style and mechanics. Each of the aspects had certain points. The range of the score was between 0-100.

The writer used SPSS version 22 in analyzing the data. First, the normality and the homogeneity of the score was found in order to see whether the data can be used in an inferential statistics.

FINDINGS

Before answering the three research questions stated before, the writer will present the distribution of the posttest result. The result of the posttest showed that there were no students in Need Work and Major Flaws levels. All of the students were in Competence and Excellent group. See Table 1

Table 1 . The distribution of students writing achievement in both groups

LEVEL OF ACHIEVEMENT	FRE- QUENCY	PERCENTAGE
EXCELLENT (76-100)	34	43.58%
COMPETENT (51-75)	44	56.41%
NEEDS WORK (25-50)	-	-
MAJOR FLAWS (0-25)	-	-
TOTAL	78	100%

The result of the posttest of both TAD and Journal groups can also be seen from the distribution of students' writing achievement based on the aspects of writing. Although the distribution as a whole (N=78) showed that no students were in Need Work level, the analysis based on the aspects of writing showed conversely that

there were some students in Need Work level (Table 2).

Table 2. Distribution of student's writing achievement in both TAD and Journal group based on the aspect of writing

Variable	Mean	Excel- lent	Compe- tence	Needs Work	Major Flaws
Total Writing	72.66	43.59	56.41		
Con-tent	19.81	64.15	33.3	2.56	-
Main Points	18.77	53.84	42.3	3.84	-
Organize.	17.80	64.10	33.3	2.56	-
Style	08.37	41	47.4	11.5	-
Mechanics	07.94	19.23	65.35	15.38	-

To answer the first research question, which intended to know the significant difference of students' writing achievement between students who were taught by using TAD and that of those who were not, the writer used the independent t test. To use the t test, the normality and homogeneity test was done. The result of Kolmogrov-Smirnov test of the pretest of the writing recount achievement in TAD group showed that the p value was 0.060. The result of posttest was 0.077. Because both p values were bigger than 0.05, it can be concluded that the data gained in TAD group was normal. The result of Kolmogrove-Smirnov test of the pretest of the writing recount achievement in the Journal group also showed that the p-value was 0.200, while in the posttest was 0.105, which meant that the data gained in Journal group was also normal.

Furthermore, Lavene's test was used in order to know the homogeneity. The p-value based on Mean of pretest was 0.589 and of posttest was 0.655 which meant that the variance between the groups were

homogeneous. Since the data were normal and the variance were also homogeneous, the independent t test was done.

Table 3.a Mean Difference Analysis of TAD and Journal Group

Var.	Pretest		Posttest	
	TAD	J O U R N A L	TAD	J O U R N A L
Writing	57.8	57.3	74.7	70.5
Content	15.2	15.1	20.4	19.2
Main Points	14.6	14.3	19.5	17.9
Orgnization	13.6	13.5	19.3	16.2
Style	7.1	7.3	7.4	9.26
Mech.	7.1	7.0	7.9	7.92

Table 3b. Mean Difference Analysis of TAD and Journal Group

Var.	Mean Diff. within (TAD)/ p-value	Mean Diff. Within (Journal) / p-value	Mean Diff. Between/ p-value
Writing	16.974 0.000	13.243 0.000	4.205 0.054
Content	5.128 0.000	4.0384 0.000	1.205 0.094
Main Points	4.974 0.000	3.666 0.000	1.602 0.021
Orga-niza-tion	5.653 0.000	2.6794 0.000	2.756 0.000
Style	0.346 0.100	1.9102 0.000	-1.769 0.000
Mech.	0.807 0.000	0.8205 0.001	0.064 0.815

The result of mean difference writing as a whole between the two groups was 4.205 with p value 0.054, the other three aspects (main points, organization and style) were significant but the other two aspects were higher than 0.05. It means that two aspects of writing (content and mechanic) were not significantly difference.

However, the mean difference between pretest and posttest in TAD

group was 16.974 with p-value 0.000, while in Journal group the mean difference of pretest and posttest was 13.2435 with p-value 0.000. This shows that the results of pretest and posttest from both groups were significantly different. See the following table. This data can answer the first research question in this study that there was no significant difference in recount writing achievement between the TAD group and Journal group for the tenth grade students of SMA Bakti Ibu 8 Palembang.

The writer also presents the mean difference between TAD and Journal writing achievement based on the students' level of apprehension. The mean difference between TAD and Journal group for high apprehension students was 6.34 with the p-value 0.006. It showed that TAD writing achievement was significantly difference.

Table 4. The Distribution of TAD organizer Strategy and Journal Writing Strategy based on High Apprehension

	Variable	High Apprehension			
		Mea Pre test	Mean Post test	Mean Diff within	Mean diff between
TAD	Writing	46.5	65.61	-14.27 0.000	6.34 0.006
	Content	11.7	17.69	5.961 0.000	2.23 0.011
	Main Points	11.6	16.50	-4.84 0.000	2.03 0.014
	Organizat ion	10.2	18.15	-6.92 0.000	4.423 0.000
	Style	6.57	7.00	-0.43 0.372	-1.85 0.000
	Mechanic	6.46	7.23	-0.77 0.052	-0.577 0.187
	JOURNAL	Writing	41.27	59.27	-18.00 0.000
Content		10.34	15.46	-5.11 0.000	6.34 0.012
Main Point		9.88	14.46	-4.58 0.000	2.03 0.015
Organizat ion		9.38	12.76	-3.38 0.000	4.423 0.000
Style		6.07	8.84	-2.76 0.000	-1.85 0.000
Mechanic		5.88	7.80	-1.23 0.009	-0.577 0.187

For average apprehension students, the mean difference between TAD and Journal group, was 2.92 with the p-value 0.162, which showed that the mean difference was not significant.

Table 5. The Distribution of TAD organizer Strategy and Journal Writing Strategy based on Average Writing Apprehension

	Variable	Average Apprehension			
		Mean Pre test	Mean Post test	Mean Diff within	Mean diff between
TAD	Writing	51.5	74.6	-18.8 0.000	2.92 0.162
	Content	12.9	20.2	-6.2 0.000	0.575 0.407
	Main Points	12.8	20.1	-6.19 0.000	1.42 0.600
	Organizat ion	12.6	19.2	-5.5 0.000	3.15 0.001
	Style	6.30	7.46	-0.6 0.071	-1.92 0.000
	Mechanic	6.73	7.46	-0.269 0.407	-0.30 0.513
JOURNAL	Writing	58.3	71.7	-13.3 0.000	2.92 0.169
	Content	15.8	19.8	-3.9 0.000	0.575 0.409
	Main Points	14.6	18.6	-4.0 0.000	1.42 0.061
	Organizat ion	14.0	16.1	-2.1 0.000	3.15 0.001
	Style	7.53	9.38	-1.8 0.006	-1.92 0.000
	Mechanic	7.38	7.76	-0.38 0.433	-0.30 0.513

Table 5a. The Distribution of TAD and Journal Writing Strategy based on Low writing apprehension

	Variable	Low Apprehension			
		Mean Pre test	Mean Post test	Mean Diff within	Mean diff between
TAD	Writing	71.03	84.00	-12.97 0.000	12.23 0.000
	Content	19.96	23.25	-3.19 0.003	3.35 0.000
	Main Points	18.23	22.11	-3.88 0.001	3.42 0.000
	Organizat ion	17.07	21.53	-4.46 0.000	4.961 0.000
	Style	8.00	8.00	0.00 1.000	-1.38 0.000
	Mechanic	7.84	9.23	-1.230 0.009	1.461 0.002

JOURNAL	Writing	72.3	80.6	-8.3 0.000	12.2 0.000
	Content	20.3	22.3	-2.0 0.000	3.35 0.000
	Main Points	18.4	20.7	-2.3 0.000	3.42 0.000
	Organization	17.3	19.9	-2.54 0.000	4.96 0.000
	Style	8.42	9.5	-1.12 0.041	-1.38 0.000
	Mechanic	8.00	8.1	-0.15 0.613	1.46 0.002

For low apprehension students, the mean difference of TAD and Journal was 12.23 with the p-value 0.000, which showed that the writing achievement in TAD and Journal was significantly difference.

In high apprehension students, almost all aspects of writing were significantly difference except for aspect of mechanic. For low apprehension students, all of the aspects were significantly difference. While for average apprehension students, only the aspects of organization and style were different.

To summarize, the first research question that asked the significant difference of students' writing achievement between students who were taught by using TAD and that of those who were not, can be answered. There were not significant difference in writing achievement between the students who were taught by using TAD and that of those who were taught by using Journal Writing Strategies.

Next, to answer the second and third research question, which asked whether or not there was significant interaction between TAD group and Journal group, the two way ANOVA was used. The interaction exists if the p-value is less than or equal (0.05).

The result showed that the significance of the writing strategies used was below 0.05 and also the

apprehension was below 0.05. It means that there was interaction of strategies to writing achievement and there was interaction between level of apprehension to writing achievement.

However, the significance of strategies and level of apprehension was higher than 0.05, which means that there was no interaction among strategies, level of apprehension and writing achievement.

Table 7. Interaction between strategies and apprehension level

Source	Sum of Square	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Strategies	344.8	1	344.8	7.840	0.007
Apprehension	3615.8	2	1807.9	41.104	0.000
Strategy* Apprehension	35.3	2	17.6	0.401	0.671

The result of this two way ANOVA answers the second and the third questions question of this study. It can be concluded that there was no interaction among the TAD Organize, apprehension level and writing achievement of the students. And there was also no interaction among the Journal writing, apprehension level and writing achievement. However, there was significant interaction between strategies on writing apprehension and there was also significant interaction between apprehension level and writing achievement.

For additional information, the contribution of each aspects of writing was also measured. Stepwise regression was applied in order to analyze the contribution of each aspects of writing, since there was significant progress in writing achievement after the implementation of the strategy. The result showed that all aspects had significant contribution to writing achievement for both group.

For TAD group, the highest contribution is in Main point (78.1 %), Organization (14%), Content (3.7%), Mechanic (3.2%) and Style (1%). While for Journal group, the highest contribution was also in Content (93%), Organization (4.6%), Main point (1.1%), Mechanic (0.5%) and Style was also (0.5%).

Table 8. The Results of Model Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis of Writing Achievement to Its Aspects of Writing

Var.		Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
TAD	a. Predictors: (Constant), Main points	1	,884 _a	,781	,775	3,93
	b. Predictors: (Constant), Main points, organization	2	,960 _b	,921	,917	2,38
	c. Predictors: (Constant), Main points, organization, Mechanics	3	,976 _c	,953	,949	1,87
	d. Predictors: (Constant), Main points, organization, Mechanics, Content	4	,995 _d	,990	,988	,89
	e. Predictors: (Constant), Main points, organization, Mechanics, Content, Style	5	1,000 _e	1,000	1,000	,07883
JOURNAL	a. Predictors: (Constant), content	1	,965 _a	,931	,929	2,88913
	b. Predictors: (Constant), content, organization	2	,989 _b	,977	,976	1,67537
	c. Predictors: (Constant), content, organization, mainpoint	3	,994 _c	,988	,987	1,25404
	d. Predictors: (Constant), content, organization, mainpoint, mechanics	4	,996 _d	,993	,992	,96132

e. Predictors: (Constant), content, organization, mainpoint, mechanics, style	5	,999 _e	,997	,997	,63375
---	---	-------------------	------	------	--------

DISCUSSION

The result of the independent t test showed that there was significant difference in writing achievement between TAD group and Journal group. TAD group showed better improvement than Journal group. However, the result of the paired sample t test for both of the groups showed that both strategies enhanced the students writing achievement. So it could be assumed that TAD organizer and journal writing strategies were good to be used for teaching writing.

The improvement of TAD Organizer to the students' writing achievement indicated that TAD could be used to improve students' recount writing achievement. Since TAD Organizer is kind of Graphic Organizer, the result was in line with the argument of Kroll and Paziotopoulos (2004) who state that graphic organizer help students became creative and analytical thinkers because it is a step by step process from general knowledge at the lowest point to being able to connect to real life and gave opinion to a highest point.

The improvement in Journal Writing group also showed that Journal Writing improved the students' recount writing achievement. As stated by Hiew (2010), writing a literature response journal could be a strategy to improve the students writing fluency. Furthermore Hiemstra (2001) claims that journaling could also be a source of ideas because the process often evokes conversation with self, another person or even an imagined other person. This is also

inline with the results of the study done by Maryanti (2013) who applied Journal Writing to improve recount writing achievement and motivation. The result showed that Journal writing contributed to the students' progress and enhanced the motivation in writing recount text.

Main point became the dominant aspect of writing in TAD Organizer. In recount, sequence of events was the main point because it was part of writing which states the points of the story. Grabe and Jiang (2007), stated that certain graphic outlines could highly guide the writer for authoring an organized and coherent piece of writing which promotes thought and idea development.

The dominant contribution of content aspect in journal is understandable because content includes the whole body of the writing, in recount it includes the orientation, sequence of events and re-orientation. The content engages the readers and creates interest because of the interesting story and the experience. According to Hammer (2007), Journals allow students to express feelings more freely and openly. The spontaneous expression of a writer in journal influences the content of writing.

From the result of ANOVA analysis, it was found that there was no interaction among the TAD and journal strategy, the apprehension level and students' writing achievement. Apprehension did not interacted to writing achievement when it was combined with TAD and Journal group, but apprehension interacted to writing achievement without TAD and Journal Writing. The strategy did not interacted when it was combined with Apprehension,

however, it interacted to writing achievement without apprehension.

Apprehension did not interact with TAD organizer and Journal writing because both of the strategy was used to teach recount text. A recount text tells the experience in life. This could reduce the apprehension that the writer suffer. This was inline with the opinion of Bloom (1979, as cited in Smith 1984) that using a logbook to describe writing experience can reduce writing apprehension. Bloom (1980) also shat some apprehensives who enjoyed writing for self-expression were capable in writing.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

In conclusion, TAD Organizer and Journal Writing Strategy were significant for improving the students recount writing achievement. TAD organizer was effective because it could promotes thought and idea development. Meanwhile, Journal writing was also found effective for improving recount writing achievement because writing in a journal could make the ideas come easily. However, there was no interaction effect of TAD organizer and writing apprehension level on students recount writing apprehension, as well as, there was no interaction effect of Journal writing strategy and writing apprehension level on students recount writing apprehension. They did not interact because of the genre of writing used.

After conducting this research, the writer suggests the future researchers to do research with other kinds of writing such as descriptive or explanation combining with the level of apprehension. And it is also possible for other researcher to

investigate other kinds of apprehension, such as communication apprehension and ICT apprehension in order to know their influence for students in learning English.

REFERENCES

- Alnufaie, M., & Grenfell, M. (2013). Writing apprehension: the macro and micro. *Journal of Arts and Humanities (JAH)*(2) 3, 79-87.
- Alwasilah, A. C. (2001). *Teach them writing not grammar. A case study of undergraduate collaborative writing*. Paper presented at the 2001 RELC Seminar, Singapore.
- Grabe, W., & Jiang, X.(2007). Graphic organizers in reading instruction: Research findings and issues. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 19(1) 34-35.
- Hadley, A. O. (1993). *Teaching language in context*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Hanna, K. J. (2010). *Student perceptions of teacher comments: Relationships between specific aspects of teacher comments and writing apprehension*. Ph.D Dissertation, The University of North Dakota.
- Hiemstra, R. (2001). Uses and benefits of journal writing. *Promoting journal writing in adult education*, 2001, (90),19-26. doi:10.1002/ace.17
- Kinsella, P. (1985). *The technique of writing*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publisher.
- Kroll, M., & Paziotopoulos, A. (2004). Hooked on thinking. *International Reading Association*, 57(7), 672-677.
- Madya, S. (2002). Developing standards for EFL in Indonesia as Part of the EFL Teaching Reform. *TEFLIN Journal*.13(2), 1-7.
- Maryanti, L. (2013). *Enhancing writing achievement and motivation on SMK Farmasi Yayasan Pembina Palembang student on recount text and journal writing*. Unpublished graduate thesis, Sriwijaya University, Palembang.
- Peha, S. (2003). *Teaching that makes sense*. Inc. Retrieved from.Carrboro:www.ttms.org.
- Sharrock, T. (2008). *The effect of graphic organizers on students' writing*. Kennesaw, GA: Kennesaw State University.
- Smith, M.W.(1984) *Reducing writing apprehension..* Urbana, IL. ERIC Publication
- Widiatmoko.(2010). *Analytical rubric of assessment of recount text*. Retrieved from <http://mokogeong.multiply.com>
- World Bank. (2010). *Indonesia skill report: trends in skills demand gap, and supply in Indonesia*. Retrieved from <siteresources.worldbank.org/...donesiaSkillReport.pdf>

About the Author:

Kurnia Valentina, S.Pd., M.Pd is the English teacher at the Senior High School Bakti Ibu 8, Palembang, South Sumatera