

THE USE OF RAFT STRATEGY TO IMPROVE THE STUDENTS' WRITING ABILITY

AmrohUmaemah
IAIN SyekhNurjati Cirebon
Amrohumaemahlayar@gmail.com
Mohammad Adnan Latief
a.adnanlatief@gmail.com
Eny Irawati
ennyingambek@gmail.com
Universitas Negeri Malang

Abstract: *Teaching English writing for the students of junior high school level needs high creativity, the students have to be encouraged to study hard to gain writing competence. Additionally, the students themselves face many problems: the lack of vocabulary and poor knowledge of grammar. The objective of the study is to improve the students' writing ability using RAFT strategy employing classroom action research (CAR) design involving two cycles, three meetings each. The observation to see the result of the implementation used questionnaire, observation checklist, writing test and field notes. The expected criteria of success were that all the students achieve the minimum passing grade 55 and 75% of them involve actively in the implementation of the RAFT strategy. Thirty students of grade 8 of MTs Salafiyah Syafiyah Babakan Ciwaringin Cirebon West Java participated in the study. The finding shows the implementation of RAFT strategy was successful to improve the students' writing ability. All the students achieved the score at least 55 and 74.24% of them actively involved in the process of teaching and learning.*

Key Words: RAFT strategy, improve, writing, ability.

BACKGROUND

The ability to produce spoken and written discourse is the aim of learning English in school. The process of teaching and learning English focuses on certain literacy level. According to Wells 1987(Depdiknas, 2007:79), Literacy stages include performance, functional, informational, and epistemic. Performance refers to the ability of the students to read, write, listen, and speak using the symbol. Functional aspects refer to the ability of the students to use the language to meet their daily needs. Informational level refers to the ability of the students to access knowledge using their language ability. The epistemic level refers to the ability of the students to express knowledge in the target language.

To develop writing skills requires that learners follow the process of learning how to get ideas, how to put them together, how to get them on the paper, and how to polish them into a piece of writing (Sorenson, 2010:3). The process of writing involves content, organization, vocabulary, language feature, and mechanic. A writing task involves simple sentences to elaborated texts or essays. It is the process of putting, discovering, and organizing feeling, beliefs, and the ideas through symbols through a well-constructed text. In other words, writing requires a specific knowledge that helps the writer to put her or his thought into words in a meaningful form and to communicate the message in the text. Brown (2007:391) considers writing as the most difficult skill for foreign language learners to master. Learning writing especially in second language needs to focus on many aspects in a certain time. Richard and Renandya (2002) explain that the difficulty lies on how to generate and organize ideas using appropriate choice of vocabulary, sentence, and paragraph organization, and how to translate the ideas using a readable text. So far, Bell and Burnaby (1984) in Ghazali (2010:293) add writing as a complex activity because the writer has to control sentences with some elements: structure, vocabulary, spelling, punctuation, etc. A writer needs to have enough language ability and general intellectual skills to generate and organize ideas in coherent, logically ordered, intelligible sentences and paragraphs in an essay. According to Richard and Renandya (303: 2004), L2 writers have to pay attention to higher level of planning and organizing as well as lower level skills of spelling, punctuation, word choice, and so on. Writers have to learn by developing the ability to manipulate language. Hyland (2003:3). Meanwhile, Raimes (1983:3) says that writing is useful to reinforce grammatical structure, idioms, and vocabulary and to get the students take adventure with the language. Additionally, Harmer (1998:79) argues that students essentially need to learn writing as a language skill. It indicates that writing ability is important to learn especially for the students of junior high school because the younger the learners are, the better they gain the acquisition of language especially in learning a foreign language. As stated by Snow and hoenvagel-hogles's study in Spada & Lightbown (2001:66) comparing child, adolescent and adult language learners, the adolescents were by far the most successful learners. Additionally, Spada and Light bown (2001:67) state that older learners of language could attain higher success.

Learning to write in English as foreign language needs appropriate ways to be effective. Thang Permpoon Tanatkun (2008:8) states that teaching writing skills to non-native students is challenging because it takes a long time to see the improvement. Furthermore, Galbraith(2009:20) adds that learning to write in a different language is not just a matter of developing linguistic skills. It is not a matter of talking thoughts in one language and trying to translate them into the words of another language. Writing is thinking and it is the effect of L2 on the writers' thought.

Dealing with the students' difficulties in writing English, Mukminatien (1991:114) states that the difficulties are not caused by the students themselves but also because of inappropriate techniques of approaching language teaching. There are any reasons Rozimela(2004:83) that teachers have treated writing unfairly, the big class size, limited time, teacher's low competence, and the requirements of the final examination. Concerning writing task, Byrne (1979:36) suggests for the students in the early stage writing activities controlled by the teacher. Teachers must avoid giving activities that do not encourage the learners to think about what they write and which in any case do not help them to understand how language forms. Last, teachers must demonstrate that writing has the purpose of communication.

The preliminary study conducted from August 7 to 12, 2014 shows that 30 students were given a test for writing short messages. The school decided the score 55 for the minimum passing grade for English. Only 9 students (30%) passed the test. The average score for the preliminary study is 47.5. The rest of the students failed for the writing test. In other words, the students have problems in writing short message texts. They had problems in using language feature in short messages. They took words from dictionary without considering the context of the sentence. Spelling, punctuation, and capitalization also contributed to their problem in writing.

In respect to the gap between the importance of writing in learning English and the students' problem in writing, Raimes (1983) in Parila santi et.al (2014) states, there are three reasons why teaching writing is important. First, writing reinforces the grammatical structure, idiom, and vocabulary that the teacher has been working with the class. When writing, the students have a chance to be adventurous with the language. Second, the students become more involved in the language with themselves and the readers. Mukminatien (1991; 135) adds that creating an interesting atmosphere in the classroom is a big job for the teacher.

The objective of the study is to improve the students' writing ability of the eight graders at *Madrasah Salafiyah Syafiyah Babakan Ciwaingin* Cirebon. In this study, the researcher used RAFT strategy to solve the students' problem in writing class. RAFT (Role-Audience-Format-Topic) is a system to help students understand core elements to organize paper. Mc.Charty(2014) explains that *Role* gives writers context to write, *Audience* focuses their choices of words and details to meet specific needs, *Format* can be flexible for any students' interest or learning profile, *Topic* structures the message using strong verbs to create expressions.

The function of RAFT strategy in writing process is to help students generate ideas by arranging RAFT assignment. In this step, students generate their idea by connecting Role, Audience, Format, and Topic for their writing in details. The students are ready to write the draft of writing after they have made the RAFT assignment. In other words, RAFT strategy has a significant role in writing process especially in prewriting stages. Alisa et al, (2:2013) add that RAFT strategy encourages students to write creatively and to think of a topic from various points of view to specific audience in a variety of formats of text.

The position RAFT strategy in the process writing is to open the students' mind for generating idea by connecting the concept of role, audience, format, and topic in their draft. The joining of four elements leads the direction of process of writing draft according to the context. Additionally the column of topic provides some vocabularies and language feature. Therefore, the writing process becomes easy. Furthermore, the students can solve their problems in generating ideas in writing short messages through RAFT assignment.

Sejnost &Thiese (2010:85) state that RAFT strategy also bolsters the students what it means to be a writer by making them aware of the impact that the topic and the format can meet their audience. Therefore, it makes students enjoy their writing. In other words, the insight as writers for learners in RAFT strategy affords to emerge the new spirit to explore their writing task.

Furthermore, RAFT strategy is simple but gives the students opportunity to explore their imagination of what they want to do according to their creativity after they have found ideas by working on the RAFT assignment. Groenke (2008) in Parila Santi et.al, (2014) said that RAFT strategy helps students make connection between prior and new knowledge, and among interconnected concepts, and provides context for thinking deeply about the topic.

Some studies of RAFT strategy have shown positive improvement for the students' writing. Parila santi, et. al (2014) indicated that there were significant differences in writing skillbetween students taught using RAFT strategy and conventional strategy. Lindawati,et.al (2014: 12) showed that RAFT strategy improved the students' performance in writing formal letter from cycle to cycle. It strengthens their sense of writers by making them aware of the impact of the topic on the format of their audiences. Furthermore, RAFT strategy also helped the students write better expressions in writing formal letters and respond the given writing prompts accurately. Sudarningsih & Wardana (2011:12) exhibited positive attitude, high learning motivation, as well as active participation in learning recount text writing.

The results of research above indicate that RAFT strategy is effective to solve the problem in the class of writing in different levels of school. The positive contributions in using RAFT strategy for writing class is relevant as pre writing strategy in the early stage of process writing, and it is in keeping with the characteristics of the students' problems in eight grade students of *MTS Salafiyah Syafiyah Babakan Ciwaringin Cirebon*.

METHOD

The researcher conducted the study using classroom Action Research (CAR) design to solve a classroom problem by developing a certain innovative instructional strategy. The model of classroom action research by

Kemmis and McTaggart (1988) cited in Latief (2015:146) was used in this study. It consists of four steps; Planning the action, Acting or implementing the instructional scenario, Observing or collecting data indicating the success of strategy in solving the classroom problem, and Reflection or analyzing the data to determine how far the data collected have shown the success of the strategy in solving the problem (Latief, 2015:149).

In planning, the teaching learning process was prepared. Based on the result of the preliminary study, the discussion with the colleagues, and reviewing reference, the researcher decided to use RAFT strategy in solving the students' problem in writing short messages. The strategy begins with activating the student's schemata by asking them questions related to the material of short messages, such as: *Have you experienced getting a short message? Who sent the short messages?* Then teacher then shares with the students the background information of the RAFT strategy, a useful technique to use when they first encounter some writing prompt. The elements of RAFT help the students focus on the appropriate purpose, audience, and topic. The teacher points out what each letter stands for and what it means. They have to use those elements (what the position of the writer is, who the audience is, and what the form of expression is) before they write. The teacher shows the video to sharpen their understanding of the four components as a unit in the process of brainstorming. The teacher assigns the students to work in groups of three, to discuss the RAFT model with samples of writing assignment. The students then have to identify the appropriate role, audience, format, and topic. After going over the RAFT, the teacher raises some questions related to their RAFT to sharpen the students' understanding:

- 1) *How will the role you are taking as the writer affect the way you write?*
- 2) *Who is going to be your audience?*
- 3) *How does it affect the word choice you will use?*
- 4) *What format is being required for this piece of writing?*
- 5) *What approach would you use for handling this topic?*
- 6) *What kinds of points will you include?*

Then the teacher should distribute other RAFT assignment model to the groups. The students have to discuss four elements in the prompt. Finally, the teacher has to ask the students to make their RAFT for short messages individually. The students then have to work for the process of writing: revising, editing and publishing, by adding, moving, changing or even deleting the detail in their draft based on revising guidelines. Then, they have to do the second revision by sharing their draft to their peers. Revising guidelines focuses their activity. The teacher has to go around the class to give feedback related to revising activity. The students write their draft based on the teachers' feedback and the peers' suggestion.

In the editing stage, the students focus their attention on grammar and mechanics: subject verb agreement, spelling, punctuation, and capitalization. Then the students rewrite their final draft. Last, the students apply the publishing process; the teacher guides the students to publish their writing by reading in their group or in front of the class. by posting on the wall magazines

or in school blogs. The teacher runs on-going assessment during the teaching learning process to check the students' writing progress.

In the implementing process, the researcher and the collaborator worked together to run the planned activities in class, the researcher as a writing English teacher and the collaborator as an observer during the process of teaching writing. The researcher and the collaborator investigated the class to make sure everything for implementing was in well condition.

Observing is the step of collecting data. The researcher administered a test to know the students' achievement and recording to know the students' motivation. While the researcher implemented RAFT strategy in teaching learning with the students, the collaborator observed the teaching and learning process focusing on the activities done by the teacher and the students.

The research instruments for gaining data are questionnaire, observation checklist, field notes, and writing test. The research used observation checklist to gain the data on the students' activities for running the RAFT strategy, from pre-writing, whilst writing, to post-writing. There are three indicators to measure the students' involvements in the process of teaching learning; (1) the students are able to answer the teachers' question orally, (2) The students do the teacher's instruction, and (3) The students are able to write in response to the writing task. The researcher used field notes during the teaching learning process and questionnaires to measure their response to the implementation of the strategy. The researcher administered a writing test in the last activity for each cycle to gain data about the students' achievement in writing short message texts. The product of the students was measured using scoring rubric. The points to score covered five components: content, organization, language use, vocabulary, and mechanics (Cohen, 1994:328:329). See Table 1. To avoid the subjectivity, the researcher involved two raters, the English teacher from MTsN *Lohbener Indramayu* and the English teacher from *MTs Salafiyah Syafiiyyah Babakan Ciwaringin Cirebon*.

Table1: Scoring Rubric

Aspect of Writing	Weight	Scores	Indicator
Content	8	4	The expressions clearly show the points of the message.
		3	The expressions partly indicate clear points of the message.
		2	The expressions indicate a little clear points of the message.
		1	The expressions do not indicate clear points of the message
Organization	7	4	The generic structure is complete
		3	The generic structure is almost complete
		2	The generic structure needs more components
		1	The Generic structure doesfollow the pattern
		4	Effective choice of words
		3	Adequate choices of words but few

Vocabulary	6	2 1	misuse of vocabulary Adequate but many misuse of vocabulary Very poor knowledge of words choices and verb form
Grammar	3	4 3 2 1	No errors, full control of structure Few errors, good control in structure Many errors, fair control in structure Dominated by errors, no control of structure
Mechanics	1	4 3 2 1	No errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization and paragraphing Few errors in spelling, punctuation, capitalization and paragraphing Frequent errors in punctuation, spelling, capitalization and paragraphing Dominated by errors in punctuation, spelling, and capitalization also paragraphing

Criteria of success are the measure of the success in applying the strategy used in solving the problem in the class. According to Latief (2014:161) the criteria of success for classroom action research are derived from the classroom problem to be solved and the classroom goal to be achieved. Based on the condition of the students of *Mts.Salafiyah Syafiyah Babakan Ciwaringin*, the minimum acceptable level is 55. The criteria were indicators to judge whether the implementation of the action has achieved the success (Mc.Niff, J., 1998:36). The criteria of success for the treatment use the formula that the study is successful if (1) all students achieve the minimum passing grade 55 and (2) 75% of the students participate actively in the teaching learning process.

Reflection is the last step in every cycle of classroom action research. Reflection gives a room for the researcher and collaborator to discuss the result of teaching writing process in the classroom to see whether the implementation has reached the success by matching the result of learning with the criteria of success.

The researcher conducted the study at Madrasah *Tsanawiyah Salafiyah Syafiyah Ciwaringin*, located on *Jl. Melati no 2 Babakan Ciwaringin Cirebon*. Most students lived in traditional Islamic Boarding House. The students never got English class when they were in elementary school. Their motivation to attend that place was to learn Islamic teaching in *pesantren*, because *Ciwaringin* is the center of Islamic boarding or *pesantren*.

FINDING

The writing scores show that the highest score was 75 while the lowest score was 46. As many as 60% of the students got the score higher than or equal 55 and 40% of the students got the score lower than 55. Therefore, based

on the criteria of success, the result had not reached the target yet. For identifying the student's involvement in the implementation of RAFT strategy, the collaborator examined the students' involvement in the class activities during implementation of action. The result of the observation checklist shows that there was significant improvement in the students' involvement. In meeting one, 69 % of the students were active in the teaching learning process whereas in meeting two, 73 % of the students were active, 80% of the students were active in meeting three.

The researcher made revision and improved the plan to be implemented in cycle 2. The revision was done on the basis of four items which became the problems for the students when they were in cycle 1. Referring to the classroom management especially, the arrangement of group work that influenced conducive learning atmosphere, the teacher made new group works for the students by choosing smart learners as the head of each group. Furthermore, in one group a smart learner was assigned as motivator in discussing activities. It was expected that the smart learners would help the slow learners in group work activity. The teacher gave them a RAFT assignment by giving an example suitable with their daily activities around them for the elements of topic. Hopefully, the students understood to the topic they want to express in their RAFT. Next, in vocabulary building, the students practiced how to find the words from dictionary.

In cycle two, the writing test was conducted on 2nd September 2015. The researcher involved two raters for scoring the students' writing. The result shows that their writing was getting improved. The students used appropriate words for their writing. They also made progress in the organization. They applied the generic structure for short message texts. Revising activity helped the students arrange the right generic structure based on the text. In editing, the students showed good improvement too. The students made progress in the use of grammar, choice of words, punctuation, and capital letters. Additionally, the students were happy when they got feedback from the peers and the teacher.

From the result of the test, the students' score obtained from rater 1 and rater 2 in this cycle shows improvement. It was found that all the students got the score equal or more than the minimum passing grade, of 55. Therefore, it can be concluded that the writing product of all the students have met the criteria of success.

The teaching learning process indicates that the students were actively involved during the action. In meeting one, 73% (23 students) were actively involved, in meeting two, 76% (22 students) were actively involved, and in meeting 3, 83% (25 students) were involved. It means the average students' involvement was good. Based on the result of writing test, the average score of students' achievement increased significantly. The students achieved higher than the minimum passing grade.

The result of the questionnaire shows that the students gave good appreciation, got good learning experience, and got enthusiastic in doing the writing tasks. In the three meetings, generally they looked busy and happy attending the activities (pre-writing, whilst-writing and post-writing). Many of the students (46.66 %) said that RAFT strategy gave them a room to express the ideas in writing and some of them (30%) commented they liked RAFT a lot.

The result of the students' writing test indicates that the students' achievement in writing test gradually improved. In cycle one, the average score of the students was 52, the highest score was 75, and the lowest score was 46. Meanwhile, in cycle two, the highest score was 79, the lowest score was 55, and the average score was 64. The students' involvement in the process of learning increased from cycle one (74%) to cycle two (77%). The students' response to the implementation of RAFT strategy also gave positive impact for their writing process.

The RAFT strategy that has successfully improved the students' writing quality as well as their attitude to the process of learning consisted of three steps: prewriting stage, whilst writing stage and post writing stage. The pre-writing stage is the process of activating the students' background knowledge by giving some questions related to the objective of learning. The question aims to recall their experiences for related topic to help them prepare for the learning process. In Whilst-writing activity, the teacher

- 1) guides the students to make groups of work and points the smart learner as leader of the group,
- 2) shows video of RAFT,
- 3) explains the importance of RAFT strategy for their writing process,
- 4) guides the students to observe the components of RAFT as tool of brainstorming (the role/position of the writer, the audience, format, topic),
- 5) gives a model of RAFT assignment,
- 6) guides the students to fill in RAFT assignment in groups,
- 7) asks one or two groups to present their RAFT in front of the class,
- 8) gives a model of RAFT for short message texts,
- 9) asks the group to observe RAFT of short messages,
- 10) Explains RAFT and generic structure of short messages,
- 11) guides the students to elaborate language feature of short messages,
- 12) guides the group to arrange RAFT for short messages,
- 13) assigns the group to arrange components RAFT as a unit idea of brainstorming,
- 14) asks the group to check the component of topic in RAFT,
- 15) guides the group to find words from dictionary related to the topic,
- 16) asks the group to decide grammar appropriate to the topic,
- 17) asks the group to make first draft based on RAFT made,
- 18) asks the group to present RAFT and their first draft in front of the class,
- 19) clarifies the group task,
- 20) asks the students to arrange RAFT for short messages individually,
- 21) asks the students to write their first draft individually,
- 22) asks the students to revise the draft by their peers using the revising guideline,
- 23) makes conference related to the draft,
- 24) asks the students to rewrite the draft based on the feedback from the teacher and the peer,
- 25) asks the students to edit their draft using the editing guideline,
- 26) guides the students to edit their draft from the peers' comment and the teachers' feedback,
- 27) asks the students to rewrite their final writing task, and finally

28) asks the students to publish their writing task by reading in front of the class, by posting on wall magazines and school's blog

In the Post writing activity, the teacher guides the students to draw a conclusion and reflection from the activities that they have done.

DISCUSSION

At the beginning of teaching learning process, the teacher asked the students about their condition to lead the students to the comfortable environment to activate the students' schemata with some questions concerning the objective of the activity. Therefore, there was interaction between teacher-students and students-students. It also made the environment comfortable and ready to the process of teaching learning. This is in line with the statement of Hammer (1985) that creating a favorable class is the key to reduce the students' reluctance to write. The warm environment stimulates the students to have positive interaction in the class and this makes them interested in the next process of teaching writing. Explaining the objective of the learning makes it clear to the students what to do in those activities. The questioning-and-answering technique is a part of teacher's role in motivating, guiding and evaluating the students' abilities. It could stimulate the students to enter pre-writing process.

Entering the prewriting stage, the teacher showed the students video on RAFT strategy for writing. This activity aims at making the students interested in understanding RAFT strategy as the process of prewriting. It supports Brown (2007) that teachers should be able to get a strategy and technique leading to being more effective in the teaching and learning process. As the research finding of this study shows, RAFT strategy could improve the students' involvement in the process of teaching writing from cycle to cycle. The response of the students from the questionnaire shows that 21% of the students liked RAFT strategy and 62 % of students liked it very much. It indicates that RAFT, as one of the strategies of writing process, changes the students' perspective from difficult, boring, and complicated into easy skill. Furthermore, RAFT was familiar to the students with different abilities, trends, and levels especially in the process of brainstorming. This is in line with Gebhard (1996)'s brainstorming, in which students call out ideas associated with the topic while the teacher or a student writes the idea on the board. Showing RAFT by video and discussing it with the group of students provide learning experiences to the students.

Next, the research finding in drafting activity shows that the way the students work in groups could help improve their draft. In the first cycle, the process was not effective. Some students dominated the activities in the group work. In other groups, some students worked individually. In the second cycle, the researcher changed the members of the groups so that each group had a student who was able to manage the process of discussion. In this activity, each student participated working in groups. Besides, the teacher went around giving instruction, valuable information, and feedback, while the students were working on the steps of RAFT assignment as the process of prewriting. It was the main activity in working on the writing task. This statement supports Tompkins & Hoskisson (1991) that prewriting is crucial to writers as warming up athletes. If there is an optimal guidance from the teacher in digging up students' idea on the

pre writing stage, automatically students could go to the drafting and make progress to the next activity.

From the result of observation on students' involvement in drafting, the finding indicates that the students followed the process by participating in any of the steps of drafting like: understanding RAFT, making RAFT assignment in groups, arranging RAFT in groups, presenting RAFT assignment, making RAFT assignment for short messages individually, and drafting. The students experienced a new way of learning; working together in groups and giving the impression of being enthusiastic. They were busy doing the task and sometimes talking to each other asking about vocabularies or clarifying the responses they got from other members of the group. The improvement from cycle to cycle indicates that the students enjoyed the process of writing.

Revising activity is the process of improving the draft. The students reread their draft, shared the draft in the small group or peers, and got feedback from the teacher. They did the revising activity using a guideline. Most of the students got a lot of feedback in vocabulary use and grammar. This is in line with Smalley, et.al (2001:9) who recognize the major ways of revising: in Ferris adding, cutting, replacing, and moving. We may have to add a word, phrase, sentence, or even paragraph to support and sharpen our ideas.

The students' involvement and response during the activity show that they were enthusiastic. At the first time, they were not confident in checking their draft but after getting help from the teacher, they were able to revise their draft. Later in cycle 2, progressively they did revising activity with the peers. The finding of this study shows that the comments from peers help them make better understanding for their writing task. This is in line with Sommer (1982) who suggested that the teacher communicate to the students what needs revision or change for the next draft. Besides, feedback for the students in their writing gives valuable contribution. It supports Ferris (2004:62) that the students who receive feedback or correction produce more accurate text than those who do not receive feedback.

The students made a conference with the teacher. This activity was in line with Church (1993) in O' Malley and Pierce (1996) who state that conferencing is an important component in the process of writing in which the teacher meets the students individually and asks questions about the process of their writing. The students felt happy when the teacher gave feedback on some parts of their writing. Furthermore, the conference made the interaction between the teacher and the students more intense. Through the conference, the students participated more in both revising and editing.

The last step in the process of writing is publishing. The students read their writing in their group. Only some students were willing to share their writing in front of the class in cycle 1. The teacher continuously explained that publishing was the last process in writing and the main activity of publishing was to share their writing to the others. Finally, in cycle 2, more students were willing to share their writing. They read their writing in turn in that group. From each group, one student represented their group to share their writing in front of the class. Some students chose to share their writing by posting their writing in wall magazines and some others chose to share their writing in the school blog.

The use of RAFT strategy in teaching writing was effective to improve the students' writing skill. RAFT gave inspiration to the students to consider the

importance of aspects before writing, the position of the writer, the audience, the form of the text, and the subject. Those four components make a unit in the process of writing especially in pre-writing as the way of brainstorming.

The study shows that the students were able to develop the idea through RAFT. The process of getting ideas or brainstorming using RAFT stimulated the students to write according to the various topics but focused to the mission of writing after arranging the components (RAFT) for their writing. The implementation of teaching writing using RAFT created good interaction between student – student and students – teacher. Consequently, it brought positive attitudes for the students in the process of implementing RAFT strategy in the class. The Implementation of RAFT strategy helped the students make positive progress for their writing skill. In the process of brainstorming, the use of RAFT stimulated the students to get the idea by making RAFT assignment for their draft of writing. The students developed the ideas steps by steps according to the context they have chosen. Using RAFT, they also felt as real writers because the concept of RAFT strategy gave inspiration for the students to write what they want to write according to their choice. It supports Greece that the RAFT strategy can be used as a writing strategy and or as strategy for helping students to prepare for small or large discussion. During the implementation, RAFT strategy motivated the students to understand the importance of group work in writing class as a learning process. It also attracted the students to write according to the context they used. Besides, the students also could relate their experience in their life for the topic of their draft of writing. The improvement of students' writing ability shows that they made progress in learning writing through RAFT strategy.

CONCLUSION

The students' writing ability and their involvement throughout the implementation of RAFT strategy progressively improved. The result of students' writing test shows that the implementation of RAFT strategy helps them increase their writing ability. So far, RAFT strategy gives positive effect for the students' involvement and motivation in the process of teaching learning writing. The RAFT strategy covers several steps from helping students to working in groups as the first step to publishing in the last step.

SUGGESTIONS

As the result of the fact that RAFT strategy gives positive effect for the students' writing ability and the students' motivation, the researcher suggests the English teachers who have similar problems in the classroom apply RAFT strategy in their writing class. The researcher recommends the future researchers especially who are interested in implementing RAFT strategy conduct further study on applying RAFT strategy to improve the students' writing by using other types of genre like descriptive, narrative, recount etc.

REFERENCES

- Alamis, Ma Melvyn, P 2010 *Evaluating students' reactions and responses to the teachers' written feed backs*. Philippine ESL journal(Online) Vol. 5, (40-41), (<http://www/Philipine journal.com>) Retrieved 5 Mart 2014.
- Alisa, T. P., Rosa, R.N. 2013. *Raft as Strategy for Teaching Writing Functional text to Junior high school students*. (On line) Journal of English Language Teaching, volume1 no.2 March 2013.FBS State University of Padang. Retrieved November 20, 2014
- Brown, H.D.2007.*Teaching by principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*.(2nd ed.) New York, Longman.
- Byrne, D.1979.*Teaching Writing Skill*. Essex: Longman
- Depdiknas.2006. *Permendiknas2006 tentang SI&SKL*Jakarta: SinarGrafika
- Ferris, D.(2004)The grammar correction debate in L2 writing: Where are we and where do we go from here here? (and what do we do in the meantime?). Journal of Second Language Writing 13 (1).Retrieved (Online), <WWW.sciencedirect.com>.Retrieved Pebruari 12th 2015.
- Ghazali,A.S.2010.*Pembelajaran Keterampilan Berbahasa*.Bandung :Rafika Aditama
- Galbraith, David.,(2009). *Cognitive models of writing*. GFL- journal (German as foreign language) no 2-3/2009.ISSN 1470-9570.(Online), WWW. [gfl.journal.de/2-2009/ galbraith](gfl.journal.de/2-2009/galbraith). Retrieved 14November 2014
- Gebhard,Jerry-Greer.2000.*Teaching English as a Foreign or Second Language: A Self-Development and Methodology Guide*.AnnArborr: University of Michigan Press.
- Harmer,J.2004. The Practice of English Language Teaching.(4th edition).Essex: Pearson Education.
- Hyland, K.2003. *Second Language Writing* Cambridge: Library of Congress Instruction on Strategies Online RAFT
<Http://olc.spsd.skca/DE/PD/Instr/strat/raft/>
- Latief, M.A.2014. *Research Methods on Language learning An Introduction* State University of Malang
- Lightbown,P.M.,Spada,N.2001.*How Languaged Learned* Oxford University press
- Lindawaty,J.,Sudarsono,Clarry,S., *Implementing RAFT Strategy to enhance students' skill in writing formal letter*Jurnal : Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran UNTAN. Online volume 3 no 9 (2014) Retrieved 2ndJanuary 2015.
- Masangya,Elaine M. Lozada,louella, *An Investigation on the relationship between the language exposures and errors in essays of high school students*. ESL Journal.Online, vol. 2,Index February (<Http://www/Philipine ESL journal.com>) Retrieved 2nd March 2014
- McNiff, Jean. 1998. Action Research: Principles and Practice.London:Macmillan
- Mukminatien,N.1991. *Making A Writing Class Interesting*Teflin Journal: an EFL Journal in Indonesia,Volume 4 Number 2,Oktober 1991.
- Parilasanti, Elis Ni Made., Suarnajaya, I wayan,Marjohan,Arsril.,*The Effect of RAFT Strategy andAnxiety upon Writing Competency of the Seven Grade Students of SMP Negeri 3 MengwiInAcademicYear 2013/2014*. Jurnal Penelitian UNDIKSHA,online, Volume 2 no 1(2014)
- RAFT Galleryforexamples.<http://www.Geocities.com/Writingprocess/Gallery.html>

RAFT.<http://wvde.Wv.us/Strategybank//RAFT.html>.

Raft Strategy of the month.<http://forpd.ucf.edu/strategies/Raft Strategy-jan 09.html>.

Raimes,A. 1983.*Techniques in Teaching Writing* Oxford: Oxford University Pres

Richard, J.C., & Willy A. Renandya2002*Methodology in Language Teaching*

Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

Scrivener, J.2005*Learning Teaching: A guidebook for English Language*

Teachers, Macmillan.

Sejnost&Thiese.2010. *Implementing RAFT Strategy to enhance students' skill in writing formal letter*.Portal Garuda.org/article. Retrieved 3rd January 2015.

Tangpermpoon.(2008) *Integrated Approaches to Improved Students Writing Skills for English Major Students*. ABAC,Online,28(2):1,(Online), [www.journal.au.edu/abac.../01\(19\)article](http://www.journal.au.edu/abac.../01(19)article), Retrieved 13 December 2013

Tomkins,Gail E.,&Hoskisson, Kenneth. 1991, *Language Arts: Contents and Teaching Strategies*. New York :Machmillan publishing company.

