*Original Paper*

# The Implementation of Interactive Comprehensible Written Input-Output Instruction in Teaching Writing of English

Cucu Sutarsyah[1*] & Hery Yufrizal[1]

[1] English Department, Lampung University, Bandar Lampung, Indonesia

[*] Cucu Sutarsyah, English Department, Lampung University, Bandar Lampung, Indonesia

*Abstract*

*The long term goal of this research is to prove the effect of input and output means in the theory of Second Language Acquisition. The input-output means has been proven to be able to influence the process of second language acquisition (Izumi et al., 1999). A comprehensible approach called Interactive Input-Output Instruction Written designed and developed to maximize input obtained through reading materials that were then used to produce meaningful paper or essay. Assuming that there was a problem with the ability of students to use the language, especially in terms of ability to write, which is important for every students of English, type of learning in a group can be used to benefit the students to get input from the reading process to influence their writing skills. In groups, the students were given a writing assignment that must be completed. This writing task brings a bias problem solved by recourse through the reading process. Therefore, the reading was done with a purpose and contribution of each member in the group is very helpful in completing the task of writing. The study involved 36 students who attend Mathematics English courses in the first semester of academic year 2016/2017. The students were given the opportunity to process narrative and anecdotal text, made text reconstruction, paragraph predicting continued, wrote prediction, give and receive feedback and make revisions. The results show there significant difference between students' ability to write comprehensible Written before implementation Interactive Input-Output Instruction and after implementation comprehensible Written Interactive Input-Output Instruction. Of the five aspects of writing, the students obtained an increase in value in terms of content and organization. The predictive ability of students is quite high as evidenced by the nine groups that made predictions, five groups could do exactly.*

*Keywords*

*Interactive Input-Output Instruction, English writing, general English*

## 1. Introduction

Reading is a process of input and writing is a process of output, and the importance of the integration of these two process are obvious (Li, 2013). Reading only provides the potential possibility for writing and how to write well requires the intake of both the language proficiency and the writing skill, which usually comes after persistent reading and conscious noticing (Qi, 2014; Nation, 2009). Since English is considered to be the second language for the students, the theories about comprehensible input and output can be the consideration for the students in learning English (Izumi et al., 1999).

Some studies on the relationship between cooperative learning and students' writing ability reveal positive findings which generally state that incorporation of cooperative learning to teaching writing is a good method to promote the enhancement of the students' writing achievement. Cooperative Learning strategy makes the students active in pairs and group work discussion. In the cooperative classroom, students are able to share ideas with each other. They are able to work together to accomplish shared goals and do the assignment cooperatively rather than competitively and individualistically (Sabarun, 2011).

This research aims to find out whether there is a difference on students' writing ability before and after being taught by Interactive Comprehensible Written Input-Output Instruction, later called ICWIOI for short); and to investigate how input and cooperative works could affect the production of students' English writing. This study was conducted to one class in the first year students of Lampung University of Mathematic study program in 2016/2017 academic year. They learn English as general subject. The number of students recruited was 36 students consisting of six males and 30 females. These students were involved in processing input and producing output of Narrative text and Anecdote text through ICWIOI.

For the treatments, two different genres of text were used, that is, Narrative Text and Anecdote Text. They are chosen because both texts have essential ending parts which turn to be the interesting parts to entertain the readers. By ICWIOI, the ending part can be made more entertaining by thinking critically and connecting ideas in the previous paragraphs to form a resolution and think an unusual and interesting ending by combining the idea from the students in a group (Ferdous, 2015). Students' writing ability was evaluated in accordance with some aspects of writing, such as content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics (Heaton, 1991).

ICWIOI is an instruction done in a group which provides the students with written input through reading text and offers opportunity to reconstruct that text through writing. In addition, the students were given the opportunity to maximize their input and output through exchanging the draft, giving feedback, and revising their writing. In this context, the students would have benefit by providing a chance for them to produce output in an occasion that provides interaction to make comprehensible input (Rivers, 1987). In the present study, the researcher would like to propose ICWIOI that provides comprehensible input and output through cooperative learning. This is in line with what Yufrizal (2013) states that Cooperative Learning Groups are one way for new learners of English to receive plenty of

324

understandable input and output. One of the reasons is that a small group setting allows for more comprehensible input because the teacher or classmates modify or adapt the message to the listener's needs.

In addition, this kind of instruction was integrated into the writing process proposed by Palmer (1994, p. 8), that is, pre-writing, drafting, sharing, revising, editing, and publishing. For comprehensible input, the students were provided with incomplete text without an ending. The students were asked to read the text and answer the questions provided. After answering comprehension questions, the teacher and students discuss the answers. New and difficult words and expressions in each passage were marked and provided explanations to help the students understand the passage better and to make the input comprehensible. Those steps of comprehensible input have fulfilled 5 characteristics of input for acquisition proposed by Krashen (1982) and Lantolf (2000) that is, the input must be comprehensible, interesting and relevant. It should not be grammatically sequenced; it must be in sufficient quantity.

For comprehensible output, the students were firstly provided with comprehension questions. Comprehension questions result in students reproducing or recovering pieces of content information from the text or in explaining certain linguistic items (Varaprasad, 1994). In the case of writing, most composition tasks set on reading texts demand a summary or re-statement of the content in the texts, requiring a knowledge of relevant information and linguistic accuracy in composition (Jacob et al., 1981). The question is in form of information transfer exercise which provides the student with information for the subsequent question. In producing an answer for the second task (reconstruct the text), the student uses information provided by the visual clue in the first, in this case a list of questions and does not just transfer chunks of information from the original text into his own. Thus, the act of reproducing or reconstituting information from a visual to a verbal medium "using your own words" is facilitated if the input for the writing is not the text itself but another medium (Varaprasad, 1994).

Information transfer exercises in the form of questions, tables, diagram, flow-charts, graphs, plan, maps, etc, based on the information structure in the text can form the basis for writing activities (Varaprasad, 1994). With a lot of help, the learner's task is made more challenging as the focus now is on finding a solution to the given problem rather than mechanically doing an exercise. After that, the students are asked to predict the continuation of the story and reconstruct the text as a whole with the same meaning intended. The last, the students compared their reconstructed text writing to the original one.

In short, according to Ferdous (2015), ICWIOI refers to the instruction done in a group which provides the students with written input through reading text and offers opportunity to reconstruct that text through writing by using their own words. The input for the writing is not the text itself but another medium, that is, comprehension questions provided.

## 2. Results and Discussion

To determine the students' writing entry point and to make sure the students were homogeneous, the pretest was administered to the students. The students were asked to choose one of the topics presented and compose a writing text based on the topic they have chosen consisting Opening, Content, and Closing within 60 minutes. After administering both writing pretest and posttest, the result of the pretest was compared with the result of the posttest to analyze the difference on the students' writing ability before and after being taught through ICWIOI. The difference between the pretest and the posttest score shows that the students' mean score of writing posttest is higher than that of in the pretest, that is, $71.12 > 63.33$. Those scores can be seen on the following table.

**Table 1. Comparison of students writing in pretest and postest**

|  | Pretest Score | Posttest Score |
|---|---|---|
| Total students (n) | 36 | 36 |
| Mean (m) | 63.33 | 71.12 |

A t-test analysis was conducted to see whether there is any significant effect of the treatment to students' writing as conducted with the following result.

**Table 2. Paired Samples Test**

|  | Paired Differences | | | | | T | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Lower | Upper | | | |
| Pair 1   Pretest - Posttest | -7,79167 | 7,86164 | 1,31027 | -10,45166 | -5,13167 | -5,947 | 35 | ,000 |

The result of the computation shows that t-value is 5.947 and the two tail significance showed that $p < 0.05$ ($p = .000$). Referring to the criteria, that is, $H_0$ is rejected if $t_0 > t_{tab}$ and $p < 0.05$. It reveals that $H_0$ is rejected because $5.947 > 1.960$ and $.000 < 0.05$. That means that the hypothesis is accepted; there is a significant difference on the students' writing ability and that shows that ICWIOI can affect the production of students' writing ability.

*2.1 Comparing Writing Aspects*

To answer the question which aspect of writing is mostly influenced by the implementation of ICWIOI, the results of students' writing aspect in pretest and post test were compared in terms the gain students got from each aspect. The result is presented in the following table.

**Table 3. The Students' Writing Aspect Achievement**

| No. | Aspect of Writing | Mean Score of Pretest | Mean Score of Posttest | Gain |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Content | 18,8611 | 21,0417 | 2.18 |
| 2. | Organization | 15,9028 | 17,9306 | 2.03 |
| 3. | Vocabulary | 13,2917 | 14,5139 | 1.22 |
| 4. | Language Use | 12,0139 | 13,8472 | 1.83 |
| 5. | Mechanics | 3,2917 | 3,7917 | 0.5 |

Table 3 shows that the achievement (gain) obtained at the highest aspect of the contents of text (2.18), followed by the achievement of the vocabulary component (2.03). While the lowest gain is on the components of the writing (0.5) points. This means that the greatest contribution of Interactive Comprehensible Input-Output Instruction Written exist on the component of content and organization of student writing.

*2.2 Qualitative Analysis*

In conducting the treatments, the students were grouped into 9 groups consisting 4 students in every group. In a group, they were asked to discuss the content of the reading text, completing each other's lack in terms of vocabulary meaning, grammar used in the text, and the prediction of continuation of the story. One of the examples of the student' writing from draft to draft is as follows.

*2.3 Father's Love*

An old 80 years old man along with his 45 years old son was sitting on the sofa in their house. Suddenly, a crown perched on their window. The father asked his son, "What is this?" The son replied, "It is a crow".

After a few minutes, the father asked his son the second time, "What is this?" The son replied, "Father, I just told you "it is crow". "After a little time, the father asked his son the third time, "What is this?". At this time the son felt some irritation and replied, "It is a crow, a crow, a crow". Then, the father asked his son the fourth time, "What is this?", and the son shouted to his father, "Why you keep ask me same question again and again although I have told you many times IT IS A CROW".

Suddenly, the father took the old diary from his room. The father opened the first page of the old diary and his son read the following words on the old diary. When his son read the old diary, the father said, "When you were four years old, you asked same question that I ask to you right now again and again, but I still replied your question patiently". Listening his father's words, the son felt that he disappointed his father. Suddenly he hugged his father.

After every student had reconstructed the text and completed the text with their own prediction, the researcher exchanged every student's draft with the other student in the same group and the other group. Every student had to check and give feedback correction to what their friend had written in terms of five aspects of writing (content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics). After that,

327

every student checked the feedback given and did revision when it was necessary. From that first draft, several things corrected by the students were mainly focused on language use aspect because content, organization and vocabulary had been good. For the mechanics, it seemed the students did not really pay attention because it dealt with a small thing in writing, such as spelling, punctuation, and capitalization. The examples of feedback correction given were an inappropriate use of the word "old", misspelling of the word "crown", and misformation of regular past form "hugged". Those corrections were checked and revised by the students and that first draft became the second draft as follows (Text 1, Draft 2).

*2.4 Father's Love*

An 80 years old man along with his 45 years old son was sitting on the sofa in their house. Suddenly, a crow perched on their window. The father asked his son, "What is this?" The son replied, "It is a crow".

After a few minutes, the father asked his son the second time, "What is this?" The son replied, "Father, I just told you "it is crow". "After a little time, the father asked his son the third time, "What is this?". At this time the son felt some irritation and replied, "It is a crow, a crow, a crow". Then, the father asked his son the fourth time, "What is this?", and the son shouted to his father, "Why you keep ask me same question again and again although I have told you many times IT IS A CROW".

Suddenly, the father took the old diary from his room. The father opened the first page of the old diary and his son read the following words on the old diary. When his son read the old diary, the father said, "When you were four years old, you asked same question that I ask to you right now again and again, but I still replied your question patiently". Listening his father's words, the son felt that he disappointed his father. After that he hugged his father.

Every student's draft then was also checked and they were also given feedback. Each student revised the second draft to be the final draft. Correction was given on five aspects of writing in terms of content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics, for instance, capitalization on the use of capital letter for "*it is crow*", misformation of interrogative sentence and misformation of V-ing after the word "keep" for "*Why you keep ask me same question*", omission of and his son read the following words on the old diary. The student then revised that second draft and it became final draft as follows.

Father's Love

An old 80 years old man along with his 45 years old son was sitting on the sofa in their house. Suddenly, a crow perched on their window. The father asked his son, "What is this?" The son replied, "It is a crow.

After a few minutes, the father asked his son the second time, "What is this?" The son replied, "Father, I just told you "It is crow". "After a little time, the father asked his son the third time, "What is this?" At this time the son felt some irritation and replied, "It is a crow, a crow, a crow". Then, the father asked his son the fourth time, "What is this?" and the son shouted to his father, "Why do you keep asking me same question again and again although I have told you many times IT IS A CROW".

328

Suddenly, the father took the old diary from his room. The father opened the first page of the old diary. When his son read the old diary, the father said, "When you were four years old, you asked same question that I ask to you right now again and again, but I still replied your question patiently". Listening to his father's words, the son felt that he had made his father disappointed. After that, he hugged his father.

The three drafts above were made by the first group. It could be seen that ICWIOI could affect the production of student' writing ability from draft to draft in relation to writing aspect as follows (Heaton, 1991).

**Content**; the students could reconstruct and represent the global idea from the original text and brought it to reconstructed text they made. There was no idea left by the students.

**Organization**; the students could reconstruct the text based on the arrangement and chronological order of the story as in the original text.

**Vocabulary**; From reading input and cooperative work (Johnson et al., 2000; Kaur, 2000), the student could use some distinctive vocabulary used in the story such as *tattered diary, maintained, perched, pretended*, and *set up*. The students also could use new vocabulary which was not used in the original text as the similar meaning of the word to represent the idea of vocabulary used in the original text to their reconstructed text, such as *nephew*, *passed away*, and *wealth*.

**Language use**; from reading input and cooperative work, the student could use some past tense form to tell past events, differentiate and use direct sentence with different tense in it, and the use of nominal and verbal verbs.

**Mechanics**; the students could pay attention to the use of capitalization, punctuation of comma and full stop, and also spelling.

Table 2 shows the statistical t test results for comparison between the value written on the pretest and post-test was 5947 (df = 35). In means there is a significant difference between the values of students' writing on the pre-test to the value of writing students at post-test at a significance level of 0.001. It means that there is no significant effect of written implementation of Interactive Comprehensible Input-Output Instruction in improving student writing skills. These results support the indication of Long's (1980, 1985) which states that write directly influence the process of acquiring a second language. Comparison of the student's writing before and after the process of receiving the input, the input processing to achieve meaningfulness input and proceed with efforts to produce a paragraph indicates students' skills improvement. From the theory of meaningful input (Krashen, 1985), the results of this study indicate that an input can be meaningful if the student or language learners have the time to understand the input. On the other hand, as the opinion of Swain (1995), it is said that language learners will gain increased achievement if they are forced (pushed) to produce speech or writing. This study shows that if the content or messages obtained from the input has been compromised, the learner can be already forced to produce language. The resulting output of students becomes meaningful when language learners have the opportunity to receive feedback and make revisions to output their language.

The second result of this research is on the fifth aspects of writing: content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanic, Table 3 shows that the achievement of gain obtained at the highest aspect of the contents of text (2.18), followed by the achievement of components vocabulary (2.03). While the lowest gain on the components of the writing (0.5) points. This means that the greatest contribution of ICWIOI exists on the component content and organization of student writing. These results can be understood intuitively and empirically. Intuitively, the students who got the correct model for the preparation of the paragraphs of the input received the organization of writing. It is certainly good increases. Similarly, in terms of content writing, during the paragraphs processing period, students discussed and explored the passage so that they can write their predicted results in the next paragraph. It can automatically be estimated; they controlled the topics that would be written. The results empirically demonstrate the aspects of writing the highest achievement is the content (content), followed by orgnisation, use of language, vocabulary, etc.

The third Finding of this study is in the qualitative aspect. For narrative texts almost fifty percent of the students were able to predict the passage accurately and obtained key point developed appropriately. Forty percent of the students were able to acquire the basic ideas and predictions despite the passage in the development of different key points. There is only one group of students who have no precise predictions point, missing key development. For narrative text, only ten percent of the students were able to acquire the basic idea and developed key input appropriately anyway. Seven groups obtained appropriate input of basic idea, but not in the development of different key points. One group acquiring the basic idea is not appropriate and that the development of key point is incorrect.

This indicates that there is a common thread between the processes of understanding the inputs, from the raw input into the intake, and then become innate. If the third process is going well, it will generate understanding (comprehensibility) at the input (Li, 2013). Consequently on output resulted in process, learners will be able to develop the idea of thinking based on the meaningful input and the feedback they receive during the learning process.

## 3. Conclusions and Suggestions

Based on the analysis of the result, the following Conclusion and Suggestions can be formulated. There is a significant influence of Interactive Comprehensible Written Input-Output Instruction to improve the quality of students' writing. Comparison of the results of students' writing test before and after the implementation of Interactive Written Comprehensible Input-Output Instruction shows a significant difference. That means the treatment gives relatively positive effect. The value of students' writing for the better results after participating Interactive learning sessions of Written Comprehensible Input-Output Instruction is clear.

Of the five aspects of writing, the highest point of rehabilitation is on the important of the *content* and *organizational* aspects. This shows the effectiveness of the process input of the content of reading and writing as well as examples of existing paragraphs. This helps students improve their organization. In

330

terms of predictive capability and capacity to write, the most affected text type is the narrative text, rather than the anecdote text. More groups could predict the main idea and wrote precisely the key points in the narrative text rather than in the anecdote text. This is understandable because more students encounter narrative text rather than anecdote text.

## References

Ferdous, A. B. (2015). Investigating the Effects of Written Output and Input Enhancement on EFL Learners' Grammatical Development. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, *2*(7), 138-156.

Heaton, J. B. (1991). *Writing English Language Tests*. New York: Longman.

Izumi, S., Bigelow, M., Fujiwara, M., & Fearnow, S. (1999). Testing the Output Hypothesis: Effects of Output on Noticing and Second Language Acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *21*, 421-452. https://doi.org/10.1017/ S0272263199003034

Jacobs, H. L., Zinkgraf, S. A., Wormuth, D. R., Hartfiel, V. F., & Hughey, J. B. (1981). *Testing ESL Composition: A Practical Approach*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Smith, K. A. (1998). Cooperative Learning Returns to College: What evidences is there that it works? *Change*, *30*, 26-35. https://doi.org/10.1080/00091389809602629

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Stanne, M. B. (2000). *Cooperative Learning Methods: A Meta-Analysis*. Retrieved from http://www.tablelearning.com/uploads/File/EXHIBIT-B.pdf

Kaur, M. (2000). *The Use of Cooperative Learning Method in the Teaching of Learning Process of Reading Comprehension to Increase Learner Achievement at Tertiery Level* (Unpublished Masters Degree). Penang: Universiti Sains Malaysia

Krashen, S. (1985). *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications*. Beverly Hills, CA: Laredo Publishing Company.

Lantolf, J. P. (2000). *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Li, J. M. (2013). Reading and Writing: The Gap between Input and Output. *Shaanxi Jiaoyu* (Gaojiao), *12*, 55-57.

Long, M. H. (1980). *Input, Interaction, and Second Language Acquisition* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). University of California, Los Angeles.

Long, M. H. (1985). Input and Second Language Acquisition Theory. In S. Gass, & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 377-393). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Nation, I. S. P. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL Reading and Writing*. New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis.

Palmer, B. et al. (1994). *Developing Cultural Literacy through the Writing Process*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Qi, G. H. (2014). Rethinking the Relationship between Reading and Writing. *Journal of Jixi University*, *11*, 85-87.

Rivers, Wilga M. (1987). Interaction as the key to teaching language for communication. In a Wilga M. Rivers (Ed.), *Interactive Language Teaching*. NY: Cambridge University Press.

Sabarun. (2011). Improving Writing Ability through Cooperative Learning Strategy. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, *1*, 41-47. https://doi.org/10.23971/jefl.v1i1.35

Swain, M. (1995). Three Functions of Output in Second Language Learning. In G. Cook, & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principles and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honour of H.G. Widowson* (pp. 125-144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swain, M. (1995). Three Functions of Output in Second Language Learning. In G. Cook, & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principles and practice in the study of language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Varaprasad, C. (1994). *Research in Reading and Writing: Reading and Writing-An Integrated Approach*. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.

Yufrizal, Hery. (2013). Multi Media for Receptive and Productive Second and Foreign Language Skill Development. *International Conference on Education and Language*. Bandar Lampung: UBL, Indonesia.