

## A writing workshop model to enhance students' skills in writing essays in Sundanese

Usep Kuswari<sup>1</sup> and Ruswan Dallyono<sup>2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Sundanese Education Department, Faculty of Language and Literature Education, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Jl. Dr. Setiabudhi No. 229, Bandung, West Java, Indonesia*

<sup>2</sup>*English Language and Literature Department, Faculty of Language and Literature Education, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Jl. Dr. Setiabudhi No. 229, Bandung, West Java, Indonesia*

### ABSTRACT

Writing is generally considered to be difficult by most students. Having a limited understanding on what to write or the fear of making grammatical or spelling errors is often a major problem for students when they are instructed to write an essay or an article. Such difficulties are respective for Sundanese language classes in West Java. This study aims to investigate a number of fundamental problems of writing in Sundanese classes at a Junior High School. It also seeks to address the problems in the area of teaching writing in Sundanese classes by providing a comprehensive picture of the practice of a writing workshop model in the selected class. The study is classroom action research taking place in a public Junior High School in West Java, specifically in a Sundanese language class. The participants of the study were 36 students of 9th grade (comprising 14 male students and 22 female students) in 2018–2019 academic years. There were 3 cycles involved in this action research implemented throughout a semester. The findings revealed that the use of the writing workshop model in teaching writing in Sundanese could improve the students' writing skills. The writing workshop model, which focuses on personal analysis and peer-feedback in the essay writing process, facilitated 9th grade students in producing, evaluating, and presenting essays within their respective groups. A supportive social environment in groups allowed for students' enjoyment in writing. This environment thus led students to be exposed to varied topics and linguistic expressions in multi-social contexts. This study suggests that there are potential benefits from implementing the writing workshop model in the practice of teaching writing. Therefore, language teachers are suggested to apply this model in their classroom. Through this model, students will be more engaged in their writing classes and learn writing in more meaningful, fun, creative, and dialogic ways.

**Keywords:** Classroom action research; essay; interaction; Sundanese; writing workshop

**First Received:**

12 April 2021

**Revised:**

8 April 2022

**Accepted:**

May 2022

**Final Proof Received:**

27 May 2022

**Published:**

31 May 2022

### How to cite (in APA style):

Kuswari, U., & Dallyono, R. (2022). A writing workshop model to enhance students' skills in writing essays in Sundanese. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 12(1), 266-276. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v12i1.46597>

### INTRODUCTION

Writing is an essential skill for students in academic life. Having a good command in writing, especially academic writing, allows them to interact with others in their preferred academic field, to express ideas, to investigate topics, to record experiences, and to learn how to be a part of academic

communities (Raimes, 1983, p. 4). Nonetheless, writing is not an easy skill to master. Nunan (1999) argues that writing proficiency is the most challenging skill to achieve in language learning. Similarly, Huy (2015) contends that writing is metacognitively demanding, drawing upon the knowledge, skills, strategies, and ability of

\* Corresponding Author  
Email: [ruswan.dallyono@upi.edu](mailto:ruswan.dallyono@upi.edu)

individuals to operate through a variety of processes.

Even though writing is a complex and daunting thing to master, teachers need to be able to make it something joyful and meaningful to learn as stipulated by the Indonesian Government's law. In the Law of the Republic of Indonesia on the National Education System (No. 20/2003), Article 40, Section 2, it is stated that educators and educational personnel have the responsibility to create meaningful, joyful, creative, dynamic, and mutually inter-active education environment.

In accordance with the law, the Ministry of Education has suggested a number of methods and approaches that should be implemented at schools such as the competency-based learning and the scientific teaching method. However, apparently, most of these approaches only attempt to activate students' cognition without presenting or involving students in more realistic and authentic ways. The competency-based learning, for example, mostly only accentuates the importance of developing competence and skills through teaching and learning activities. This is because in competency-based learning, mostly the activities refer to systems of instruction, assessment, grading, and academic reporting on students' performance, knowledge, and skills (Baughman et al., 2012; Sturgis & Casey, 2018). Despite all the efforts by both through establishing regulations and carrying out teachers' training, it appears that there have not been any satisfactory results in improving students' writing proficiencies. Our prior observation revealed that the results of writing in Sundanese language classes (specifically in 9th grade) at a public junior high school in West Java Province were still far from the expected results. The students' writing abilities were still considered to be on a low level. Only 10 students (from 36 students) passed the minimum score. The completion criterion is 60%, while the average writing learning outcomes are 55%. The completion criterion in this context means the degree in which the students completed their writing and the average learning outcome refers to the average success level on which the students achieved in their writing tests.

To improve the students' writing proficiency in Sundanese, it is imperative to use a teaching model which can empower the students to develop their own writing, one of which is the writing workshop model (Calkins, 2011). The writing workshop model appears to be one of the most effective models which can be engaging for the students. The application of a writing workshop model in teaching writing can be useful as an alternative method for teachers. In a writing workshop model, students are engaged in a process that allows them to freely use personal topics and write texts for their own purposes, not necessarily for classroom reasons.

(Atwell, 1987; Calkins, 1986; Calkins, 2011; Graves, 1983).

Apart from the workshop model of writing, some scholars have contributed to the discussion on this topic of writing. Ciampa (2016) discusses the implementation of a digital-based process in writing for elementary students. It is an advanced topic in the integration of new digital tools to communicate content-area knowledge in writing.

Meanwhile, McAbee (2020) investigated the roles of teachers as participants in a writing workshop model. His study revealed that teachers' roles are significant for the success of this model. McAbee's (2020) study is not directly related to this study, but it provides useful insights that in order for a writing workshop model to produce significant results, the roles of teachers cannot be ignored. Therefore, before undertaking the research we had to make sure that the teacher working with us was well-informed about this model of writing. In the context of learning a language, Jia-Fang et al. (2018) examined the use of the writing workshop model in learning Chinese. Their study confirms that writing barriers decreased when the Chinese utilized technology-based tools. Furthermore, the writing competence and attitude of Chinese students improved after the completion of the program.

In addition to the contribution of technology to the writing workshop model, it appears that there is also another dimension to the use of the workshop model. Wortman-Wunder and Wefes (2020) believe that a short, structured writing workshop model can contribute to the confidence and competence of students and make them prepare their writing in better structure.

Realizing the benefits of this model, we decided to conduct a study using the writing workshop model to the teaching and learning of writing essays in a different language, namely Sundanese. This local language happens to be in the curriculum for Junior High School students. It is significant to investigate the students' skills in writing Sundanese essays because apparently, they do not have much exposure outside the classroom to Sundanese literacy as Indonesian is becoming more and more dominantly in use in all parts of Indonesia.

The study reported in this paper, therefore, focuses on the application of a writing workshop model to enhance students' skills in writing essays in Sundanese. Given the facts, this research aims to examine the fundamental problems of a writing in Sundanese language class at a junior high school.

For readers who are not familiar with Sundanese, it is an indigenous language in Indonesia. Linguistically, Sundanese is a member of the Austronesian language family lexico-grammatically akin to Javanese and Malay, spoken by around 27 million people in Indonesia, and is the second most frequently spoken in the country (Sobarna, 2007). Meanwhile, according to the

Central Statistics Agency (BPS), Sundanese people make up 16 percent of the population, or 36.7 million people based on the 2010 census (Kompas, 2022).

Although Sundanese is the native language of most students in West Java, the habit of writing essays is still not common in their day-to-day lives. This is because Sundanese literacy is currently still very limited. The only available mass medium is the Mangle Magazine, with a very limited readership of academics and Sundanese culture lovers. Thus, there is not much exposure for students learning how to write texts in Sundanese. Meanwhile, Sundanese essays or articles are still limitedly produced, namely only by Sundanese academics and scholars.

The writing workshop model adopted in the study has been around since the early 1980s. This model was developed by Flower and Hayes (1980) under a cognitive approach (e.g. Atwell, 1987; Calkins, 1986; Graves, 1983). This model of teaching promotes the use of process-oriented instruction to the teaching of writing. The underlying assumption of this model is the philosophy that it takes a process to be a writer. Writing skills are complex and cannot be developed instantly. As a complex process, a writer should answer of his/her own questions such as “what is the topic to write?” and “how to explain it?” then shift the focus to different aspects of narrative. Those things are problems to solve and have to do with specific mode of processing. This refers to as a cognitive process-oriented. One of the strengths of the workshop model is the degree of “plasticity” (Ray & Laminack, 2001) that both teachers and students have to cater for individual differences in terms of competence and personality traits as well as the dynamics that occur during the workshop process.

When compared to the structuralist and functionalist views, this model is different. The structuralist perspective focuses too much on error correction in grammar, in fact, error correction has little or no effect on subconscious acquisition (Krashen, 1982). On the other hand, the functionalist perspective emphasizes too much on learning as social institution (Merton, 1968). Students are exposed to different text types and are asked to observe the features and functions of these different texts. None of these approaches gives students more space to explore and experience writing as a process and learn it by discussing their work with classmates and the teacher. Empirical research has validated the necessity of employing cognitive writing processes (e.g., planning, translating, and reviewing), as proposed by important cognitive models (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987; Flower & Hayes, 1981). Previous research has shown that prewriting activities constitute planning and organizing ideas (Koster et al., 2016), fluently transcribing ideas into

words and sentences (von Koss Torkildsen et al., 2016), and reviewing activities such as text revision significantly improved elementary students' text quality (von Koss Torkildsen et al., 2016). The findings emphasize the importance of researching writing models for various student groups in order to gain a more refined understanding of the complex interplay between motivational and cognitive challenges related to students' writing skills.

Early writings were primarily concerned with the cognitive writing processes that underpin text composition (e.g., Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987; Flower & Hayes, 1981). Cognitive models were recognized by Zimmerman and Risemberg (1997) as essential descriptions of cognitive problems in writing. However, Zimmerman and Risemberg pointed out in their social cognitive model of writing that in order to fully understand children's writing performance and self-regulated growth, the involvement of social, motivational, and behavioral processes, in addition to cognitive processes, must be considered. More specifically, they hypothesize that writing self-regulation processes (i.e., self-initiated thoughts, feelings, and actions to enhance writing performance) may be divided into three categories: (1) covert self-regulation (for example, time planning and management, goal setting, self-evaluative standards, cognitive methods, mental imagery), (2) behavioral self-regulation (for example, self-monitoring, self-consequences, self-verbalization), and (3) environmental self-regulation (e.g., environmental structuring and self-selected models, tutors, or books; Zimmerman & Risemberg, 1997).

All those prior studies show that writing an advanced-level extended text includes more than simply the linguistic system, but also the social environment. Text production, therefore, needs to be facilitated through a social environment to make it more authentic. Just as in real life, journalists would gather with other journalists and they would be briefed by the editorial department head. Through a simulation, the students are put together as a group of writers who are briefed by their teacher as the trainer. This social environment provides meaningful support for conditioning their writing process.

## **METHOD**

### **Research design and participants**

This classroom action research was conducted in a Sundanese language class in a public junior high school in West Java, Indonesia. The participants of this research were 36 students in 9th grade (14 male students, 22 female students) in 2018-2019 academic years. The 9th graders were chosen because they were thought to have studied most materials that are required in the Junior high school curriculum. Those students were not selected, but

they were the ones who were willing to volunteer as participants in our research project.

This classroom action research was implemented in 3 cycles consecutively in a semester by using the workshop model. Each cycle was undertaken by completing one basic competence for three sessions. We decided to stop after 3 cycles because after the third it was estimated that we would have been able to solve the students' problems in learning. However, if the problems persisted, the fourth cycle would be needed.

In this writing workshop model, the students were given structured assignments and were given feedback by the teachers. In this model, the teacher acted as a mentor author. First, the teacher demonstrated writing techniques and had discussions with the students throughout the writing process. Then the class had a mini-lesson for assigning writing work at the beginning of each workshop and then the students were involved in active writing. Finally, the students presented their work to the class (Calkins, 2011).

As for the cycles, Cycle I was carried out in March 2018, cycle II was conducted twice in April 2018, and cycle III was performed in May 2018. Each cycle was undertaken with the steps of planning the implementation of action, observation, and reflection. The implementation of this action research was carried out in three cycles, each of which included (a) planning: i.e. taking a planned and reflective approach to implementing the program, (b) implementation: executing the program based on a fixed plan, (c) observation: taking notes and related information during the program, (d) evaluation: evaluating students' writing based on specific parameters, and (e) reflection: doing critical reflection on students' learning as individuals and groups.

The observation was implemented by following the observation format. The aspects to be observed were the situations of the teaching and learning activity where the students were asked to write a specific topic and the teacher gave them feedback on student performance and student competence in writing. The results of observation were then analysed by taking notes during the implementation of the model. Based on the results of this analysis, the teacher collaborators performed a self-reflection to determine the success of the researchers and make further plans for upcoming action.

In cycle III activity, this action research was undertaken based on the results of the reflection from cycle II. In cycle II activity, the analysis was done based on the results of Cycle I, therefore each cycle was interrelated. Cycle III is a modification form of cycle II by focusing on the implementation of the workshop model, whereas Cycle II is modification form of Cycle I by focusing on the result of observation, and Cycle I is a modification

form of the learning implementation. This was implemented with the aim of getting better results so that the predetermined success indicators as shown in Table 1 can be achieved. In other words, the deficiencies or weaknesses such as grammar accuracy and writing techniques discovered in cycle I were used as planning materials for improvement in the next cycle.

**Table 1**  
*Writing Task Assessment Model as Adapted from Paul-Elder Model Standards (Deane, 2011)*

No.	Aspects	Maximum Score	Score
1.	Depth—containing complexities	25	
2.	Logic—the parts make sense together, no contradictions	25	
3.	Accuracy—free from errors or distortions	25	
4.	Content Clarity	20	
5.	Precision	5	
Total		100	

The data analysis technique in this study used the scoring of the assessment results from the three cycles by using the essay assessment format adapted from the model of Paul-Elder standards (Deane, 2011). This was undertaken by calculating and interpreting the scoring results by using a value scale of 100, and by calculating the difference in the improvement of learning outcomes in writing from the three cycles then presenting them into tables, and qualitative data were analysed and described based on the Writing Assessment Model in table 1.

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

### A. The Implementation of Writing Workshop Model in a Sundanese Class

In the selected 9th grade students, the implementation of the writing workshop model is as follows. First, students were taught the definition and methods for determining the theme and topic of an essay. The teacher organized the students into eight groups with heterogeneous members in terms of achievement, gender, and ethnicity. The teacher delivered tasks that had to be done by the students in group discussions through mini-lesson activities, writing time and conference, and sharing time. Each group was asked to choose a topic to write.

Second, the teacher assigned students to discuss in group examples of essays that the students had to write through mini-lesson activities, writing time and conference, and sharing time. Then, the teacher emphasized that the tasks had to be done by them in group discussions through mini-lesson activities, writing time and conference, and sharing time on the steps to write an essay.

Lastly, the teacher conveyed that the tasks had to be done by students in group discussions through sharing time activities. These activities were aimed to explore the students' understanding about how to

write. This sharing activity was intended to develop the students' abilities in taking their first steps in writing.

**Table 2**

*The Average Scores of Students' Skills in Writing Essays by Using the Workshop Model in Cycles I - III*

No	Cycle	Average score of Students' Writing Aspects	Student's writing improvement	
			d (gain)	d <sup>2</sup>
1	I	22.25 (44.50%)	7.77	118.83
2	II	30.33 (60.67%)	3.5	27.05
3	III	31.33 (62.67%)	2.2	17.16

Table 2 shows that in the first cycle the average result of the writing essay for 9<sup>th</sup> grade students is 22.25 or 44.50%, which is very low. By using the writing workshop model, the average score of the students' essay writing happened to increase to 30.33 or 60.67% with a d (gain) of 3.5 and d<sup>2</sup> of 27.05 in the second cycle. Finally, in the third cycle, the average result of the students' essay writing improved to 31.33 or 62.67%. with a d(gain) of 2.2 and d<sup>2</sup> of 17.16. To put the figures in a clearer perspective, it is significant to consider the following excerpt from the students' writing product. Excerpt 1 indicates that there seems to be a sort of confusion on the part of the student writers which needed to be addressed carefully. Such a problem was resolved in the second cycle.

**Excerpt 1**

*Lamun keur komunikasi, urang Sunda boga kabisaan keur make dua bahasa. Bahasa Indonesia mere pengaruh kana basa Sunda nu dipake ku siswa.*

[When communicating, people have the ability to use two languages. Bahasa Indonesia gives influence to the language used by students.]

[Data\_28/Paragraph 7]

The problems identified in the text are related to organization and grammar. Excerpt 1 is from a first draft of an essay. Therefore, it is reasonable that the author was still confused about the context and manner of delievering idea in such a situation and topic. The use of the words *lamun* and *pengaruh* are not appropriate in the text. There is, for that reason, a grammatical inaccuracy. The word "lamun" suggests that it is a conditional sentence, but if it is observed from the context given by Excerpt 1 above it is not a conditional sentence. In this case, it means "as for", which is colloquial in nature. Meanwhile, the word "pengaruh" appears to be a form of interference from Indonesian ("pengaruh" meaning "influence").

In Cycle II, the implementation of the writing workshop followed two stages. The first stage was

related to learning plan focused on the goal that students tried to contemplate their reading to find and determine the material for their writing on a piece of paper, which included (1) themes and titles, (2) the opening section, (3) the content section, and (4) the closing section.

The second stage pertained to the learning plan focusing on the goal of developing students' abilities about developing materials that had been written on a sheet of paper so that the initial drafts of students' essays were constructed. The results of writing essay class for 9<sup>th</sup> grade students by using the writing workshop model was 30.33 or (60.67%). From the results, it can be identified that students' skills in writing were at a sufficient level. In this cycle, the students seemed to be more aware of text organization. They understood how to put forward a specific context at the first statement. One example of a text in Cycle II is as follows.

**Excerpt 2**

*SMP xxx xxxx mangrupa salah sahiji sakola anu aya di lingkungan puseur dayeuh nu siswana henteu ngan saukur ti suku Sunda wungkul, tangtu aya ti suku anu séjénna.*

[SMP xxx xxxx is one of the schools that are in downtown neighborhood in which students are not simply from the Sundanese only, of course there are from other tribes.]

[Data\_13/Paragraph 3]

In this text, the author seems to be aware of figuring a specific context of place. In this essay, the location of his or her school is the central and initial point before providing much information later on. There are no grammatical mistakes in that part of text. The author was able to construct a complex sentence. From the sentence, it is discernible that the author is able to combine three clauses, one being the independent clause [*SMP xxx xxxx mangrupa salah sahiji sakola*] and the other clauses being the dependent [*anu aya di lingkungan puseur dayeuh nu siswana henteu ngan saukur ti suku Sunda wungkul*], using the "anu" or "that" clause conjunction.

In Cycle III, the implementation of the writing class followed two stages. The first stage is related to the sharing session (reading cross) of the work of each student, which focused on the goal of understanding writing skills (content, organization, grammar, style: word choice and structure style, spelling and writing format).

Interference is a problem that may be seen in essays as well. Interference cases were discovered to be caused by Indonesian, English, and Arabic interference. Some examples of interference are the use of words such as *pengaruh* 'influence', *diberekeun* 'is/was/were given', and *ngapload* 'uploads'. The word *pengaruh* is actually an Indonesian lexical item which means 'influence' (see KBBI). In Sundanese it should be *pangaruh*, which appears to be a cross-linguistic suppletive vowel substitution in the first syllable. Meanwhile, the second word is interfered morphologically. In Sundanese, there are two words for 'give'. The first one is *bikeun* and the second one is *bere*. The first word *bikeun* is used when it is connected to a direct object, e.g. *Bikeun buku ieu ka Udin!* 'Give this book to Udin!' or *Abdi geus mikeun* (nasal affix) *buku ieu ka Udin* 'I have given this book to Udin'. In contrast, the verb *bere* is followed by an indirect object e.g. *Abdi mere Udin buku* 'I give Udin a book'. Different from Sundanese, Indonesian does not have lexical items which have grammatical functions for direct object (DO) and indirect object (IO). Instead, Indonesian uses affixes e.g., *Saya memberi Udin* (IO) *sebuah buku* (DO) 'I give Udin a book'. To change the construction, Indonesian uses *me-kan* e.g. *Saya memberikan sebuah buku kepada Udin* or in passive construction, *Sebuah buku diberikan kepada Udin*". Sundanese young people often combine the Indonesian grammar and Sundanese lexicon when they are supposed to convey this concept of giving in Sundanese. From the perspective of language learning, this is categorized as interference. The last verb is *ngapload*. This is a form of grammatical interference from the Sundanese nasal affix *nga-* and 'load' which is an English word.

Indonesian interference is possible due to a number of possibilities. First, possibly both the mother and father of the students are not native speakers of Sundanese. As a result, the language used on a daily basis is not Sundanese. Second, perhaps one of the students' parents is not a Sundanese, thus, they do not communicate in Sundanese. Third, while both parents may be Sundanese, they prefer to communicate in Indonesian rather than Sundanese. Because of the aforementioned conditions, students only have the opportunity to study Sundanese in school. Furthermore, the students receive linguistic input in the Sundanese language through their surroundings, which is not necessarily grammatical from the perspective of prescriptive grammar.

The second stage is related to learning activities to revise the initial draft from the sharing results. This activity was carried out with the aim of providing experience to students in working on improvements, additions or subtractions of an essay. The result of writing essay class for 9<sup>th</sup> grade students by using writing workshop model is 31.33 or (62.67%) (see Table 1). To see the empirical development of the cycles, it is better to return to Data\_28/Paragraph 7. The quality of text can be seen as follows.

**Excerpt 3**

*Dina komunikasi, masarakat Sunda miboga kamampuh pikeun ngagunakeun dua basa atawa salaku dwibahasawan. Ayana ieu fénoména, kiwari basa Indonesia geus mangaruhan kana basa Sunda nu digunakeun ku siswa.*

[In communication, the Sundanese community has the ability to use two languages or as a bilingual. The existence of this phenomenon, now the Indonesian language has affected the language used by students.]

[Data\_28/Paragraph 7]

The author has shown the flexibility of delivering idea through advanced vocabulary and sentence structure. From the result, it can be identified that students' competence in writing is sufficient. As further discussed, the students' competence is low at application with a score of 66.97% or more adequate score, interpretation with a score of 63.88% or a more adequate score, a factual category with a score of 51.11% or a sufficient score, and transactions with a score of 46% or a less score.

Through the use of the workshop model, it turns out that there were a number of productive phenomena observed in the lessons as indicated in the following table.

**Table 3**  
*Observation of the Lessons*

No.	Observed Phenomena	Checklist
1.	Interactivity	V
2.	Motivation	V
3.	Creativity	V
4.	Confidence	V

First, interactivity was evidenced in the demonstration of writing by the teacher when he conferred with the students walking around the class. The students asked many questions to the author mentor. The teacher answered all the questions patiently. Interactivity was also observed in the mini-lesson and in the sharing session where the students presented their work in the class. Following is an example of a sharing session. A

student had just presented his essay. Another student asked and the question was responded by the student presenter.

S1: *Kumaha cara ngaronjatkeun ajen produk-produk lokal sangkan bisa nyaingan produk luar nagri?*

(How can we promote the quality of domestic products so that we can compete with foreign products?)

S2: *Aya opat langkah nu bisa ngaronjatkeun ajen produk local. Nu kahiji, urang kudu nataan kabutuh konsumen. Kadua, ngamangpaatkeun kabutuh langganan urang. Naon wae eta teh. Katilu, nalungtik atanapi ngontrol ajen sakabeh produk. Nu kaopat, neuleuman daya saing produk luar. Diteuleuman teh pikeun nalungtik naon wae kakuatan tur kalemahan produk luar dibandingkeun jeung produk urang.*

(There are four steps that we can use to promote the quality of domestic products. First, we need to identify the consumers' needs. Second, we can make use of information about our customers' needs. What are those? Third, we need to control the quality of all products that we have. Fourth, we should examine both the strengths and weaknesses of foreign products compared to ours)

S1: *Naon dimaksud neuleuman kakuatan produk luar? Kumaha upama memang bener produk luar leuwih alus tibatan produk urang?*

(What do you mean by investigating the strengths of foreign products? What should we do of the quality of their products is better than that of ours?)

S2: *Tinggal dititinan wae naon kaunggulan. Engke urang ciptakeun produk nu leuwih unggul. Urang bisa make prinsip urang China. ATM. Amati, Tiru, Modifikasi. Tah dina tahapan modifikasi teh urang bisa ngaluhuran ajen produk batur.*

(We can just scrutinize what their strengths are. Later we can make products that are more competitive. We can use the Chinese principles of ATM. Observe. Copy. Modify. By modifying, we can actually outweigh the quality of their products)

S2: *Tah kuduna nu opat langkah eta dituliskeun dina esai sabab dina pidangan makalah tadi teu dieceskeun kumaha cara ningkatkeun ajen produk-produk lokal.*

(That's it. You should have included the four steps in your essay because in your presentation you didn't clarify how you would promote the quality of the local products)

S1: *Hatur nuhun. Inshaallah engke dilebetkeun kana esai abdi.*

(Thank you. God willing, I'll incorporate that into my essay)

(Recorded Question and Answer Session in the Second Step of Sharing)

These exchanges between S1 and S2 show a highly interactive event. S1 appeared to be dissatisfied with S2's responses so she used a

follow-up question for clarification. S2 was able to respond to the question convincingly. S2 also gave some feedback about the essay and this input was gladly accepted by S1. Such a presentation and question and answer session were highly beneficial both for the presenter and the audience. Both sides were equally motivated to learn more. Thus, they became more confident with their writing.

Second, motivation was reflected in how they spent the 45 minutes in the writing session where they were focused and absorbed in their individual work. From our observation, most of the students appeared to be interested and engaged in the lessons as evidenced in their enthusiasm shown in their faces and questions that they asked during classes. Third, the students were creative in their choices of topics that they decided to write on. This phenomenon was also noticed their use of poetic words and expressions such as *panon poe geus peureum* (the sun has dimmed). The word *peureum* actually means 'closed eyes'. The verb is used metaphorically to refer to the sun, so it makes the sentence poetic. This is a creative form of personification on the part of the students. Fourth, the students appeared to be more confident in presenting their work in the sharing sessions. They spoke eloquently and excitedly about their work as evidenced in our observations. Their classmates responded to the presenters' work appreciatively. This created an encouraging atmosphere in the teaching and learning process.

## B. Students' Improvement in Writing Class in Sundanese

Students' improvement in writing class in Sundanese can be identified by comparing the quality their first work in the first cycle, second cycle, and third cycle. The students' improvement in writing class in Sundanese happened in all cycles. The following data exemplify how the students progressed. They are from the same excerpt but taken from different cycles.

First Cycle:

Excerpt 4

*Dina jaman kemajuan teknologi informasi saperti ayeuna urang Sunda kudu milu nimbrung dina raraga ngamajukeun budaya tur bahasa Sunda pikeun dikanyahoikeun ku batur anu caricing di pulau atawa nagara deungeun.*

[In today's era of informational and technological progress as currently being experienced, Sundanese people have to participate in order to promote Sundanese culture and language so that they are known by people living in other islands and countries.]

Data\_30/Paragraph 3

Second Cycle:

Excerpt 4:

*Dina jaman kamajuan teknologi informasi danget ieu urang Sunda kudu ilu biung dina ngamajukeun bahasa katut budaya Sunda supaya leuwih dikanyahokeun ku bangsa-bangsa deungeun.*

[In today's era of informational and technological progress as currently being experienced, Sundanese people have to participate in promoting Sundanese language and culture so that they are more known by other nations]

Data\_30/Paragraph 3

Third Cycle:

Excerpt 4:

*Dina jaman kamajuan teknologi informasi saparti danget ieu urang Sunda kudu miboga kahayang tur tekad anu kuat pikeun babarengan ngamajukeun bahasa katut budaya Sunda sangkan leuwih nanjeur tur boga ajen di kalangan suku-suku di Indonesia jeung bangsa-bangsa deungeun di Kawasan ASEAN tur di tempat-tempat lain di dunia.*

[In today's era of information technology progress as currently being experienced, Sundanese people should have a strong willingness and determination to work together and promote Sundanese language and culture so that they are more established and respected amongst various ethnic groups and other nations in ASEAN and in other places in the world.]

Data\_30/Paragraph 3

In the first cycle, this student writer still made interference problems such as *kemajuan* instead of *kamajuan* and *pulau* instead of *pulo*. Both *kemajuan* and *kamajuan* actually mean the same thing, i.e., 'progress', but *kemajuan* is an Indonesian word. In Sundanese the correct prefix should be *ka-an* to form the nominalized form *kamajuan*. Meanwhile, the Indonesian word *pulau* is adapted into Sundanese as *pulo*, with the diphthong *-au* changing to the monophthong *-o*.

The data from the second cycle clearly indicate that the excerpt is free from errors. However, the text itself appears to be still rudimentary and lacks sophistication in terms of style and content. The phrase *ilu biung* should be written as one word, i.e., *ilubiung* which means 'to participate'. In addition, the student writer still seemed to have no clear idea as to which the places refer to by *bangsa-bangsa deungeun* 'other nations'.

The third cycle data clearly show that the student achieved a significant level of progress in terms of style and formality. The student used the affixed form of *miboga* 'to have'. The prefix *mi-* is rarely used and it is formal. This verb collocates with the nominalized noun *kahayang*, which makes it a tasteful phrase choice. The student's choice for *sangkan* 'in order to' and *nanjeur* 'developed/established' should also be appreciated. The two words are both formal and aesthetic.

The results of the study indicated that the students started to be driven by the standardization of writing class objectives in different methods and by using structured writing assignments. The findings show that students' skills in writing essay in Sundanese have increased. Therefore, the present study confirms a study conducted by Amos (2020). The implementation of a writing workshop model is necessary to personalize instruction, involve students in personal learning.

The present study also proves that unlike traditional models of process-based writing instruction, which primarily focused on the personal writer and the basic process of writing, the implementation of the writing workshop model in the 9<sup>th</sup> grade students established a community in which writers interact as apparent in the question and answer sessions presented above. Although the scope and structure of the writing workshop is different, the key components typically include mini-lessons, conferencing, and sharing.

The mini-lesson was a 5–15-minute lesson that provided explicit/direct instruction. The direct instruction was given in the mini-lessons about what the students needed to do in their assignments, i.e., the step-by-step processes in writing. The respective session focused on developing a general topic of writing (pre-writing, revision, and editing) as explained by Calkins (1994). The present study confirms the effective mini-lesson session as introduced by Calkins and Mermelstein (2003). It shows that the session should be multilevel, focused, and responsive to students' needs. During the various stages of the writing process in the selected class of this research, the teacher's role was that of an observer and responder. In this capacity, the teacher has role as magnetic force of the reader and writer (Calkins, 1994, p. 232).

The final aspect of the writing workshop was sharing. The present study applied the session where students shared their writing in which participants listened and responded with comments and/or discussion. This stage corroborates the stages as introduced by (Atwell, 1987). The focus of this stage was interaction. Students were allowed to identify external factors of the production of effective writing. The present study found that these are necessary to be adopted for adolescent students. It confirms the findings from the prior studies (Atwell, 1987; Calkins, 1994; Graves, 1983).

The present study considers that the writing workshop remains the dominant model of creative writing instruction. By considering prior studies, it is reasonable to state that there is no shortage of writing teachers to provide practical applications for students to improve their skill without creating democratic situation (Abbott, 2010; Bertolini; 2010; Cain, 2010; James, 2009; Vanderslice, 2010; Wilson, 2010). The present study also has successfully identified improvements in students'



writing after they have obtained instruction in non-conventional method.

The practice of this research confirms the study conducted by Troia et al. (2011). It is necessary to raise teachers' recognition to tailor effective instruction and situation. According to Jasmine and Weiner (2007), the writing workshop model provides a positive social atmosphere as it allows students to raise confidence, motivation, and opportunity. Motivation is a critical aspect underpinning the initiation, direction, and persistence of learning activity, and it plays an important role in understanding writing success and failure (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011). Understanding how educational practice shapes motivational factors is thus an important investigation goal. Therefore, it creates interactivity between participants, i.e., writers and readers. Notwithstanding the concerns about the quality of feedback, it creates a more or less good perspective between both writers and readers. The feedback from students could improve the quality of writing products. It can be seen from the statistical analysis on the writing results. Thus, this study also confirms the study conducted by Caffarella and Barnett (2000). By using this workshop model, the students developed their confidence as writers to accept the critiques they received.

The present study proposes a conceptual model to display a balance between the concepts of writing instruction and writing products. The present study has demonstrated an implementation of a writing workshop model. By following III cycles, the elements such as features, feedback, and learning activities are engaged with students' personal choice about topic and style. It should be noted that resources for instruction are diverged. Students' engagement and opportunities in writing process should also be considered.

The differences suggest several important instructional implications. The present study discovered that the cause of writing barrier is not simply about a lack of linguistic knowledge and skill. Writing barriers are often related to affective factors such as students' personal expectations, self-confidence, perceptions of their own abilities, and perfectionism (Cheng, 2002; Cheng et al., 1999; Gregersen & Horwitz, 2002; Onwuegbuzie et al., 1999; Spielmann & Radnofsky, 2001; Williams & Andrade, 2008). Based on the field analysis of this study, the application of a writing workshop model allows students to be spontaneous, risk takers, and discover new approaches for their personal writing. Further facts that arose in the present study are social elements in the process of writing workshop. The students cared about reactions of their friends on the essays. The reactions may result feedback or comment to the betterment of a particular essay. The practice is confirmed by Bizzell (1992) as inner-directed action. In a writing class, the ability to

accept and consider constructive feedback is necessary. Students are needed to be exposed to a systematic framework in producing a writing product (draft-edit-revise-final draft). To this end, the writing workshop model is salient for junior high school students to be socialized into a given or new discourse that they write. This study found a plethora of data about authors' perspectives of the effectiveness of peer input. Peer feedback may assist students understand good writing by increasing their understanding of their audience as well as their own writing skills and flaws (Lee, 2015; Tsui & Ng, 2000; Yu & Hu, 2017; Zhao, 2014). However, problems with peer feedback quality (for example, unclear and insufficiently developed remarks) have been documented (Wang, 2014). Some students have found peer feedback on task response useful, however, peers may sometimes focus too much on surface-level faults (Nelson & Carson, 1998).

## CONCLUSIONS

The present study concludes that the implementation of the writing workshop model in teaching writing in Sundanese improved the students' writing skills. The writing workshop model which focuses on a personal analysis and peer-feedback in the essay writing process helped 9th grade students produce, evaluate, and present essays within their respective groups. Therefore, it can be stated that the application of this model in teaching writing in the Sundanese class made students engage in more meaningful, fun, creative, dynamic, and dialogic learning processes.

The students' skills in writing essay in Sundanese were raised when they were given freedom and dialectical support. Such an atmosphere is crucial to make them confident, independent, and proficient in putting out words in an essay as the implementation of their own research. The creation of social environments in groups is the ultimate goal in achieving students' enjoyment in writing. Students need interaction to expose them to varied topics and linguistic expressions in multi-social contexts. The findings promote the potential of the writing workshop as an effective model for the practice of teaching writing in Sundanese classes.

## REFERENCES

- Abbott, K. K. (2010). The things I used to do: Workshops old and new. In D. Donnelly (Ed.), *Does the writing workshop still work?* (pp. 169-181). Multilingual Matters.
- Amos, M. L. (2020). Practicing what we teach: Using SOTL to challenge pre-service teachers' assumptions with the reading/writing workshop model. *Evidence-Based Faculty Development Through the Scholarship of*

- Teaching and Learning (SoTL)*, 19(2), 24–38. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-2212-7.ch013>
- Atwell, N. (1987). *In the middle: Writing, reading, and learning with adolescents*. Heinemann.
- Baughman, J., Brumm, T., & Mickelson, S. (2012). Student professional development: Competency-based learning and assessment. *The Journal of Technology Studies*, 38(1), 115–127. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43604687>
- Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (1987). *The psychology of written composition*. Erlbaum.
- Bertolini, M. E. (2010). Workshopping lives. In D. Donnelly (Ed.), *Does the writing workshop still work?* (pp. 160-168). Multilingual Matters.
- Bizzell, P. (1992). *Academic discourse and critical consciousness*. University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Caffarella, R. S., & Barnett, B. G. (2000). Teaching doctoral students to become scholarly writers: The importance of giving and receiving critiques. *Studies in Higher Education*, 25(1), 39–52.
- Cain, M. A. (2010). ‘A space of radical openness’: Re-visioning the creative writing workshop. In D. Donnelly (Ed.), *Does the writing workshop still work?* (pp. 216-229). Multilingual Matters.
- Calkins, L. (2011). *A curricular plan for the writing workshop*. Heinemann.
- Calkins, L. M. (1986). *The art of teaching writing*. Heinemann.
- Calkins, L. M. (1994). *The art of teaching writing* (2nd ed.). Heinemann.
- Calkins, L. M., & Mermelstein, L. (2003). *Launching the writing workshop*. FirstHand.
- Cheng, Y. S. (2002). Factors associated with foreign language writing anxiety. *Foreign language annals*, 35(6), 647–656.
- Cheng, Y. S., Horwitz, E. K., & Schallert, D. L. (1999). Language anxiety: Differentiating writing and speaking components. *Language learning*, 49(3), 417–446.
- Ciampa, K. (2016) Implementing a digital reading and writing workshop model for content literacy instruction in an urban elementary (K-8) school. *The Reading Teacher*, 70(3), 295–306. <https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.1514>
- Deane, P. (2011) Writing assessment and cognition. *ETS Research Report Series*, 2011(1), i-60 <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2333-8504.2011.tb02250.x>
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2011). *Teaching and researching motivation* (2nd ed.). Longman.
- Flower, L. & Hayes, J. L. (1980). The cognition of discovery: Defining a rhetorical problem. *College Composition and Communication*, 31(1), 21–32. <https://doi.org/10.2307/356630>
- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 32(4), 365–387. <https://doi.org/10.2307/356600>
- Graves, D. H. (1983). *Writing: Teachers and children at work*. Heinemann.
- Gregersen, T., & Horwitz, E. K. (2002). Language learning and perfectionism: Anxious and non-anxious language learners' reactions to their own oral performance. *The Modern Language Journal*, 86(4), 562–570
- Huy, N. T. (2015). Problems affecting learning writing skill of grade 11 at Thong Linh High School. *Asian Journal of Educational Research*. 3(2), 53–69.
- James, G. (2009). The undergraduate creative writing workshop. *Creative writing: Teaching theory & practice*, 1, 48–62.
- Jasmine, J., & Weiner, W. (2007). The effects of writing workshop on abilities of first grade students to become confident and independent writers. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 35(2), 131–139.
- Jia-Fang, E., Hsin-Te, Y., & Hungwei, T. (2018). Learning Chinese through a twenty-first century writing workshop with the integration of mobile technology in a language immersion elementary school. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 31(4), 346–366. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2017.1399911>
- Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia. (n.d.). Pengaruh. In *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia*. Retrieved 12 April, 2021 from <https://kbbi.kemdikbud.go.id/entri/pengaruh>
- Kompas. (2022). *10 Suku dengan populasi terbanyak di Indonesia, Minangkabau dan Batak masuk daftar*. <https://amp.kompas.com/regional/read/2022/01/05/212041478/10-suku-dengan-populasi-terbanyak-di-indonesia-minangkabau-dan-batak-masuk>
- Koster, M. P., Bouwer, R., & van den Bergh, H. (2016). *Think first! The effect of prewriting on the writing performance of elementary students*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Pergamon Press Inc.
- Lee, M. K. (2015). Peer feedback in second language writing: Investigating junior secondary students' perspectives on inter-feedback and intra-feedback. *System*, 55, 1–10.
- McAbee, D. (2020). Shifting the power dynamics in the creative writing workshop: Assessing an instructor as participant model. *New Writing*, 17(3), 244–252. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790726.2019.1586959>

- Merton, R. K. (1968). *Social theory and social structure*. Free Press.
- Nelson, G. L., & Carson, J. G. (1998). ESL students' perceptions of effectiveness in peer response groups. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 7*, 113–131.
- Nunan, D. (1999). *Second language teaching & learning*. Heinle & Heinle.
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Bailey, P., & Daley, C. E. (1999). Factors associated with foreign language anxiety. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 20*, 217–239.
- Raimes, A. (1983). *Techniques in teaching writing*. Oxford University Press.
- Ray, K. W., & Laminack, L. L. (2001). *The writing workshop: working through the hard parts (and they're all hard parts)*. National Council of Teachers of English.
- Sobarna, C. (2007). Bahasa Sunda sudah di ambang pintu kematiankah? *Makara, Sosial Humaniora, 11(1)*, 13–17.
- Spielmann, G., & Radnofsky, M. L. (2001). Learning language under tension: New directions from a qualitative study. *The Modern Language Journal, 85(2)*, 259–278.
- Sturgis, C. & Casey, K. (2018). *Quality principles for competency-based education*. iNACOL.
- Troia, G. A., Lin, S. C., Cohen, S., & Monroe, B. W. (2011). A year in the writing workshop: Linking writing instruction practices and teachers' epistemologies and beliefs about writing instruction. *The Elementary School Journal, 112*, 155–182.
- Tsui, A. B. M., & Ng, M. (2000). Do secondary L2 writers benefit from peer comments? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 9*, 147–170.
- Vanderslice, S. (2010). Once more to the workshop: A myth caught in time. In D. Donnelly (Ed.), *Does the writing workshop still work?* (pp. 30–35). Multilingual Matters.
- von Koss Torkildsen, J., Morken, F., Helland, W.A., & Helland, T. (2016). The dynamics of narrative writing in primary grade children: Writing process factors predict story quality. *Reading and Writing, 29(3)*, 529–554. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-015-9618-4>
- Wang, W. Q. (2014). Students' perceptions of rubric-referenced peer feedback on EFL writing: A longitudinal inquiry. *Assessing Writing, 19*, 80–96.
- Williams, K. E., & Andrade, M. R. (2008). Foreign language learning anxiety in Japanese EFL university classes: Causes, coping, and locus of control. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 5(2)*, 181–191.
- Wilson, L. K. (2010). Wrestling Bartleby: Another workshop model for the creative writing classroom. In D. Donnelly (Ed.), *Does the writing workshop still work?* (pp. 205–215). Multilingual Matters.
- Wortman-Wunder, E., & Wefes, I. (2020). Scientific writing workshop improves confidence in critical writing skills among trainees in the biomedical sciences. *Journal of Microbiology & Biology Education, 21(1)*. <https://doi.org/10.1128/jmbe.v21i1.1843>
- Yu, S., & Hu, G. (2017). Can higher-proficiency L2 learners benefit from working with lower-proficiency partners in peer feedback? *Teaching in Higher Education, 22*, 178–192.
- Zhao, H. H. (2014). Investigating teacher-supported peer assessment for EFL writing. *ELT Journal, 68*, 155–168.
- Zimmerman, B. J., & Risemberg, R. (1997). Becoming a self-regulated writer: A social cognitive perspective. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 22(1)*, 73–101. <https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1997.0919>