

APPLYING CORRECTION GAME IN TEACHING NOMINALIZATION TO IMPROVE STUDENTS' WRITING OF DISCUSSION TEXT

Siti Aisyah Dailla Fasha
Indonesian University of Education, Bandung, Indonesia

Hasna Parida Bachtiar
Indonesian University of Education, Bandung, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Related to curriculum 2013 which is currently applied in Indonesia, students are required to learn genres and later write the text independently. Based on prior observation, one genre which is learned and considered difficult to write for tertiary students is argumentative discussion. They often face difficulties in delivering and elaborating their opinions and reasons in writing discussion text since they do not know exactly how to do so. Using qualitative design and Systemic Functional Linguistics analysis, this study attempts to identify the discussion text written by expert in which becomes the basic reference to discover the main problem found in the students' texts which later help to find correction game as pedagogical implication to improve students' writings. The results show that the expert's text is an ideal model of discussion text. Besides, there are two problems appeared in the students' texts in term of the situational contexts such as lack of nominalization and the absence of passive sentence. The former becomes the major problem since it is assumed to affect the appearance of the latter. The implementation of Correction Game integrated in the genre based approach teaching reveals as pedagogical implication as well an alternative solution to develop the students' abilities in writing discussion text.

Keywords: *Discussion text, Correction Game, GBA, Nominalization*

Sari

Berkaitan dengan penggunaan kurikulum 2013 di Indonesia, para siswa diharuskan mempelajari jenis-jenis teks dan kemudian menuliskannya secara mandiri. Salah satu jenis teks yang dipelajari dan dianggap sulit oleh siswa SMA adalah teks diskusi argumentasi. Para siswa seringkali menghadapi kesulitan dalam menyampaikan dan menguraikan pendapat dan alasan ketika menulis teks diskusi karena mereka tidak tahu dengan pasti bagaimana menuliskannya dengan baik. Dengan menggunakan metode kualitatif dan analisis *Systemic Functional Linguistics*, studi ini berusaha untuk mengidentifikasi teks diskusi yang ditulis oleh ahli yang dijadikan landasan untuk mengidentifikasi masalah utama yang ditemukan dalam teks siswa yang kemudian dapat membantu menemukan permainan koreksi sebagai implikasi pedagogis untuk meningkatkan kemampuan menulis mereka. Hasil studi menunjukkan bahwa teks yang ditulis oleh ahli merupakan model ideal dari teks diskusi. Selain itu, terdapat dua

masalah dalam hal konteks situasi yang terdapat pada teks siswa seperti kurangnya nominalisasi dan ketidakadaan kalimat pasif. Kurangnya nominalisasi menjadi masalah utama karena diasumsikan berdampak pada munculnya masalah yang kedua. Penerapan permainan koreksi yang diintegrasikan dalam pengajaran berbasis teks muncul sebagai implikasi pedagogis dan solusi alternatif untuk meningkatkan kemampuan siswa dalam menulis teks diskusi.

Kata Kunci: *Teks Diskusi, Nominalisasi, Permainan Koreksi, Pendekatan berbasis Teks*

Received 30 June 2018 last revision 15 August 2018 published 26 September/2018

Introduction

In learning English as foreign language, writing is one of four essential skills (reading, listening, speaking and writing). Related to the current curriculum namely curriculum 2013, students are required to learn genres and later write the text independently. Genre discussed here is considered as text types (Christie, 1990; Cope and Kalantzis 1993a, Callaghan, Knapp and Noble, 1993). Based on prior observation, one genre which is learned and considered difficult to write for tertiary students is argumentative discussion.

Discussion text is a factual text that explores different sides of an issue in order to reach an informed judgment or recommendation (Butt, et al; 2000). In learning discussion text, students are provoked to think critically and give their ideas clearly as the supporting evidences of the issue discussed (Rachman, 2016). However, they often face difficulties in delivering and elaborating their opinions and reasons in writing argumentative discussion text since they do not know exactly how to do so.

By applying Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) analysis to understand the context of the situation which includes three metafunctions of language: a. ideational (to express and construct ideas or information), b. interpersonal (to interact), c. textual (to construct coherent and cohesive texts) and to discover the context of the culture (Halliday, 1994a), the text created by an expert and by students will be compared. The analysis result of the expert text will give the ideal example of discussion text, conversely; students' text is identified to find the kinds of problems they face in producing the text.

Therefore, it is intriguing to discover pedagogical implication of the problems which is later implemented in genre-based stages.

This study aims to find out the analysis results of the discussion texts produced by the expert and the students using SFL analysis which further become the consideration to determine the implementation of correction game as the pedagogical implication of the problems. In line with the purpose, the following questions are addressed:

- a. How is the analysis result of the expert's text?
- b. What is the main problem revealed in the students' texts compared to the expert text?
- c. How is correction game implemented as pedagogical implication in genre based learning to improve students' writing of discussion text?

Methods

Since the purpose of this study is to collect, examine, analyze, describe and categorize textual data using interpretative analysis, qualitative design is considered appropriate (Creswell, 2000). It is also in line with the statement of Hamied (2017) that qualitative methodology is suited best to address 'why' and 'how' questions and to get the in-depth exploration on a phenomenon. In this case, discussion genre created by expert and students are the phenomena in the form of descriptive data that are analyzed in detail.

There are three documents analyzed namely discussion text written by an expert and two students. The title of the expert text is 'Boarding School' while only two students' texts are selected entitled 'Online Transportation' represents high achiever and 'Town' represents low achiever. Analyzing the discussion text as the data by using Systemic Functional Linguistics is started by identifying the context of the culture such as the social purpose and the schematic structure of the text. It is then followed by analyzing the context of situation: ideational, interpersonal and textual metafunction.

Results and Discussion

a. The Expert's Discussion Text

The result shows that the text is considered as an ideal model of discussion text if seen from the cultural and the situational context. The former is noticed from the pro and the con arguments of the text entitled 'Boarding School' which reveals conclusion at the end of the text. The text aims to present two perspectives from the writer about boarding school issue. In addition, there are 4 paragraphs of the text. The first paragraph is introductory statement (issue statement), followed by pro arguments presented in the second paragraph, and contra arguments in the third paragraph. The fourth paragraph as the closing contains the conclusion of the arguments. The latter indicates that the text is dominated by: material and relational attributive process type, nominalizations and abstract nouns, causal circumstances, present tense finite, several passive sentences, circumstantial adjunct, emotive words, and topical themes.

Table 4.1
Process types shown in the expert's text

No.	Process Type	Occurrence	Percentage
1	Material	8	26.67%
2	Behavioral	3	10%
3	Mental	3	10%
4	Verbal	3	10%
5	Relational Identifying:	2	6.66%
6	Relational attributive:	8	26.67%
7	Existential	3	10%
	Total	30	100%

Table 4.2
Nominalization shown in the expert's text

No.	Nominalizations	Occurrences
1.	Which (their arguments)	1
2.	Interacting and communicating	2
3.	Living and studying	1
4.	Their self-confidence	1

Table 4.3
Abstract nouns appeared in the expert's text

No.	Abstract Nouns	Occurrences
1.	Which (advantages)	1
2.	Which (their arguments)	1
3.	Interacting and communicating	2
4.	A Arts and crafts, music and theatre, as well as many different sporting activities	1
5.	Living and studying	1

6.	their self-confidence	1
----	-----------------------	---

Table 4.4
The occurrence of circumstances in the expert’s text

No.	Circumstances	Occurrence
1	Time	1
2	Location	-
3	Manner: means	2
4	Cause	5
5	Accompaniment	4
6	Matter	1
7	Role	1

Table 4.5
The occurrence of tenses finite in the expert’s text

No.	Tenses Finite	Occurrence	Percentage
1.	Present	29	96.67%
2.	Past	0	0%
3.	Future	1	3.33%
	Total	30	100%

Table 4.6
Types of adjunct appeared in the expert’s text

No.	Types of Adjunct	Occurrence	Percentage
1.	Circumstantial Adjunct	18	62.07%
2.	Conjunctive Adjunct	9	31.03%
3.	Mood Adjunct	2	6.9%
	Total	29	100%

b. Problems Found in the Students’ Texts (Compared to the Expert’s Text)

The students’ texts point out that the problems are in term of the situational context namely lack of nominalizations and the absence of passive sentence. The writer assumes that the absence of passive sentences is due to lack of nominalizations particularly as subjects. Thus, the former is considered as major problem since it relates to the appearance of the other problem.

Table 4.7
Nominalizations found in the expert's and the students' text

No.	Expert	Occurrence	Text 1	Occurrence	Text 2	Occurrence
1.	Which (their arguments)	1	Application	2	association	1
2.	Interacting and communicating	2				
3.	Living and studying	1				
4.	Their self-confidence	1				

c. The Pedagogical Implication: why it should be game

Correction' game is a language game aimed to identify grammar mistakes. It is useful grammar game and can be prepared very quickly and played with small classes. Hadfield (1990) defined game as "an activity with rules, a goal and an element of fun". In deciding which game to be used in a particular class and which game will be most appropriate and most successful with their students, teachers must take many considerations into account such as the level of the game that suits the students' language levels and the type of the game that fits the learning objective.

Richard-Amato (1996) further stated that, even though games are often associated with fun, the implementation of game in teaching should not lose the sight of their pedagogical values, particularly in second language teaching. Games are effective because they provide motivation, lower students' stress, and give them the opportunity for real communication. There are reasons of why games are considered as learning aids, among others are:

- 1) They spur motivation and students get very absorbed in the competitive aspects of the games,
- 2) They lower students' stress in the classroom,
- 3) Students learn without realizing that they are learning,
- 4) Increasing students' proficiency,
- 5) Games provide language practice in the various skill-speaking, writing, listening and reading.
- 6) Learning a language requires a great deal of effort, games help students to make and sustain the effort of learning.

d. Integrating ‘Correction Game’ to Genre based Approach to Teach Nominalization

- Building Knowledge of the Field

This stage focuses on building background knowledge and the content of the topic (Gibbson, 2002; Rothery, 1996). The teacher chooses one issue that invites pro and contra arguments like ‘online transportation’. The teacher and the students share what they know about the issue as well as the advantages and the disadvantages of it. Later, she or he can have the students deliver their arguments in spoken. Finally, the teacher explains the students that different from spoken arguments; there are ways in delivering written arguments to sound more objective.

- Modeling Stage

This stage is designed to introduce the students with the text so they can read it and deconstruct it (Rothery, 1996 cited in Emilia, 2005). It aims to create students’ understandings of the purpose, schematic structure and language features of the genre. As nominalization is related to the language feature, so at this stage the explanation about nominalization is carried out more deeply. Activities conducted in this stage are (Emilia, 2005).

- 1) Introducing the students with the written argumentative genre called Discussion including the purpose and providing a model of discussion text,
- 2) Presenting the schematic structure of the text,
- 3) Guiding them to notice each language feature contained in the text followed by giving clear and detail explanations of the features particularly about nominalization. Telling them that nominalization is a way to make the arguments in the text sound more objective in order to achieve the social purpose of the text itself.
- 4) Presenting other discussion texts.

- Joint Construction

This stage refers to the activities in which the students do something more practical. They do the exercises by modifying and manipulating the text given. Guided by the teacher, the students reconstruct the text, revise and paraphrase the vocabulary usage

before going forward to the next stage. At this stage, integrating 'Correction' play is conducted through some steps, as follows:

- 1) The teacher writes 10-15 sentences on the board. All the sentences are taken from a discussion text. The teacher has to tell the class that each sentence contains a mistake and they are supposed to concentrate on the grammar points particularly nominalization based on what they have studied recently,
- 2) The teacher separates the class into two teams (A and B),
- 3) The teacher tells the teams to read the sentences and look for the mistakes, as it is a game, they have 100 points to start with,
- 4) Team A starts and chooses a sentence for team B to correct,
- 5) Team B decides how many points they would like to gamble (the more confident they are, the more points they will gamble),
- 6) The maximum bet is 50 points, and the teacher should impose a time limit for their consultation,
- 7) If team B identifies the mistake, the teacher adds their points. If they don't identify the mistake, they lose the points and team A has a chance to pick up the points by correcting the sentence. If they answer correctly, they get the points that team B proposed,
- 8) It is then the turn of team B to choose a sentence for team A to correct and so on.
- 9) After the game ends, the teacher decides the winner team and gives a reward,
- 10) The teacher then asks the students to arrange the sentences that have been corrected into a discussion text.

- **Independent Construction**

This is the last stage in which the students are required to produce the text independently. In this case, the teacher must be sure that the students have understood what they have learned in the previous stages. The instructions to make the students produce their texts individually are:

- 1) Asking the students to choose the topic,
- 2) Having them write a draft,
- 3) While setting out their drafts, the teacher can remind them how to write nominalization and other grammatical features that they have learned and applied in joint construction stage,

- 4) When the students finish their writing, they are encouraged to consult each other. Then, the students can consult with the teacher who acts as a facilitator.

Conclusion and recommendation for further research

Based on the findings, this part attempts to review on the analysis result of the expert's text, the main problem revealed in the students' texts compared to the expert's text and the implementation of correction game as pedagogical implication.

Employing SFL analysis as a framework, the analysis result shows that the expert text is an ideal model of discussion text since its characteristics suits the theories taken from Eggins (2004), Butt et. al (2000), Derewianka (1991) and Emilia (2005). After comparing the students' texts with the expert's text, the problems revealed are in the case of situational context including lack of nominalization, the absence of passive sentences, the lack number of clauses and the dominant use of marked theme. It is assumed that lack of nominalization is the main problem since it causes on the appearance of another problem which is the absence of passive sentences. Therefore, to improve the students' writings of discussion text, pedagogical implication through the integration of 'correction game' to genre-based approach teaching is conducted.

It is advisable to carry out the further research to evidence the pedagogical implication of this study. Besides, as there are many problems found in the students' texts, other pedagogical implications are wisely recommended to explore as an effort to enhance students' writings of discussion text.

References

- Butt, et.al. (2000). *Using functional grammar: An explorer's guide* (2nd edition). Sydney: Macquaire University.
- Callaghan, M., Knapp, P., and Noble, G. (1993). *Genre in practice*. In Cope, B., and Kalantzis, B. (1993). *The powers of literacy. A genre approach to teaching writing*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Christie, F. (1990). *The changing face of literacy*. In Christie, F. (1990).(Ed). *Literacy for a changing world*. Melbourne: ACER.

- Cope, B., and Kalantzis, M. (1993a). *Introduction: How a genre approach to literacy can transform the way writing is taught*. In Cope, B. and Kalantzis, M. (1993). (Eds). *The powers of literacy. A genre approach to teaching writing*. London: The Falmer Press
- Cresswell, J. H. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Boston: Pearson.
- Derewianka, B. (1991). *Exploring how texts work*. Sydney: Primary English Teaching Association.
- Eggin, Suzanne. (2004). *An introduction to systemic functional linguistics* (2nd edition). New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Emilia, Emi. (2005). *A critical genre-based approach to teaching academic writing in a tertiary efl context* (Dissertation). Australia: The University of Melbourne
- Gibbons, P. (2002). *Scaffolding language and scaffolding learning. Teaching second language learners in the mainstream classroom*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Hadfield, J. (1990). *A collection of games and activities for low to mid-intermediate students of english*. Intermediate Communication Games. Hong Kong: Thomas and Nelson and Nelson and Sons Ltd.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1994a). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. (2nd ed). London, Edward Arnold.
- Hamied, F. A. (2017). *Research methods: A guide for first-time researchers*. Bandung: UPI Press.
- Rachman, L. A. (2016). *Argumentative discussion text analysis*: lukmanarifrachman.blogspot.co.id.
- Richard-Amato, P.A. (1996). *Making it happen*. New York: Addison Wesley Publishing Group. Pp 192-199.
- Rothery, J. (1996). *Making changes: Developing educational linguistics*. In Hasan, R., and William, G. (1996). (Eds). *Literacy in Society*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman Limited.

Biography

Siti Aisyah Daila Fasha is a post graduate student in Indonesian University of Education, Bandung, Indonesia. She obtained her S.S. degree in Literature (2013) from

School of Foreign Language Yapari ABA at Bandung. She is interested in conducting research related to Systemic Functional Linguistics, Genre based Approach and Reading to Learn. She can be reached at sdailafasha@gmail.com

Hasna Parida Bachtiar is a post graduate student in Indonesian University of Education, Bandung, Indonesia. Her undergraduate study was from English Department of Sunan Gunung Djati State Islamic University. Now, she focuses on doing her research about Reading to Learn (Systemic Functional Linguistics); besides, she has great concern for English for Young Learners subject. Please feel free to contact her at hasnaspiba@gmail.com.

