

## **The Effect of Crawford Series Teaching (CST) on the Students' Writing Achievement**

**Aswadi Jaya, Hermansyah, Asti Veto Mortini**

[aswadijaya@yahoo.com](mailto:aswadijaya@yahoo.com)

**Universitas PGRI Palembang**

**Abstract:** This experimental study aimed to investigate if there was any significant difference in writing ability between the students who were taught by Crawford series Teaching technique and those who were taught by using individual writing technique. Two classes of the first grade students of SMAN 5 Palembang were selected randomly as the sample of the study; experimental and control groups. Each group consisted of 28 students. The instrument used in this study was a set of pre and post-tests. This study used t-test to see the difference achievement between experimental and control groups in terms of writing descriptive paragraph. The result showed that the students in EG achieved better performance in writing descriptive paragraph. P-value got from T-test was 0.02; it was less than the level of significance (0.05). Furthermore, the mean score of the post-test of the EG increased 13.35 points compared to the pre-test, while there was a progress of 6.67 points in the CG. The result also showed a great improvement in the five aspects of writing (content and mechanical, organization, vocabulary, and grammar. In conclusion, students' achievement in writing descriptive paragraph improved significantly through Crawford Series Teaching technique.

---

**Keywords: CST, writing, descriptive paragraphs.**

### **I. BACKGROUND**

Writing is more difficult than speaking. To say orally in English is easy (Oshima & Hogue, 1997; Thornburry, 2002; Swan, 2005). Reid (2006, p. 4) refers to writing as a skill that involves not just a graphic representation of speech, but the development and representation of thoughts

in a structured way. Blanchard and Root (2003, p. 1) argue that writing can be

as long as people understand w difficult even in our own language. In a new language, writing is even more difficult. The good news is that writing involves skills that we can learn, practice, and master. Oshima and Hogue (1997,p. 3) also assert that

writing, particularly academic writing, is not easy. It takes study and practice to develop this skill. It is important to note that writing is a process, not a product. This means that a piece of writing is always possible to review and revise.

Various methods and techniques as well as classroom activities have been applied to improve students' writing skills. However, the students' achievements are still insufficient. The Indonesian Government also has tried various policies to improve the quality of students' writing skills in English. The Government has changed the national curriculum for several times, from 1947 until Curriculum 2013 as recently applied in Indonesia (Saharuddin, 2013). Ideally, the revision is expected to bring improvement to education system that will enhance the quality of Indonesian human resources. Regarding these curriculum revisions, a great number of teaching methods, paragraph books and other teaching media have been adjusted in order to cope with the curriculum demands including English as one of the subjects taught at school.

However, if we notice the result of a survey conducted by English First (EF) in 2014 regarding the English Proficiency Index (EPI) in English non-native speaker countries, it illustrates that Indonesia is classified into the "moderate proficiency"

country which ranks at the 32nd place among 70 countries. This inconvenient fact shows us that the existence of English pedagogy in Indonesia year by year is still unsuccessful in which the students failed to acquire the language, in this case English. Moreover, Hamied (1997, cited in Huda, 1999) reported that the overall students' performance in Indonesia was very low. This could possibly be caused by other factors revealed by a survey conducted by Huda (1999). He stated that based on his survey, the teachers' competence in Indonesia is still 'gloomy'. Thus, teachers should improve their competence in teaching, otherwise, students' achievement will never increase.

In teaching writing, teachers should find creative ways to design activities in the classroom that can recommend and motivate students to learn. For achieving such a situation, teachers should devise a conducive learning activity that enables students to use the target language. In line with this case, Harmer (1998) states that teachers should apply effective strategies which can encourage the students to be more active and motivated in the teaching and learning process. They should provide an environment in which students can contribute to learning activities. The activities should maximize students' use of target language as well. Therefore, this

study found that CST was a possible technique to improve students' writing skills (Kagan, 1992; Lie, 2002; McCafferty, Jacobs & Iddings, 2006; Kagan & Kagan, 2009; Santoso, 2011; Sulisworo & Suryani, 2014).

## **II. METHOD**

This study was conducted at State Senior High School (SMAN) 5 Palembang. Two classes of the first grade were randomly selected as the sample. The first class was the experimental group, and the second one was the control group. The total sample chosen consisted of 56 students; 28 students in the experimental group and 28 students in control group. The two groups were homogenous in terms of language proficiency. The students of the experimental group were taught writing descriptive paragraph by using CST technique, while the students in the control group were taught by using individual writing technique. To collect the data, the study used test; pre and posttests as the instrument. The pre-test was given to both groups in the first meeting, while the post-test was given to both groups at the end of teaching and learning process. In both tests, students were asked to write a composition in the form of descriptive paragraph. The students' written paragraphs were assessed

by researchers. Scoring rubrics (content, organization, vocabulary, grammar and mechanics) were used to mark students' score. The data of the students' writing scores in pre-test and post-test of the experimental and control groups were then analyzed statistically.

## **III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

This part presents the results of the study based on the data obtained from the

students. First, the results of quantitative data collected from the pre-test and post-test of both experimental and control groups are analyzed. Second, the progress of the aspects of writing of the experimental group is presented.

### **Research Question 1**

The first objective of this study is to find out whether there was any significant difference in writing ability between the students who were taught by using Crawford series teaching technique and those who were taught by using individual writing technique. To meet the objective, students' writing scores were analyzed statistically.

**Table 1: Statistical summary of mean score of the pre-test of the experimental and the control groups.**

Table 1 shows the result of mean score calculation towards the pre-test scores of the experimental and the control groups. Based on the table above, it can be seen that the mean score of pre-test of the experimental group is 51.04. Meanwhile, the mean score of the control group is 52.04. Thus, the average initial writing ability of both groups is similar.

**Table 2: Statistical summary of mean score of the post-test of the experimental and the control groups.**

| <i>Group</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Mean</i> | <i>Std. Deviation</i> | <i>Std. Error Mean</i> |
|--------------|----------|-------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Experimental | 28       | 64.39       | 9.46                  | 1.79                   |
| Control      | 28       | 58.71       |                       |                        |

Table 2 shows the result of mean score calculation towards the post-test score

of the experimental and the control groups. Based on table above, it can be seen that the mean score of the post-test of the

| <i>Group</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Mean</i> | <i>Std. Deviation</i> | <i>Std. Error Mean</i> |
|--------------|----------|-------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Experimental | 28       | 51.04       | 9.49                  | 1.79                   |
| Control      | 28       | 52.04       | 8.43                  | 1.59                   |

experimental group is 64.39. Meanwhile, the mean score of the post-test of the control group is 58.71.

**Table 3: Statistical summary of independent sample t-test of the post-test of the experimental and the control groups.**

Table 3 shows the result of independent sample T-test of the post-test of the experimental and the control groups.

| Aspects      | Pre-test | Post-test |
|--------------|----------|-----------|
| Content      | 50 %     | 60 %      |
| Organization | 48 %     | 68 %      |
| Vocabulary   | 52 %     | 67 %      |
| Grammar      | 43 %     | 58 %      |
| Mechanics    | 59 %     | 69 %      |

The table depicts that p-value is 0.02. The value is less than the level of significance (0.05). It indicates that there is significant difference of achievement in writing descriptive paragraph between students who were taught by using CST technique and those who were taught by using individual writing technique. Therefore, CST technique can be an alternative to be applied in improving students' achievement in writing descriptive paragraph.

### Research Question 2

The second objective of this study is to identify the progress of each writing aspect made by the students after being taught by using two Crawford series

| Levene's Test for Equality of Variances |      |      | t-test for Equality of Means |                 |                 |
|---|------|------|------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| F                                       | Sig. | T    | Df                           | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean difference |
| 0.14                                    | 0.71 | 2.44 | 54                           | 0.02            | 5.68            |

teaching technique were. The progress of writing aspects in the experimental group can be seen in the following table

**Table 4: The students' score of writing aspects of the experimental group in pre-test and post-test.**

Table 4 shows the score of writing aspects gained by the students of the experimental group in both the pre-test and post-test which portrayed a significant improvement in each aspect of writing.

### IV. INTERPRETATION

The result of the test showed that Crawford Series Teaching technique could help students in making their writing descriptive paragraph better. Based on the result of the test, the students who were taught by using Crawford Slip method got higher scores in pre-test and post-test than

those who were not by Crawford Series teaching.

Based on the writer's observation during the treatment process, the students could develop their writing. The students had good responses to their activities in experimental group. We can see in statistical analysis of the result of pre-test and post-test in which the students could develop the content, organization, vocabulary, language use, mechanics well. Besides Crawford series teaching gave them information about the characteristics and the meaning of the text then can develop their information with their own words. Overall, the experimental group had improved their ability in writing descriptive paragraph and also eliminating their difficulties in writing descriptive paragraph.

Based on the result of the post-test in the control group, the writer found out that the highest score was 69 reached by 4 students and the lowest score was 60 reached by 4 students too with the average score was 64.80. it can be interpreted that the control group made progress. Meanwhile, the result of the post test in the experimental group, the writer found out that the highest score was 87 reached by 4 students and the lowest score was 75 reached by 4 students too with the average score was 81.14. It means that the

experimental group made progress, even better than what the control reached.

Besides, the result of paired and independent sample t-test shows that were significant effects on the students' writing achievements after they were taught through Crawford slip method. The result of paired sample t-obtained is -2.45 (left -side test), where the value of t-table was 1.697 at significance level of 0.05 and with one tailed testing. The post-test result of the experimental group shows that the students got higher score that the students in control group and the result of independent sample t-obtained was 1.86 at significance level of 0.05 and with one tailed testing. Since the value of t-obtained was higher than the value of t-table, consequently the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) was rejected and the alternative hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) was accepted.

In conclusion the use of Crawford series teaching was effective in teaching writing of the tenth grade students in improving their writing especially writing descriptive paragraph. They also found it interesting as they could develop their idea and creativity

## **V. CONCLUSION**

There is significant difference of achievement in writing descriptive paragraph between students who were taught by using CST technique and those who were taught by using individual writing

technique. The students who were taught writing by using CST technique achieved a better performance in writing descriptive paragraph compared to those who were taught by using individual writing technique. This fact can be proven by comparing the mean scores of the pre-test and post-test of the experimental and control groups. There was a progress of 13.35 points in the experimental group. Meanwhile, there was a slight progress which was only 6.67 points in the control group. In addition, the fact can be proven as well by looking at the result of Independent Sample T-Test of the post-test of both the experimental and the control groups. P-value gained in the result was 0.02. It was less than the level of significance (0.05). The students in the experimental group showed a great improvement in the five

aspects of writing as well. The aspects included content, organization, vocabulary, and grammar and mechanics usage. It was found that all of the aspects increased more than 10%.

## **VI. SUGGESTION**

The result of this study suggested to those teachers who teach English lesson at Senior High School in Palembang to use CST technique as a possible way in teaching writing. As the study was limited to Senior High School 5 Palembang, it is suggested that other researchers conduct further research and more focus on all the aspects of writing rather than only focus on content, organization, lexical items, and grammar and mechanics usage. We also suggest an extension of future research to see the students' motivation by using CST in teaching writing.

## **REFERENCES**

- Blanchard, K., & Root, C. (2003). *Ready to write more: From paragraph to essay*. London: Longman.
- Crawford, A., Saul E.W., Mathews, S., & Makinster, J. (2005). *Teaching and learning Crawford strategies for the thinking classroom*. New York: The International Debate Education Association.
- English First English Proficiency Index. (2014). *EF EPI country rankings*. Retrieved November 10, 2015 from <http://www.ef.edu/epi>.
- Harmer, J. (1991). *The practice of English language teaching*. New York: Longman.
- Harmer, J. (1998). *How to teach English*. New York: Longman.
- Huda, N. (1999). *Language learning and teaching: Issues and trends*. Malang: IKIP Malang.

- Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Smith, K. A. (1998). *Cooperative learning returns to collage: What evidence is there that it works?* Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.
- Johnson, D. W. & Johnson, R. T. (2009). *Making cooperative learning work*. Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.
- Kagan, S. (1992). *Cooperative learning*. San Clemente, CA: Kagan Cooperative Learning.
- Kagan, S. & Kagan, M. (2009). *Kagan cooperative learning*. San Clemente, CA: Kagan Publishing.
- Lie, A. (2002). *Cooperative learning: Mempraktikkan cooperative learning di ruang-ruang kelas*. Jakarta: Grasindo.
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2001). *How languages are learned*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McCafferty, S. G., Jacobs, G. M., & Iddings, A. C. D. (2006). *Cooperative learning and second language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oshima, A. & Hogue, A. (1997). *Introduction to academic writing*. New York: Addison Wesley Publishing Company.
- Reid, J. M., (2006). *Essentials of teaching academic writing*. Boston: Heinle.
- Saharuddin. (2013). *Perubahan kurikulum dan kualitas pendidikan di Indonesia*. Retrieved November 10, 2015 from [http://www.kompasiana.com/%20saharuddin\\_lasari/perubahan-kurikulum-dan-kualitas-pendidikan-di-indonesia](http://www.kompasiana.com/%20saharuddin_lasari/perubahan-kurikulum-dan-kualitas-pendidikan-di-indonesia).
- Santoso, R. (2011). *Types of cooperative learning model CST* Retrieved January 29, 2015 from <http://serc.carleton.edu/introgeo/cooperative/techniques.html>.
- Sulisworo, D. & Suryani, F. (2014). The effect of cooperative learning, motivation and information technology literacy to achievement. *International Journal of Learning & Development*, 4(2), 58-64.
- Swan, M. (2005). *Practical English usage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thornbury, S. (2002). *How to teach vocabulary*. London: England Pearson Education Limited.