

**IMPROVING STUDENTS' WRITING NARRATIVE TEXT
THROUGH DIALOGUE JOURNALS AT SMA AL-KAUTSAR GRADE X**

(A Script)

By

Ayu Lucky Widiarsi



**ENGLISH EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAM
LANGUAGE AND ARTS EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION FACULTY
UNIVERSITY OF LAMPUNG**

2016

ABSTRACT

IMPROVING STUDENTS' WRITING NARRATIVE TEXT THROUGH DIALOGUE JOURNALS AT SMA AL-KAUTSAR GRADE X

AYU LUCKY WIDIASARI

The aim of this study was to find out whether there was an improvement in students' writing narrative texts after being taught using dialogue journals at SMA N Al-Kautsar Grade X.

The subjects of the research were SMA Al-Kautsar Grade X students. The researcher chose one class out of eight classes as the research sample consisting of 36 students by lottery. One-group pre-test and post-test design was used to do this research. The researcher administered a pretest, five meetings, and a posttest. The instrument used in this research was a writing test. In order to analyze the results, the researcher compared the mean of the pretest and posttest scores. The differences between the tests were analyzed using Paired Sample T-Test.

The result of the study showed that the average score in the pretest was 64.50 and the average score in the posttest was 80.22. It could be seen that the improvement of the students' scores was 15.72. Besides, the hypothesis testing resulted $13.033 > 2.030$ which meant that the null hypothesis was rejected. Then, it proved that there was an improvement in students' writing narrative text after the students' being taught using dialogue journals.

It can be concluded that dialogue journals improved students' writing narrative text at SMA Al-Kautsar Grade X. Dialogue journals could help the students to edit their work better since dialogue journals provide reflection. In addition, dialogue journals also could improve students' writing with academical orientation which is narrative text, at senior high school level, and in a short period of time such as five meetings with 45 minutes for each.

Keywords: *writing, dialogue journals, narrative text.*

**IMPROVING STUDENTS' WRITING NARRATIVE TEXT
THROUGH DIALOGUE JOURNALS AT SMA AL-KAUTSAR GRADE X**

By

Ayu Lucky Widiarsi

A Script

Submitted in a Partial Fulfillment of

The Requirement for S-1 Degree

in

The Language and Arts Department of

Teacher Training and Education Faculty



**ENGLISH EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAM
LANGUAGE AND ARTS EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION FACULTY
UNIVERSITY OF LAMPUNG**

2016

Research Title : **IMPROVING STUDENTS' WRITING NARRATIVE
TEXT THROUGH DIALOGUE JOURNALS AT SMA
AL-KAUTSAR GRADE X**

Student's Name : *Ayu Lucky Widiasari*

Student's Number : **1213042012**

Department : **Language and Arts Education**

Study Program : **English Education**

Faculty : **Teacher Training and Education**



Advisor

Sm

Prof. Dr. Patuan Raja, M.Pd.
NIP 19620804 198905 1 001

Co-Advisor

Ari Nurweni

Dr. Ari Nurweni, M.A.
NIP 19630302 198703 2 001

The Chairperson of
The Department of Language and Arts Education

Mulyanto Widodo

Dr. Mulyanto Widodo, M.Pd.
NIP 19620203 198811 1 001

ADMITTED BY

1. Examination Committee

Chairperson : **Prof. Dr. Patuan Raja, M.Pd.**

Sm

Examiner : **Drs. Sudirman, M.Pd.**

Sud

Secretary : **Dr. Ari Nurweni, M.A.**

Nur

2. The Dean of Teacher Training and Education Faculty



Dr. H. Muhammad Saad, M.Hum.

NIP 19590722 198603 1 003

Graduated on : **June 28th, 2016**

SURAT PERNYATAAN

Sebagai civitas akademik Universitas Lampung, saya yang bertanda tangan dibawah ini:

Nama : Ayu Lucky Widiyasari
NPM : 1213042012
judul skripsi : Improving Students' Writing Narrative Texts through
Dialogue Journals at SMA Al-Kautsar Grade X
program studi : Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris
jurusan : Pendidikan Bahasa dan Seni
fakultas : Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan

Dengan ini menyatakan bahwa

1. Karya tulis ini bukan saduran/ terjemahan, murni gagasan, rumusan, dan pelaksanaan penelitian/ implementasi saya sendiri tanpa batuan dari pihak manapun, kecuali arahan pembimbing akademik dan narasumber di organisasi tempat riset;
2. Dalam karya tulis ini terdapat karya atau pendapat yang telah ditulis atau dipublikasikan orang lain, kecuali secara tertulis dengan dicantumkan sebagai acuan dalam naskah dengan disebutkan nama pengarang dan dicantumkan dalam daftar pustaka;
3. Pernyataan ini saya buat dengan sesungguhnya dan apabila dikemudian hari terdapat penyimpangan dan ketidakbenaran dalam penyataan ini, maka saya bersedia menerima sanksi akademik berupa pencabutan gelar yang telah diperoleh karena karya tulis ini, serta sanksi lainnya sesuai dengan norma yang berlaku di Universitas Lampung.

Bandar Lampung, 28 Juni 2016

Yang membuat pernyataan,


Ayu Lucky Widiyasari
1213042012

CURRICULUM VITAE

The writer's name is Ayu Lucky Wideasari. She was born on November 30th, 1994 in Mesuji. She is the first child out of six children. Her father's name is Widia Wicaksono and her mother's name is Susana. Her father works as a national civil servant and her mother works as an entrepreneur. She has two brothers and three sisters. Her brothers' names are Syahrul Sidiq Wicaksono and Ahmad Fajri Wicaksono. The names of her sisters are Regita Zahrani Mediasari, Alyani Kartika Susandi, and Rajwa Ayla Trisandi.

She started her first formal education at TK Bratasena Adiwarna in 1999 and was graduated in 2000. She continued her study at SD N 1 Pasiran Jaya and graduated in 2006. Then she continued her study at SMP N 1 Dente Teladas and graduated in 2009. After that she continued her study at SMA N 1 Kotagajah and graduated in 2012. In the same year, in 2012 she was registered as a student of English Education Study Program, Language and Arts Education Department of Teacher Training and Education Faculty at Lampung University.

From July 27th to September 22nd 2015, she carried on Teaching Practice Program (PPL) at SMP N 1 Ngambur, West Pesisir, Lampung. She had her script final examination on Tuesday, June 28th 2016.

DEDICATION

This paper is humbly dedicated to:

My beloved Parents

Widia Wicaksono and Susana

My beloved sisters and brothers

Syahrul Sidiq Wicaksono

Ahmad Fajri Wicaksono

Regita Zahrani Mediasari

Alyani Kartika Susandi

Rajwa Ayla Trisandi

MOTTO

“Yesterday I was clever, so I wanted to change the world.
Today I am wise, so I am changing myself.”
(Rumi)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Praise is merely to the Almighty Allah SWT for the gracious mercy and tremendous blessing that enables the writer to accomplish this script entitled: Improving Students' Writing Narrative Texts through Dialogue Journals at SMA Al-Kautsar Grade X. This script is presented to fulfill one of the requirements in accomplishing S-1 Degree in English Education Study Program, Teacher Training and Education Faculty, University of Lampung.

Gratitude and honor are addressed to all persons who have helped and supported the writer until the completion of this research. Since it is necessary to be known that this research will never have come into its existence without any supports, encouragements and assistances by several outstanding people and institutions, the writer would like to express her sincere gratitude and respect to:

1. Prof. Patuan Raja, M.Pd. as the first supervisor who has contributed and given his invaluable evaluations, comments, and suggestions during the completion of this script.
2. Dr. Ari Nurweni, M.A. as the second advisor, for her assistance, ideas, guidance and carefulness in correcting the writer's script.
3. Drs. Sudirman, M.Pd. as the examiner and for his support, encouragement, ideas, and suggestion.
4. Dr. Ari Nurweni, M.A. as the Chief of English Education Study Program and all lecturers of English Education Study Program who have contributed their guidance during the completion process until accomplishing this script.
5. Dr. Mulyanto Widodo, M.Pd. as the chairperson of Language and Arts Education Department for his contribution and attention.
6. Datu Noplanol, S.Pd. as the English teacher of SMA Al-Kautsar grade X who has guided the writer during the research.
7. The writer's beloved parents (Widia Wicaksono and Susana). The writer's beloved family (Syahrul Sidiq Wicaksono, Ahmad Fajri Wicaksono, Regita Zahrani Mediasari, Alyani Kartika Susandi, Rajwa Ayla Trisandi). Thank you so much for your guidance, advices, support, motivation, prayer and your love.
8. The great brotherhood of English Department '12, especially Insani Salma, Marlia Fitriani, Rifka Arina Ruantika, Meisita Aidila, Dian Tika Cahyanti, Nikmaturrahmah MS, Sella Merista, Syafira Riani and Yoesis Eka P and the other members of Bipolar Class and A Class.
9. The writer's bestfriends (Elok Waspadany, Citra Ratri Puspita, and Izu Khoirina F.L.). Hopefully our fraternity is last forever.

10. The writer's organization friends: Reffky, Niken, Arsyad, Agung, Pandu, Ghufron, Tyas, Isti, Dani, Selvy, Ega, Dewi, Nurma, Pita, Haris, Catur, Arwi, Panji, Agung and the others. Thank you for everything.
11. The writer's KKN friends: Enggal, Ani, Laras, Darma, Agil, Pera, Mila, Heni, and Anggun. Thankyou for the great experience and moments.

Finally, the writer believes that her writing is still far for perfection. There may be weakness in this research. Thus, comments, and suggestions are always opened for better research. Somehow, the writer hopes this research can give a positive contribution to the educational development, the readers and those who want to accomplish further research.

Bandar Lampung, June 2016
The writer,

Ayu Lucky Widiyasi

CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	ii
APPROVAL PAGE	iv
ADMISSION	v
SURAT PERNYATAAN	vi
CURRICULUM VITAE	vii
DEDICATION	viii
MOTTO	ix
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	x
CONTENTS	xii
TABLES	xiv
FIGURES	xiv
APPENDIXES	xiv
I. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Background	1
1.2. Research Question.....	4
1.3. Objective.....	5
1.4. Uses	5
1.5. Scope.....	5
1.6. Definition of Terms.....	6
II. LITERATURE REVIEW	7
2.1. Writing	7
2.2. Process Writing.....	9
2.3. Narrative Text	13
2.4. Techniques in Responding to Students Writing.....	15
2.5. Dialogue Journals	17
2.6. Editing Writing through Dialogue Journals.....	18
2.7. Procedures of Editing Writing through Dialogue Journals.....	20
2.8. Advantages and Disadvantages of Dialogue Journals.....	21
2.9. Theoretical Assumption	22
2.10. Hyphotesis	23
III. RESEARCH METHOD	24
3.1. Research Design	24
3.2. Data.....	25
3.2.1. Identification of Variables	25
3.2.2. Definition of Variables	25
3.3. Data Sources	25
3.4. Instrument.....	26

3.5.	Validity and Reliability of the Instrument.....	26
3.5.1.	Validity	27
3.5.2.	Reliability	27
3.6.	Data Collecting Procedure.....	29
3.7.	Data Analysis.....	30
3.8.	Data Treatment	31
3.9.	Hypothesis Testing	32
IV.	RESULT AND DISCUSSION	34
4.1.	Result.....	34
4.1.1.	Treatment Implementation.....	34
4.1.2.	Result of Pretest	36
4.1.3.	Result of Posttest	38
4.1.4.	Hyphothesis Testing	40
4.1.5.	The Improvement of Students' Writing Narrative Texts.....	41
4.2.	Discussion.....	50
V.	CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS.....	55
5.1.	Conclusions	55
5.2.	Suggestions.....	55
	REFERENCES.....	57
	APPENDIXES	61

TABLES

	Page
Table 3.1. The Result of Reliability of Pretest and Posttest	28
Table 4.1. The Distributions of Students' Pretest Score	35
Table 4.2. The Distributions of Students' Posttest Score.....	37
Table 4.3. The Result of Hypothesis Testing	39
Table 4.4. The Comparison between Students' Pretest and Posttest Score	40
Table 4.5. The Comparison between Students' Pretest and Posttest Score of Each Aspect	41

FIGURES

	Page
Figure 4.1. The Average Score of Aspects of Writing in Pretest.....	36
Figure 4.2. The Average Score of Aspects of Writing in Posttest	38
Figure 4.3. The Improvement of Students' Score in Each Aspect of Writing	42

APPENDIXES

	Page
Appendix 1. The Research Schedule	62
Appendix 2. Lesson Plan	63
Appendix 3. Pretest	80
Appendix 4. Posttest	82
Appendix 5. Scoring	84
Appendix 6. Normality Test	86
Appendix 7. Result of Students' Pretest	87
Appendix 8. Result of Students' Posttest	89
Appendix 9. Hypothesis Testing	91
Appendix 10. Reliability of Pretest	92
Appendix 11. Reliability of Posttest	94
Appendix 12. Students' Work	96
Appendix 12.1. Student's Dialogue Journals	97
Appendix 12.2. Student's Pretest 1	108
Appendix 12.3. Student's Pretest 2	109
Appendix 12.4. Student's Pretest 3	110
Appendix 12.5. Student's Posttest 1	111
Appendix 12.6. Student's Posttest 2	112
Appendix 12.7. Student's Posttest 3	113
Appendix 13. <i>Surat Izin Penelitian</i>	114
Appendix 14. <i>Surat Keterangan Penelitian</i>	115

I. INTRODUCTION

In order to introduce the research, this chapter deals with the reasons for having this research, research questions, objectives, uses, scope, and definition of terms.

1.1. Background

In learning English, there are four major skills that have to be mastered by the students. They are listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills. Listening and reading are the parts of receptive skills where the learners receive the language and decode the meaning to understand the message. Meanwhile, speaking and writing are the parts of productive skills where the learners need to use the language and produce a message through speech or written text in order to deliver their idea.

According to Harris (1993), writing is a process that occurs over a period of time, particularly if the writer takes account the sometimes extended periods of thinking that precede initial drafts. In writing, the writer needs a time to do some processes inside. The length of the time is different among writers. Some need a longer time just to think about what to write before making the initial drafts.

Bell and Burnaby in Nunan (1989) state that writing is an extremely complex cognitive activity in which the writer is required to demonstrate control of a number of variables simultaneously. At the sentence level these include control of content, sentence structure, vocabulary, punctuation, spelling, and letter formation.

According to Kutz, Groden & Zamel (1993), the nature of academic literacy often confuses and disorients students, "particularly those who bring with them a set of conventions that are at odds with those of the academic world they are entering". In addition, the culture-specific nature of schemata--abstract mental structures representing our knowledge of things, events, and situations--can lead to difficulties when students write texts in L2. From the statement, it could be concluded that different students will have different problems dealing with writing since they have different schemata.

Carson (2001) believes that although instructors may think of errors as part of a language learning process related to linguistic, situational, and psycholinguistic contexts, and writing as a skill developed over time, most L2 learners' writing is judged according to criteria that are static and product-based. In addition, Sternglass (1997) and Zamel (1998) state that teachers draw conclusions about intellectual ability on the basis of structural and grammatical problems has also been well documented. The result of this condition is the students who have low understanding of the material will be hard to follow the material further.

Noplanol (2016), one of the English teachers in the first grade of SMA Al-Kautsar, states that writing is a skill that has lot of difficulties compared to the other skills. Most of students in SMA Al-Kautsar grade X have the problems with grammar, vocabulary and arranging the text. The ability of students is different from one to each other. Some students are good in grammar only or vocabulary only. In the narrative text material itself, rather than making a text, the teacher usually asks the students to rewrite a story or arranging jumble sentences. Because it is hard for the students to create a narrative text.

To deal with this problem, the teacher should find a technique to overcome the individual needs and lacks. A technique employed by many ESL teachers in recent years is the technique of dialogue journals. Davis (1983) provides a description of dialogue journals, explaining that they are a modified extension of traditional journal writing. Instead of evaluating or grading the students' entries, teachers simply provide feedback to each entry in the form of a written response. In turn, students reply to the teacher after reading the teacher's response. Peyton (1987) also suggests that using journals (including dialogue journals) in ESL writing classes can be especially helpful because all students can participate in the activity and they can write at their own individual level. He states that dialogue journals give students the chance to daily practice writing skills that lead to fluency.

Tanner and Clement (1997) conducted a research to find out the effect of dialogue journal on students' writing ability with 13 ESL writing teachers at Brigham Young University's English Language Center (ELC) as the participants. The finding of this study showed that dialogue journals had a positive effect on the students' writing ability. However, Jones and Peyton in Tanner and Clement (1997) stated that some teachers did not use dialogue journals because dialogue journals did not provide the structured writing practice students needed were academically oriented.

Tuan (2010) conducted a research to enhance EFL learners' writing skill via journal writing of 85 second-year students at the Faculty of English Linguistics and Literature of the University of Social Sciences and Humanities in Ho Chi Minh City (USSH-HCMC). The result of the study showed that there was better improvement in students' writing achievement. Since this study used college

students as their subject, then the researcher tried to apply dialogue journal for senior high school students.

Lee (2004) conducted a research about the effectiveness of using dialogue journal as a multi-purpose tool for preservice teacher preparation of 18 teachers. One of the findings showed that time was a problem not only for prospective teachers but also for the teacher educator. The research conducted by Lee applied dialogue journal all the time in two semesters. It meant that conducting dialogue journal in a long time could affect both teachers and teacher educators. As a result, the researcher of this study tried to conduct a dialogue journal in a short time.

From the explanations above, the researcher tried to apply dialogue journal in academical orientation focusing in narrative text. The participants of the research were senior high school students since the previous research had conducted a research in college students. Besides that, the time in conducting the research was shorter than that of the previous research.

Based on these reasons, the reasearcher conducted a research in an English writing class by using dialogue journals. The research tried to find out the improvement of students's writing narrative texts using this technique. Therefore, this research was entitled as "Improving Students' Writing Narrative Texts through Dialogue Journal at SMA Al Kaustar Grade X".

1.2. Research Question

Based on the explanations of the background above, the research question of this research was formulated as "Is there any improvement in students' writing narrative texts after being taught using dialogue journals?".

1.3. Objective

Based on the research question, the objective of this research is to find out whether there is an improvement in students' writing narrative text after being taught using dialogue journals.

1.4. Uses

The uses of this research are:

1. Theoretically, this research is expected to verify the theories related to dialogue journals technique in teaching writing process. The findings of this research will also enrich the theory of students' writing mastery.
2. Practically, the findings of this research are expected to become a source of information about the ways to improve the teaching and learning quality, especially in improving students' writing skill. This study is also expected to increase awareness of individual achievement to improve the students' writing skill in teaching and learning process.

1.5. Scope

Based on the background of this research, the focus of this study was the improvement of the students' writing skill through dialogue journals. The subject of this study was a group of students grade X in SMA Al Kautsar which consisted of 36 students. The researcher used X-7 class chosen by lottery out of eight classes to be the experimental class. The depth of this study was limited on the content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics of the students' writing. The material of the learning process was taken from source book used in SMA Al-Kautsar. The material was limited only at Narrative Text of national fairies.

1.6. Definition of Terms

Here are some definitions of terms that were used in this study:

Writing

It is a process that occurs over a period of time. It refers to an action of delivering or expressing ideas and feeling through written forms.

Teaching Writing

It is an approach to make the students being able to write in target language.

Narrative Text

It refers to a text which tells about a story in order to entertain the reader.

Dialogue Journals

It is a written conversation with dialogic conversation and responsive relationship between a learner and a teacher in English as the foreign language.

Based on the explanations given in this chapter, it could be concluded that the researcher tried to find out whether there was an improvement in students' writing narrative text after being taught using dialogue journals. Theoretically, this research is expected to verify the theories related to dialogue journals technique in teaching writing process. Practically, the findings of this research are expected to become a source of information about the ways to improve the teaching and learning quality, especially in improving students' writing skill.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter discusses the literature review used in this study, they are: writing, process writing, types of writing, narrative text, techniques in responding to students' writing, dialogue journals, editing writing through dialogue journals, procedures of dialogue journals, advantages and disadvantages of dialogue journals, theoretical assumption, and hypothesis.

2.1. Writing

Based on Harmer (2004), writing (as one of the four skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing) has always formed part of syllabus in the teaching of English. However, it can be used for a variety of purposes, ranging from being merely a 'backup' for grammar teaching to a major syllabus that stands in its own right, where mastering the ability to write effectively is seen as a key objective for learners.

Bell and Burnaby in Nunan (1989) define writing as an extremely complex cognitive activity in which the writer is required to demonstrate control of a number of variables simultaneously. At the sentence level these include control of content, sentence structure, vocabulary, punctuation, spelling, and letter formation.

Myles (2002) states that the ability to write well is not a naturally acquired skill; it is usually learned or culturally transmitted as a set of practices in formal instructional settings or other environments. Writing skills must be practiced and

learned through experience. Writing also involves composing, which implies the ability either to tell or retell pieces of information in the form of narratives or description, or to transform information into new texts, as in expository or argumentative writing.

In addition, Hadley in Myles (2002) states that perhaps it is best viewed as a continuum of activities that range from the more mechanical or formal aspects of "writing down" on the one end, to the more complex act of composing on the other end. In addition, it is undoubtedly the act of composing, though, which can create problems for students, especially for those writing in a second language (L2) in academic contexts.

Harris (1993) believes that writing is a process that occurs over a period of time, particularly if the writer takes account the sometimes extended periods of thinking that precede initial draft. In writing, the writer needs a time to do some processes inside. The length of the time is different among writers. Some need a longer time just to think about what to write before making the initial draft. The researcher will use this belief as a navigation in this research.

In line with the definitions given above, there are some aspects taken into consideration in writing. According to Jacobs et al. (1981), there are five aspects of writing. They are:

1. Content

It is defined as the substance of writing in which it can be identified from the topic sentence and main idea.

2. Organization

It refers to the coherence of the text. It deals with how the writer arranges the ideas so that those will run smoothly within the paragraphs.

3. Grammar/Language Use

It deals with the grammatical forms of the text. The use of grammatical form constructs a well formed sentence.

4. Vocabulary

It refers to the selection of appropriate words for the content. It can be identified by looking at the word choices or diction in order to deliver the ideas to the reader.

5. Mechanics

It deals with the graphic conventional of the language. The identification can be from its spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and others within the paragraph or text.

From those explanations, it could be concluded that writing is a process that occurs over a period of time. It refers to an action of delivering or expressing ideas and feeling through written forms. It is one of skills with high complexity. Different writers could produce different kinds of writing. There are some aspects of writing such as content, organization, language use, vocabulary and mechanics.

2.2. Process Writing

According to Harmer (2004), the importance given to writing differs from teaching situation to teaching situation. In some cases it shares equal billing with the other skill; in other curricula it is only used, if at all, in its 'writing for learning' role where students write predominantly to augment their learning of the grammar and vocabulary of the language.

Mahon in Ho (2006), states that traditional approaches to the teaching of writing focus on the product: in other words, the production of neat, grammatically correct pieces of writing. However, Cheung in Ho (2006) argues that the process

approach to writing, an innovation in a product-oriented culture, has been seen as an improvement over the traditional methods of writing instruction in recent years.

Currently, all current composition theorists make a distinction between process-oriented and product-oriented writing. Nunan in Sun and Feng (2009) clearly states how very different this “process” approach is from the traditional product-oriented approach. Whereas the product approach focuses on writing tasks in which the learner imitates, copies and transforms teacher supplied models, the process approach focuses on the steps involved in creating a piece of work. The primary goal of product writing is an error-free coherent text. Process writing allows for the fact that no text can be perfect, but that a writer will get closer to perfection by producing, reflecting on, discussing and reworking successive drafts of a text. Though these theorists differ in their explanations of the distinction between process- and product-oriented writing, there is one important point upon which they all agree: good product depends on good process.

As quoted by Yulia, Rufinus, and Novita (2011), Elbow states that writing is most likely to encourage thinking and learning when students view writing as a process. By recognizing that writing is a recursive process, and that every writer uses the process in a different way, students experience less pressure to "get it right the first time" and are more willing to experiment, explore, revise, and edit.

In the process approach, Onozawa (2010) states that learners are looked upon as central in learning, so that learners' needs, expectations, goals, learning styles, skills and knowledge are taken into consideration. He argues that through the writing process, learners need to make the most of their abilities such as

knowledge and skills by utilizing the appropriate help and cooperation of the teacher and the other learners.

Harmer (2004) describes that writing process is the stage a writer goes through in order produce something in its final written form. He states that there are four main elements in writing process. They are:

Planning

Writers plan what they are going to write. Before starting to write or type, they try and decide what they are going to say. For some writers this may involve making detailed notes. For others a few jotter words may be enough.

Drafting

We can refer to the first of a piece writing as a draft. This first 'go' at a text is often done on the assumption that it will be amended later. As the writing process into editing, a number of drafts may be produces on the final to the final version.

Editing (Reflecting and Revising)

Once writers have produced a draft they then, usually, read through what they have written to see where it works and where it doesn't work. Reflecting and revising are often helped by other readers (or editors) who comment and make suggestions. Another reader's reaction to a piece of writing will help the author to make appropriate revisions.

Final Version

Once writers have edited their draft, making the changes they consider to be necessary; they produce their final version. This may look considerably different

from both the original plan and the first draft, because things have changed in the editing process.

Beside the stages explained by Harmer (2004), there are four main stages in writing process by Rahayu and Prayitno (2015). They are:

Pre-Writing

In this stage, the writer chooses and narrows the topic to a particular aspect of the general one. Doing this will help the writer to make a clear and complete writing. The writer also can brainstorm in this stage.

Planning

The writer needs to plan what topic to write, when to start, and how to end at this stage. Making planning is important because from this point the writer will decide the writing.

Writing and Revising Draft

As soon as the writer has planned, the writer directly executes writing with all techniques that the writer has. After writing the draft, the writer should revise it.

Writing the Final Copy

Writing the final version takes some time, hence it should be done carefully. Sometimes, it is necessary to re-edit the work until the writing is ready to be published.

According to the considerations in teaching of writing to the learners, the researcher used process approach in teaching english. The process approach consists of planning, drafting, editing (reflecting and revising), and final version.

2.3. Narrative Text

According to Braine, et al. (1995), when the description is about events, such as a story, we say that the writer is using narration. In addition, Maulana (2010) states that narrative text tells story.

Regina et al. in Maulana (2010) states that although narration usually refers to the telling story, the term is used here to describe the relating of an experience. That experience may be in the past (past narration), or it may be typically experience (what people usually do) or it may be going on now (present narration). Maulana (2010) believes that there are many types of narrative text. They can be imaginary, factual, or both. They may include fairy stories, mysteries, science, fiction, romance, horror stories, adventures, fables, and so on.

Mark and Anderson (1997) say that narrative texts can have five main parts. These are shown on the explanations below:

1. Orientation

On this paragraph, the narrative tells the audience who is on the story, when it is happening, where it is happening, and what is going on.

2. Complication

This is the part of the story where the narrator tells about something that will begin a chain of events. These events will affect one or more of characters. The complication is the trigger.

3. Sequence of Events

This is where the narrator tells how the characters react to the complication. It includes their feelings and what they do. The events can be told in chronological order or with flashback. The audience is given narrator's point of view.

4. Resolution

This part of the narrative where the complication is sorted out or the problem is solved.

5. Coda

The narrator includes a coda if there is to be moral or message to be learned from the story.

On the other hand, Anderson in Karolina (2006) states that there are some steps in constructing a narrative text. They are:

1. Orientation/exposition

At first, the main characters and possibly some minor characters are introduced to the readers. Some indication is generally given of where the action is located and when it is taking place.

2. Complication/rising action

The complication is pushed along by a series of events, during which we usually expect some sort of complication or problem to arise. It just would not be so interesting if something unexpected did not happen. This complication will involve the main characters and often serves to (temporarily) hinder them from reaching their goal.

3. Sequence of event/Climax

It is where the narrator tells how the character reacts to the complication. It includes their feeling and what they do. The event can be told in chronological order (the order in which they happen) or with flashback. The audience is given the narrator's point of view.

4. Resolution/falling action

In this part, the complication may be resolved for better or worse, but it is rarely left completely unresolved (although this is of course possible in certain types of narrative which leaves us wondering 'How did it end?')

5. Reorientation

It is an optional closure of event.

Several studies have been conducted for increasing students' narrative text writing. One of them was conducted by Maulana (2010). The study was aimed to find out the implementation of clustering technique in teaching of narrative text to tenth grade students of SMA PGRI 56 Ciputat. The finding of study showed that the technique could improve the students' narrative text writing score.

According to the explanations above, it could be concluded that narrative text is a text that tells a story related to an experience. The story could be imaginary, factual, or both. The types of narrative can be chosen by the narrator. The researcher, then, will use narrative text in this study.

2.4. Techniques in Responding to Students' Writing

Raimes (1983) states that there are several techniques in responding to students' writing. They are:

Written Comment

Comments on students' papers that take the form of paraphrase of the ideas expressed, praise, questions, or suggestions are more productive than an end comment like "Only fair", "Good", or "Needs more work". So our first task should be to read the paper through once first before writing anything on it and then to note what the student has done well. After receiving praise of the strengths, the writer then needs to know what to do to improve the piece of writing. Suggestions must be specific, giving directions that students can follow, step by step. Questions are useful to us too, if we want to lead the writer to consider other options without necessarily suggesting those options ourselves.

Talking about The Paper

One of the best ways to help a student revise a paper is to discuss it with the student, in person. One-to-one conferences are extremely time-consuming and, in some teaching situations, just not practical. Often, however, a conference of just a few minutes can be so productive that some teachers hold a very short conferences before and after and even during the class while other students are writing or working together in a group.

Checklist

Teacher can use editing checklists and so can students. Checklist can contain questions about manuscript form (“Does your essay have a title?”), instructions about grammar (“Circle every pronoun and above it write the word or words in your composition that the pronoun refers to”), task to analyze content and organization (“underline the sentence that expresses the main idea of each paragraph”), or just words to jog the memory (“verb forms”).

Students’ Responses to Student Writing

Since teachers want their students to write a lot, and since they can not read and mark huge quantities of writing, they have to find a means of enlisting the aid of other students in the class as readers.

Self-Editing

What students really need, more than anything else, is to develop the ability to read their own writing and to examine it critically, to learn how to improve it, to learn how to express their meaning fluently, logically, and accurately. They need to be able to find and correct their own mistake.

From those explanations, this research tried to use written comment technique to improve students writing skill. It deals with comments on students' papers that take the form of paraphrase of the ideas expressed, praise, questions, or suggestions.

2.5. Dialogue Journals

Yoshihara in Hemmati & Soltanpour (2012) states that a dialogue journal, often used as a supplementary activity, is a written conversation between a student and teacher who write regularly to each other over a course of study. Whereas classroom writing is an essential academic requirement, writing outside the classroom can be a useful tool to enhance writing skill (Chanderasegaran, 2002).

Porter et al. in Todd, Mills, Khamcharoen, and Palard. (2001) believe that the most effective journals involve an ongoing dialogue between learners and the teacher or between trainees and the trainer. In addition, Peyton (1987) suggests that using journals (dialogue journals) in ESL writing classes can be especially helpful because all students can participate in the activity and they can write at their own individual level. Dialogue journals give students the chance to daily practice writing skills that lead to fluency. Also, Peyton claims that "communication, on a one-to-one basis, is crucial - not only to help (the students) adjust, but to help the teacher understand them and address their special needs".

Fulwiler and Young in Rokniand Seifi (2013), teacher can individualize instruction for each student and encourage independent thinking from students' dialogue journal writing. On the other hand, when students write a dialogue journal they can record their backgrounds and individual experiences and extends teachers' contact time with them and based on this relationship and personal information from each student, teacher considers an especial instruction.

However, according to Staton in Hemmati & Soltanpour (2012), effective dialogue journal use is a system with three equally important components: “(a) the written communication itself, (b) the dialogic conversation, and (c) the responsive relationship” between a learner and a more competent person in the foreign language.

Based on Davis (1983), dialogue journals are a modified extension of traditional journal writing. He adds that in dialogue journals, instead of evaluating or grading the students' entries, teachers simply provide feedback to each entry in the form of a written response. In turn, students reply to the teacher after reading the teacher's response.

From those explanations, it could be concluded that dialogue journal is a written conversation with dialogic conversation and responsive relationship between a learner and a more competent person in the foreign language.

2.6. Editing Writing through Dialogue Journal

In the Process approach, Onozawa (2010) states that learners are looked upon as central in learning, so that learners' needs, expectations, goals, learning styles, skills and knowledge are taken into consideration. He argues that through the writing process, learners need to make the most of their abilities such as knowledge and skills by utilizing the appropriate help and cooperation of the teacher and the other learners.

Harmer (2004) states that there are four main elements in writing process. They are planning, drafting, editing (reflecting and revising), and final version. Harmer (2004) states that reflecting and revising are often helped by other readers (or

editors) who comment and make suggestions. Another reader's reaction to a piece of writing will help the author to make appropriate revisions.

Peyton in Rokniand Seifi (2013) states that dialogue journals open new channels of communication and concentrate on transferring meaning by letters and vocabulary consequently; form and structure do not have a significant role in Dialogue Journal Writing. When students write with their teachers, they have a great opportunity to create and use English words in an interaction with their teachers in a non-threatening atmosphere and they do not have any focus on form and correction. In addition, students can discuss and solve problems through their comments and reflections in this mutual interaction with teacher and even with other students.

As quoted by Yulia, Rufinus, and Novita (2011), Elbow states "Writing is most likely to encourage thinking and learning when students view writing as a process. By recognizing that writing is a recursive process, and that every writer uses the process in a different way, students experience less pressure to "get it right the first time" and are more willing to experiment, explore, revise, and edit. Beside that, writing a journal stimulates reflection on learning and teaching experiences, and so enhances learning (Todd, Mills, Khamcharoen, and Palard, 2001). It means that by the reflection students could find out their mistakes and revise their works.

However, some studies have been conducted to find out whether dialogue journals could be helpful for students writing. Tanner and Clement (1997) conducted a research to find out the effect of dialogue journal on students' writing ability with 13 ESL writing teachers at Brigham Young University's English Language Center (ELC) as the participants. The finding of this study showed that dialogue journals had a positive effect on students' writing ability. However, Jones and Peyton in

Tanner and Clement (1997) stated that some teachers did not use dialogue journals because dialogue journals do not provide the structured writing practice students need who are academically oriented.

Tuan (2010) conducted a research to enhance EFL learners' writing skill via journal writing of 85 second-year students at the Faculty of English Linguistics and Literature of the University of Social Sciences and Humanities in Ho Chi Minh City (USSH-HCMC). The result of the study showed that there was better improvement in students' writing achievement. It meant that dialogue journal could improve students' writing at the collage level.

According to the explanation above, it could be concluded that applying dialogue journal in teaching writing would support the stage of editing (reflecting and revising) since dialogue journal provided the students to reflect and revise their works.

2.7. Procedures of Editing Writing through Dialogue Journals

According to Reid (1993), dialogue journals are interactive journals in which students write entries to and for the teacher. In this case, the students will be asked to write narrative text. After the students write down their entries, the teacher responds with a journal entry of his/her own. The student can leave the back of each page empty for teacher response. After that, the students can rewrite the entries and give another questions about the class material, discuss the problem in writing process, and others. At last, since the focus is on fluency and communication, the teacher responds to queries, gives information, encourages, comments on success and accomplishments, discusses communication topics, and expresses concern. However, according to Linnell (2010), teachers can

incorporate focus on form both intensively and incidentally without compromising the communicative nature of the dialogue journals.

2.8. Advantages and Disadvantages of Dialogue Journals

There are some advantages from Dialogue Journals, they are:

- a. Writing a journal stimulates reflection on learning and teaching experiences, and so enhances learning (Todd, Mills, Khamcharoen, and Palard, 2001).
- b. Dialogue journals, which involve teachers and students writing and exchanging their writing in mutual response, are often cited as a powerful tool for promoting reflection in teacher education (Lee, 2004).
- c. Providing a safe place for non-threatening, private communication is a tenet of dialogue journals, and this promotes good communication between student and teacher (Molen, 2011).
- d. Through reading and responding to learners' journal entries, teachers are able to measure each learner's competence and understand their needs, thoughts, and feelings, which helps teachers accommodate their teaching ways to learners' preferences and give learners appropriate assistance to their problems along the writing course (Tuan, 2010).

Dialogue Journal also has disadvantages, they are:

- a. Taking a long time. "Time was a problem not only for prospective teachers but also for the teacher educator" (Lee, 2004).
- b. Dialogue journals do not provide the structured writing practice students need who are academically oriented (Jones and Peyton in Tanner and Clement, 1997).

It could be concluded that dialogue journals has many advantages since it stimulates reflection for the students and for the teacher, promotes a good communication between the students and the teacher, and helps the teacher to accomodate their teaching ways. However, it has some lacks such as time taking and do not provide the structures writing practice.

2.9. Theoretical Assumption

Writing is a process that occurs over a period of time, particularly if the writer takes account the sometimes extended periods of thinking that precede initial draft. It refers to an action of delivering or expressing ideas and feeling through written forms. Afterwards, teaching writing using process approach focuses on the steps involved in creating a piece of work. In line with the steps, there are four main elements in writing process. They are planning, drafting, editing (reflecting and revising), and final version. It is suggested that reflecting and revising are often helped by other readers (or editors) who comment and make suggestions. Another reader's reaction to a piece of writing will help the author to make appropriate revisions.

A technique in which students can discuss and solve problems through their comments and reflections in mutual interaction with teacher and even with other students is called dialogue journals. Writing a journal, including dialogue journals, stimulates reflection on learning and teaching experiences, and so enhances learning.

From the explanations above, it could be concluded that dialogue journal supports teaching writing process in the stage of editing (reflecting and revising).

2.10. Hypothesis

Based on the theories and the theoretical assumptions, the hypothesis formulated by the researcher was that there is an improvement in students' writing narrative texts after being taught using dialogue journals.

III. RESEARCH METHOD

In this chapter, the researcher would like to discuss several subchapters, those were research design, data, data sources, instruments, validity and reliability of the instrument, data collecting procedure, data analysis, data treatment, and hypothesis. All those subchapters would be presented as follow.

3.1. Research Design

This research used quantitative research in order to find out whether there was an improvement in students' writing narrative text before and after being taught using dialogue journals. One-group pretest and posttest design was used to this research. Ary, Jacobs, and Sorensen (2010) explain that one group the pretest-the posttest design usually involves three steps: (1) administering a pretest which measuring the dependent variable; (2) applying the experimental treatment to the subject; and (3) administering a posttest, again measuring the dependent variable. In this research design, there was no control group. This research used one class as the experimental class. The researcher conducted a pretest, five meetings, and a posttest in the research. Here is the illustration of the one group pretest posttest design.

T1 X T2

Where:

T1 : Pretest
X : Treatment
T2 : Posttest

(Setiyadi, 2006)

3.2. Data

Data of this research deals with the score gained from the variables. The data in this research that influenced the instruments consisted of as follows:

3.2.1. Identification of Variables

Hatch and Farhady (1982) says that variable as an attribute of person or an object which varies from person to person or from object to object. In order to assess the influence of the treatment in this research, variable could be divided as independent variable and dependent variable. The independent variable (X) of this research was dialogue journal because this variable was major and was investigated. Then, the dependent variable (Y) of this research was writing skill because this variable measured to determine the effect of dialogue journal.

3.2.2. Definition of Variable

According to Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh (1979), variable is an attribute, which is regarded as reflecting or expressing some concept or construct. It takes on different values. In research, variable that was consequence of or dependent upon preceding variable was called dependent variables. On the other hand, variable that was antecedent to dependent variable was defined as independent variables.

3.3. Data Sources

The subjects of this research were the first grade students of SMA Al Kautsar. SMA Al Kautsar had eight classes in grade X. The researcher chose one class to be the sample of this research. The class that was used as a sample was chosen by lottery. The number of students in the class was 36 students. This research was conducted in five meetings with 5 total journals.

3.4. Instrument

Instruments refers to the tools or means by which investigators attempt to measure variables or items of interest in the data-collection process. Suharsimi (2002) states that research method is a manner that is used to collect data, and instrument is the tool to collect it. Instrument has relation with evaluation. Instrument is very important to collect data and to do the researcher's work easily in research activity. This research had an instrument as follow:

Writing Test

The instrument used to collect data in this research was a written test (see Appendix 3-4). The tests were conducted in the first meeting and last meeting. These tests were used to measure the students' writing skill improvement after being taught using dialogue journal. The test consisted of instructions to make a narrative text based on the direction given. According to Weigle in Reyhan (2012), in analytic scoring, scripts are rated on several aspects of writing or criteria rather than given a single score like holistic scoring do. Jacobs et al (1981) rates the scripts based on five aspects of other analytical scales of writing composition which are: content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. In addition, they differentiate five aspects: content is weighed 30 points, language use is 25 points, organization and vocabulary are weighed 20 points, and mechanics is weighed 5 points (see Appendix 5).

3.5. Validity and Reliability of The Instrument

When discussing the good test, it is an undeniable fact to refer to two sets of good standard test, i.e. reliability and validity. Evidence of validity and reliability is especially important in educational research because most of the measurements attempted in this area are obtained indirectly (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1979).

3.5.1. Validity

The validity question is concerned with the extend to which an instrument measures what one thinks it is measuring (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1979). This research used two kinds of validity as follow:

Content Validity

Validity is the extend to which a test measures a representative sample of the subject matter content, the focus of content validity is adequacy of the sample and simply on the appearance of the test (Hatch and Farhady, 1982). In the research, the instruement was valid because the content validity of writing skill was concerned on choosing of topic about narrative text based on 2006 curriculum (KTSP) speifically at standard competence number 12 and also core competences number 12.1 and 12.2 which could be found in the textbook for first grade of senior high school. The topic of narrative text used in this research was local fair-ies.

Construct Validity

According Shohamy (1985), construct validity is concerned with whether the test is actually in line with the theory of what it means to express ideas through language. Construct validity deals with the ways a writer express the ideas using written form for instance, content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics in writing test. A test could be considered as valid in its construction if the test items measure every aspect of the written forms. Then, it could be concluded that the instrument of this research was valide because it measured every aspect of the written forms (See Appendix 3 and 4).

3.5.2. Reliability

This research used inter-rater reliability. Hyland in Türkkorur (2005) states that research supports that writing raters are influenced by many factors and can weight the writing subcategories differently during the scoring of student papers. According to Barnhardt et al. in Türkkorur (2005), using more than one experienced rater to carry out portfolio assessment independently can enhance assessment reliability.

In order to reduce rater variability, Lumley and McNamara (1993) suggest implementing rater-training sessions in which raters are introduced to the assessment criteria and asked to rate a series of selected performances. During these sessions, ratings are carried out independently and raters become aware of the extent to which they rate similarly or dissimilarly with other raters and try to achieve a common interpretation of the rating criteria. The training session is followed by additional follow up ratings and the reliability of the scores is again analyzed. Only after these training sessions, should raters and rating panels be selected. It has been found that rater training can reduce the extent of rater variability in terms of overall severity and random errors and can help develop self-consistency in raters (Lumley & McNamara, 1993).

The first rater of this research was the writer and the second rater was Sella Merista, the writer's friend whose research focused on writing too. Before the raters scored the students' narrative text writing, both raters used the same criteria of scoring. Hereby, the first and the second rater used scoring criteria devised from Jacobs et al (1981). To measure how reliable the scoring was, this study used *Rank – order Correlation* with the formula:

$$p = 1 - \frac{6 \cdot \sum d^2}{N(N^2 - 1)}$$

p : Coefficient of rank order

d : Difference of rank correlation

N : Number of students

1-6 : Constant number

(Hatch and Farhady, 1982)

In this case, the coefficient of rank correlation was analyzed with the standard of reliability as follows:

1. 0.80000 - 1.0000 : very high reliability
2. 0.60000 - 0.7900 : high reliability
3. 0.40000 - 0.5900 : medium reliability
4. 0.20000 - 0.3900 : low reliability
5. 0.0000 – 0.1900 : very low reliability

The writing test would be considered reliable if the tests reached the range of 0.60-0.79 (high reliability). Thus, the result of the the calculation from the pretest and the posttest reliability is shown as follow:

Table 3.1. The Result of Reliability of the Pretest and the Posttest

Test	Reliability Coefficient
The pretest	0.895
The posttest	0.881

Based on the table, it was shown that both the pretest and the posttest reliability consisted very high reliability because it ranged from 0.8 until 1.0. Thus, it could be concluded that the results of the tests could be used in this research.

3.6. Data Collecting Procedure

The test technique was used to find out the results of students' achievement in learning writing narrative text. Besides that, the treatment was given between the pretest and the posttest. There were some procedures that were used to collect the data in this research. They were as follows:

The pretest

The pretest was given before the treatment conducted to know how the students' ability was. The test was a written test. The test was given in the first meeting to find out the students' writing skill before giving treatment using dialogue journals.

The Treatment

The Treatment was conducted after the pretest. Treatment was the teaching process through dialogue journals. The treatment was given five times during the research, or in other words, it started from the second week up to the sixth week.

The posttest

The posttest was given to the students after the treatment. The students were given written test. The test was the same kind as in the pretest. This test was designed to find out the improvement of the students' writing skill after being taught using dialogue journal.

3.7. Data Analysis

This research analyzed the data by comparing the average score (mean) of the pretest and the posttest. This average score was used to find out the improvement in the students' writing skill after being taught using dialogue journals. The statistical formula for counting the average score was as follows:

$$x = \frac{\sum x}{N}$$

Where:

\bar{X} : mean

Σx : total score

N : number of students

To find out whether there was an improvement in the students' writing skill, the researcher used these following steps:

- (1.) Scoring the pretest and the posttest.
- (2.) Calculate the scoring using SPSS to find out that there was an improvement or not after the students were taught using dialogue journal.
- (3.) The researcher used statistical computerization i.e. paired sample T-Test of statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS).

3.8. Data Treatment

According to Setiyadi (2006), using T-test for hypotheses testing has three basic assumptions that can be described as follows:

1. The data is an interval
2. The data is taken from random sample population (conditional)
3. The data is distributed normally

Normality test

Normality test was used to know whether the pretest and the posttest data were normally distributed or not. The researcher used statistical calculation of normality test by One-Sample Kolmogorov-Sminov test in SPSS v 16.0. Here were the following steps:

1. Formulating the hypothesis of the normally test as follows:

H_0 = the distribution of the data is normal

H_1 = the distribution of the data is not normal

2. Analyzing the distribution using One-Sample Kolmogorov-Sminov test in SPSS v 16.0.
3. Comparing the asymp.sig with the level of significance.

The criteria for the hypothesis: H_0 is accepted if $\text{Sig} > .$ The level of significance was at 0.05. It could be seen that the asymp.sig of the pretest was 0.758 which was higher than 0.05 and the asymp.sig of the posttest was 0.154 which was also higher than 0.05 (See Appendix 6). From those explanations, it could be concluded that the null hypothesis was accepted and the distribution of the data was normal.

3.9. Hypothesis Testing

The hypothesis were analyzed using repeated measures T-Test of Statical Package for Social Science (SPSS) v 16.0. The researcher used the level of significance 0.05 in which the hypothesis was approved if $\text{sign} < p$. It meant that the probability of error in the hypothesis was only 5%. The hypotheses were:

H_0 : There is no improvement in students' writing narrative text after being taught by using dialogue journal.

H_1 : There is an improvement in students' writing narrative text after being taught by using dialogue journal.

(Hatch and Farhady, 1982)

The criteria were:

1. If the t-ratio is lower than t-table: H_0 is accepted that there is no improvement in students' writing narrative text after being taught using dialogue journal.

2. If the t-ratio is higher than t-table: H_1 is accepted that there is an improvement in students' writing narrative text after being taught using dialogue journal.

From the explanations above, it could be concluded that this research used One-group pretest and posttest design. The researcher administered a pretest, five meetings, and a posttest. The instrument used in this research was a writing test. In order to analyze the results, the researcher compared the mean of the pretest and posttest scores. The differences between the tests were analyzed using Paired Sample T-Test.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

This chapter presents the conclusion and suggestions drawn by the researcher based on the finding and discussion of the data analysis.

5.1. Conclusion

Based on the discussions of the research finding on the previous chapter, the researcher presents a conclusion that there is an improvement in students' writing narrative texts at SMA Al-Kautsar Grade X. It could be seen from the difference between the students' average pretest score which was 64.5 and the students' average posttest score which was 80.22. Dialogue journals help the students to edit their works since dialogue journals provide reflection.

5.2. Suggestions

Based on the finding and discussion, the researcher recommends some following suggestions:

1. For the teacher, the researcher suggested the English teachers especially in senior high school to use dialogue journals as a supplementary activity in improving students' writing narrative text. The dialogue journal can be used in one material for example narrative text writing material time. It is very helpful for the teacher who wants to fulfill students' individual need or lacks. Besides the narrative text material, the teacher may try to use dialogue journals in other types of text.
2. To other researchers, it is suggested to conduct a dialogue journals study in different levels or grade of participants such as elementary school or

senior high school grade XI to see whether the result would be different. The different type of writing texts is also suggested in the future research to find out whether this technique could be implied in all kinds of writing texts.

REFERENCES

- Abdolmanafi J. & Seifi A. 2013. Does Dialog Journal Writing Have any Effect on EFL Learners' Vocabulary Knowledge?. *International Journal of Applied Linguistic Studies Volume 2, No 2; 2013*. <http://www.science-line.com/index/>. Retrieved November 15, 2015.
- Ary, D., Jacobs. L. C., & Razavieh A. 1979. *Introduction to Research in Education* (2nd ed). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Ary, D., Jacobs. L. C., & Sorensen, C. 2010. *Introduction to Research in Education* (8th ed). California: Wadsworth.
- Braine G. & Arevalo C.. 1995. *Writing for Sources*. London: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- Carson, J. 2001. Second language writing and second language acquisition. In T. Silva and P. Matsuda (Eds.), *On second language writing*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Chandrasegaran, A. 2002. *Intervening to Help in the Writing Process*. RELC Portfolio Series 7.
- Davis. F. A. 1983. "Why you call me emigrant?": Dialogue-journal writing with migrant youth. *Childhood Education*, 60, 116-116.
- Harmer, J. 2004. *How to Teach Writing*. Pearson Education Limited: Malaysia.
- Fatemeh & Soltanpour. 2012. A Comparison of the Effects of Reflective Learning Portfolios and Dialogue Journal Writing on Iranian EFL Learners' Accuracy in Writing Performance. *English Language Teaching; Vol. 5, No. 11; 2012*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n11p16>. Retrieved November 10, 2015.
- Harris, J. 1993. *Introducing Writing*. London: Penguin English.
- Hatch, E. & Farhday. 1982. *Research Design and Statistic for Applied Linguistics*. London: Newbury House Publishers.
- Ho, B. 2006. Effectiveness of using the process approach to teach writing in six Hong Kong primary. *Perspectives: Working Papers in English and Communication*, Vol 1, No 17; 2006. www.cityu.edu.hk/en/research/spring2006ho.pdf. Retrieved December 21, 2015.

- Jacobs, Holly. L., Stephen, A., Zinggraf., Deanne. R., Wormuth, V., Faye, H., Jane, B., Hughey. 1981. *Testing ESL Composition: A Practical Approach*. Rowley: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.
- Karolina, I. 2006. *Teaching Narrative Text in Improving Writing To The Tenth Grade Students Of Sma Negeri 1 Petarukan, Pemasang*. A published script. Semarang: Universitas Negeri Semarang.
- Kutz, E., Groden, S., & Zamel, V. 1993. *The discovery of competence: Teaching and learning with diverse student writers*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers.
- Lee, I. 2004. Using Dialogue Journals as a Multi-Purpose Tool for Preservice Teacher Preparation: How Effective Is It?. *Teacher Education Quarterly; 2004*. www.teqjournal.org/backvols/2004/313/lee.pmd.pdf. Retrieved November 11, 2015.
- Lumley, T. & McNamara, T. 1993. *Rater Characteristics and Rater Bias*. Paper presented at the Language Testing Colloquium. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 365 091)
- Mark & Anderson. 1997. *Text Types in English 2*. South Yara: Macmilan.
- Maulana, I. 2010. *The Effectiveness of Clustering Technique in Teaching Writing of Narrative Text at the Tenth Grade Students of SMA PGRI 56 Ciputat*. A published script. Jakarta: UIN Syarif Hidayatullah.
- Molen, V. 2011. *Does The Use Of Dialogue Journals Affect The Writing Fluency Of Low-Literacy Adult Somali Students?*. A published script. Minnesota: Hamline University.
- Myles. 2002. Second Language Writing and Research: The Writing Process and Error Analysis in Student Texts. *TESL-EJ, Vol. 6. No. 2; 2002*. tesl-ej.org/ej22/a1.html. Retrieved June 26, 2015.
- Nunan, D. 1989. *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom*. D. Nunan(Ed.). United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Onozawa, C. 2010. A Study of the Process Writing Approach. *Co love Gakuen Maebashi International University Journal No.10; 2010*. www.kyoai.ac.jp/college/ronshuu/no-10/onozawa2.pdf. Retrieved December 20, 2015.
- Peyton, J. 1987. *Dialogue journal writing with limited-English-proficient (LEP) students: Q &A*. Los Angeles: California University.

- Pratiwi. 2011. *Optimizing the Use of Youtube Videos to Improve Students' Writing Skill*. A published script. Surakarta: Universitas Sebelas Maret.
- Rahayu, Acep, and Prayitno, & Joko. 2015. *How to Make an Academic Essay Writing*. Bandung: PenerbitAlfabeta.
- Raimes, A. 1983. *Techniques in Teaching Writing*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Reid, M. Joy. 1993. *Teaching ESL Writing*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Reyhan. 2012. The Use of Guided Writing and Sequences of Pictures as Teaching Technique to Enhance the Ability of Writing Narrative of Students in "Different English Course". *Jurnal Universitas Airlangga, Vol. 1, No. 2, 2012*. www.journal.unair.ac.id. Retrieved June 26, 2015.
- Setiyadi, B. 2006. *Teaching English as A Foreign Language*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Graha Ilmu.
- Setiyadi, B. 2006. *Metode Penelitian untuk Pengajaran Bahasa Asing: Pendekatan Kuantitatif dan Kualitatif*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Graha Ilmu.
- Sternglass, M. 1997. *Time to know them: A longitudinal study of writing and learning at the college level*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Sun, F. 2009. Process Approach to Teaching Writing Applied in Different Teaching Models. *English Language Teaching, Vol 2, No. 1; 2009*. www.ccsenet.org/journal.html. Retrieved December 20, 2015.
- Tanner, M. & Clement, L. 1997. *The Effects of Dialogue Journals in Enhancing ESL Students' Writing*. BriRham YounR University.
- Todd, R., Mills, N., Khamcharoen, P. & Palard, C. 2001. Giving Feedback on Journals. *ELT Journal vol. 55, no. 4, 2001*. <http://eltj.oxfordjournals.org/content/55/4/354.short>. Retrieved November 10, 2015.
- Tuan, L. 2010. Enhancing EFL Learners' Writing Skill via Journal Writing. *English Language Teaching, Vol. 3, No. 3; 2010*. www.ccsenet.org/elt. Retrieved November 11, 2015.
- Türkkorur, A. 2005. *Writing Portfolio Assessment And Inter-Rater Reliability At Yildiz Technical University School Of Foreign Languages Basic English Department*. Published Magister Thesis. Ankara:Bilkent University.
- Yulia, Rufinus, A., & Novita, D. 2011. Improving Recount Text Writing Ability By Guided Question-Word Questions. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan*

Pembelajaran, Vol 3, No 7; 2014. jurnal.untan.ac.id/index.php/jpdpb/article/download/1151/pdf. Retrieved June 26, 2015.

Zamel, V. 1998. Strangers in academia: The experiences of faculty and ESL students across the curriculum. In V. Zamel & R. Spack (Eds.), *Negotiating academic literacies: Teaching and learning across languages and cultures* . Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.