Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research, volume 301
Seventh International Conference on Languages and Arts (ICLA 2018)

IDEA DEVELOPMENT AND ORGANIZATION OF THESIS PROPOSAL WRITTEN BY A GROUP OF EFL LEARNERS LEARNING WRITING THROUGH COGNITIVE GENRE-BASED APPROACH

Yenni Rozimela[1], Delvi Wahyuni[2], and Nora Fudhla[3]
[1]University Negeri Padang, Padang, Indonesia, ✉ yennirozi@gmail.com
[2]University Negeri Padang, Padang, Indonesia, ✉ delvi_wahyuni2000@yahoo.com
[3]University Negeri Padang, Padang, Indonesia, ✉ norafudhla@gmail.com

Abstract
This article is composed based on an analysis of thesis proposal introductions written by EFL learners in UNP who enrolled Paper Thesis Writing course. During the course, the learners were taught by Cognitive Genre-Based Approach (CGBA). The approach focuses on improving learner's writing ability in terms of the idea development and grammatical features. The analysis was conducted through analyzing 10 selected proposal introductions. The finding shows that the learners' idea development was sufficiently improved after being treated such approach as well as its organization. They had properly organized the ideas starting from stating the research topic, problems and purposes. Besides, some of them had already mentioned several gaps found in previous researches to support the current research problem. In addition, a few had already stated the rationale why the topic was proposed. Nevertheless, it was found that their grammatical features were still seriously troublesome. There were many grammatical errors found on those introductions. It can be inferred that GBCA is appropriate to improve the idea development and organization since the course was supposed to discuss the content of a proposal. Hence, there should be additional opportunities to emphasize the grammatical features.

Keywords: Thesis proposal analysis, Genre-Based Cognitive Approach, ideas development and organization

Introduction
In the meantime, teaching writing in EFL context has already become one of major focus in literacy research since writing skill is deemed to be difficult for EFL learners. According to Richard and Renandya (2002), the learners' common difficulties in writing are 1) generating and organizing ideas using appropriate vocabulary and 2) putting such ideas into an intelligible text. As for EFL students who enroll Paper Thesis Writing Course in UNP, beside having similar problems stated above, they also have many obstacles; such as the difficulty to find a worth-discussed research topic and gap, to state the research purpose and, and last but not at least, to use grammatical and language features correctly.

The difficulties above rest in the fact that EFL learners of Indonesian tend to use English as one of compulsory subjects to be tested instead of using it as the tool of communication. Moreover, Paper thesis writing is the first course taken to compose a proposal or a research report which requires specific ideas organization and language features. Although the learners had already taken preceded writing courses such as Paragraph Writing, Essay Writing and Article Writing, the composition of research proposal and report is obviously different. This situation calls for serious attention to overcome the learners' problem since writing research proposal and report is one of the requirements to graduate.

In accordance with the problems above, Genre-Based Approach (GBA) was implemented. This well-known approach was chosen since it is a framework for literacy education which places the text as the center of instruction and curricula (Johns. 2002). Besides, it empowers learners to access and understand particular text learned and increases their awareness of how the text works (Martin,1999). Another reason to implement GBA was there had been several studies discussed and proved that GBA had successfully promoted learners' communication skills (spoken and written) in English classroom (Dirgeyasa: 2016; Elshirbini and Elashri:

2013; Rivera: 2012; Luu: 2011). Nevertheless, there had been less attention and only few studies which implemented GBA in a course which tutors how to compose a research proposal or report though it is assumed that GBA would be so meaningful to be applied. Thus, it calls for attention to apply this approach to help the learners in writing such composition in Paper Thesis Writing course.

In implementing GBA in the learning process, there were several stages conducted by the researchers. The stages were 1) setting the context and and building field activities, 2) deconstruction, 3) joint construction and 4) independent construction (Rivera: 2012). The first stage was done to establish the learners' awareness of the social context and purposes of the text genre discussed in the course. Though this stage was placed prominently, it actually occurs during the process of learning continually. During this first stage, it involves the understanding of the text genre (research proposal), its context, its terminology and the mode of communication. Thus, the learners may discuss the purpose of research proposal and the type of language it uses. The next stage, deconstruction, was the step to analyze an authentic composition which belongs to the same genre (research proposal). This is the step where the learners learn about rhetorical structure of the genre and lexico-grammatical features used in such composition. Besides, they might compare several texts to know more and how to establish each part in several ways.

The next stage was joint construction in which the learners began to write the text belonging to the same genre involving lecturers support and mediation. In this stage, the learners were producing the text using the metalanguage they gained during the previous stages and the lecturers took place as the contributors. Having completed the joint construction stage, the learners created another text in the target genre independently, which is called independent construction stage.

Nevertheless, implementing this approach was considered insufficient since the learners' problem includes the use of language features. Hence, there should be particular approach in addition to GBA which can highlight the use of language features. To fulfill this need, a cognitive approach in terms of enriching grammatical knowledge was implemented to help the learners in writing a well-grammatical and well-composed research proposal or report. That is how the approach used in this research is called CGBA or Cognitive Genre Based Approach.

In addition, a rhetorical structure namely CARS (Create a Research Space) model proposed by Swales was used to implement CGBA in Paper Thesis Writing course (Swales and Feak: 2012). This model was used as a framework to analyze the flow of ideas and organization written in a research introduction. This model consists of three moves, they are 1) Establishing the Territory Move, 2) Establishing a Niche Move, and 3) Occupying the Niche Move. These three moves are the "frames" to organize and communicate ideas which function is to shape the ideas progression. Each of these moves is divided into several steps which function is to establish and communicate ideas. The rhetorical used is described in the following table:

Table 1. Adapted from Swales and Feak (2012)

Move	Steps
1. Establishing the Territory	1.a. Claiming centrality, by showing that the general research area is important, relevant, interesting and significant: (OBLIGATORY) 1.b. Introducing and reviewing items of research in the area (OBLIGATORY)
2. Establishing a Niche	2.a. Indicating a gap in the previous research (OBLIGATORY) 2.b Extending previous knowledge in some way (OBLIGATORY)
3. Occupying a Niche	3.a Outlining purposes or stating the nature of the present research (OBLIGATORY) 3.b Listing research questions or hypothesis (PISF) 3.c Announcing principal findings (PISF)

Note: *PISF – Present in Some Fields, but rare in others

Considering the problems and the applied approach mentioned above, the primary objectives of this article are to explain the learners' idea development and organization of research proposal introduction written by the learners who were treated by CGBA as well as their ability in terms of lexico grammatical features. Besides, it will discuss the effect and result of applying such approach to the learners.

Method of the Research

During the research, the four stages of GBA were implemented. In this study, CGBA was applied to improve learners' composition. This research was properly an experimental study, but this article would

likely just to describe the idea development and organization of research proposal introduction as well as the language features used. There were 10 research proposal introduction were analyzed. The ten documents were coded D1-D10. The instrument used was coding sheet consisting of the moves and steps of CARS' Swales model. In this sheet, any findings, comments and how the moves are established were noted. The data were analyzed following Miles and Huberman's techniques of data analysis (1984). Firstly, the data were reduced and tabulated in a table containing all of identified data collected from the documents. Besides, the identified data were summarized in a table by using tally procedure to ease the process of data analysis. Secondly, the data were displayed to describe the rhetorical structure written in the documents. Lastly, the data were interpreted to draw the conclusion. In addition, the grammatical features were also highlighted to see any probable errors.

Findings and Discussion

Based on the data analysis, it was found that:

1. Establishing the Territory move (Move 1) was stated by all writers.

The writers used centrality claiming of the research topic (Step 1.a) to establish this move and only 2 of them who cited some related previous researches (Step 1.b). Nevertheless, this study revealed that the identified Move 1 was not established appropriately. Moreover, most of the writer wrote the research area centrality repeatedly. Also, most of Move 1 was stated in too general or too broad area. Besides, the research area and the centrality claiming stated by the writers were not directly correlated to the real research problem proposed in the research.

In contrast, the identified Step 1.b was considered fairly written. Based on the data analysis, the identified step strongly supported the centrality claiming established earlier and had proven detail information about the previous researches reviewed such as the name of the researcher, the years and the result of the study.

Referring to the findings above, it can be seen that the students had difficulties to begin writing the initial section of introduction with appropriate scope of research territory and to narrow down their ideas. These findings go along with the study conducted by Fudhla (2014) who found that only one of 36 Introductions she analyzed had Move 1 been written repeatedly. It also proved that the generality and the repetition of Move 1 also occurred in other range of fields. This findings also supported by Paltridge and Starfield who state that there is a possibility to recycle several moves due the length of the text allowed and the various aspects examined (2007: 91).

2. Establishing The Niche Move (Move 2)

It was found that Move 2 was not established in all of the documents. The data show that only 1 out of the 10 documents' writers stated Step 2.a (indicating the gap found in the previous studies) and only 2 of them stated Step 2.b (extending the previous knowledge in some ways).

Based on the data analysis, the identified Step 2.a was fairly written by indicating the gap found in the previous studies through citing the information of the previous researches. Furthermore, the study revealed that one of Step 2.b was well and fairly written. The writer of this document had mentioned what strategy to be extended in her present research which was successfully applied by previous researcher. Besides, the writer had mention who had applied this strategy. In contrast, another Step 2.b was poorly written since the extension of the chosen strategy was not clearly explained and the detail description of who had used it previously was not cited.

Eventually, it was found that nearly all of the documents' writers had indicated a gap or problem to be solved. They had begun to use several key signals such as quasi-negatives to show the *mini-critique* like *but, nevertheless,* and *however*. Nonetheless, the gaps or problems indicated in those documents could not be identified as the gap or problem as demanded by CARS model. The gaps or the problems written in those documents could be classified as practical research problem instead of research- based research problem as proposed by Swales. Based on Swales' CARS model, the research problem should be found in the previous studies (Step 2.a and Step 2.a) while most of the documents' writers found the problem in the practice of educational setting such as in schools, colleges, courses, etc. Thus, instead of mentioning any kind of related previous studies to show the gap or to extend the tradition, most of the documents' writers tended to justify the research problem by showing the evidence taken from the fields, such as personal experience, others experience (such as teachers, students, school principles, etc) and preliminary study result.

The findings show that only a small number of writers stated Move 2 appropriately. The niche/gap based on CARS model should be stated through previous studies rather than in the educational practices. This probably happened because the students had not reviewed supported literatures or studies which

discussed the similar topic. Besides, it might be related to the students' course of program in which they were trained to be an English teacher so that they tended to find a problem in the educational practices rather than in previous studies. It is supported by Creswell who stated that most of educational researchers would likely to choose the problem they found in the educational settings (2009a: 76).

3. Occupying the Niche Move (Move 3) was already stated by most of documents' writers.

There were 8 documents stated Step 3.a (outlining or stating the purpose of the present research), 6 documents stated Step 3.b (listing research questions or hypotheses), 6 documents stated Step 3.c (announcing principal findings), 6 documents stated Step 3.d (stating the value of the present research) and none of the documents stated Step 3.e (indicating the structure of the research proposal).

Based on the data analysis, it was found that most of Step 3.a (outlining research overall purpose) was considered poorly written which falls into two category. First, it was noted that some of Step 3.a written was considered too general. It was because this step was stated with no description about what, where and who will be studied. Second, it was found that half of Step 3.a written was considered inappropriate. It was because the purpose was inappropriate with the research problem, research questions and principal findings. In other words, what was stated as the research overall purpose had nothing to do with the research problem described earlier.

Besides, it was considered inappropriate due to the choice of word or the type of the research. In contrast, only 2 out of 10 identified Step 3.a which were considered fairly written. It was because the documents' writers had already stated appropriate research purposes which were related to the research problem and had already mentioned what, where, and who will be studied. Like Step 3.a, it was found that more than half of the identified Step 3.b (listing research questions or hypothesis) was considered inappropriate.

The poorly written of Move 3 in almost all of the documents might be related to the findings which show that most of the documents' writers did not establish Move 2 (establishing the niche). Possibly, the students had not understood about their research problem which made them confuse to state the appropriate research overall purpose, research questions, principal findings and significance of the research. This assumption is supported by Swales and Feak who stress that there is a connection between Move 2 and Move 3. They said that, by the end of Move 2, both writer and reader would have a good idea of what is coming in Move 3 (2012: 348). Thus, the inexistence of Move 2 might have contributed to the poorly written and the inappropriate Move 3.

In addition to the findings above, it was found that there were a lot of grammatical errors found on the documents. The errors include the tense used, the choice of words, part of speech, etc. up to now, it can be assumed that the errors were because the Paper Thesis Writing Course was more focused on the content of writing instead of the lexicogrammatical features. Hence, it would be better to emphasize more about the language features.

Conclusion

Based on the research findings and discussion, it can be concluded that the learners' ability in writing research proposal was improved through CGBA implementation. Their compositions were considered fair enough and some of them had already composed the introduction in proper organization. Nevertheless, there were several grammatical errors found in their writing. It can be due to the process of learning through GBA was more focused the content and the text genre instead of the lexicogrammatical features. Hence, there should be appropriate approach to overcome the students' grammatical problems.

References

Ary, D., Jacobs, L.C., and Razavieh,A. 1972. *Introduction to Research in Education, 3rd edition.* New York: CBS College Publishing.

Briones, Roy Randy Y. 2012. Move Analysis of Phylosophy Research Article Introduction Published In the University of Santo Thomas, *Philippine ESL Journal, Vol. 9*, July 2012, p. 56-75. Retrieved on January 27th 2014.

Bunton, D. 2002. Generic Moves in Ph.D thesis Introductions in J. Flowerdew (ed.), *Academic Discourse.* London: Pearson Education.

Cheung, Yin Ling. 2012. Understanding the Writing of Thesis Introductions: An Exploratory Study. *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences 46 (2012) 744 –74. Elsevier Journal*. www.sciencedirect.com. Retrieved on January 27th 2014.

Creswell, J.W. 2009a. *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. New Jersey: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall

Dirgeyasa, I Wayan. 2016. Genre Based: What and How to Teach and to Learn Writing. *English Language Teaching*; Vol. 9, No. 9; 2016 ISSN 1916-4742 E-ISSN 1916-4750 Published by Canadian Center of Science and Education

Elshirbini, Ismail Ibrahim and Abd-ElFatah Elashri. The Effect of the Genre-Based Approach to Teaching Writing on the EFL Al-Azhr Secondary Students' Writing Skills and their attitudes towards writing.

Eriyanto. 2011. *Analisis Isi: Pengantar Metodologi untuk Penelitian Ilmu Komunikasi dan Ilmu-Ilmu Sosial Lainnya.* Jakarta: Kencana

Fudhla, Nora, Yenni Rozimela, Kurnia Ningsih. 2014. An Analysis of Students' Research Proposal Introduction Based On CARS Model at STAIN Sjech M. Djamil Djambek Bukittinggi. Journal English Language Teaching. Volume 2 No 2 July 2014. P. 66-77

Hult, Christine A. 1987. "Assessment Topics: The Importance of the Rhetorical Frame." *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, Vol. 10, Number 3, Spring, 1987. p.19-28. Council of Writing Program Administrators. Retrieved on October 23rd 2014.

Luu, Tuan Trong. 2011. Teaching Writing Through Genre Based Approach. *BELT Journal · Porto Alegre ·* volume.2/No. 1, p. 121-136. Retrieved on October 7th 2018.

Miles, Matthew B. and A. Michael Huberman. 1984. *Qualitative Data Analysis. A sourcebook of New Methods.* London: Sage Publication

Paltridge, Brian and Sue Starfield. 2007. *Thesis and Dissertation Writing in a Second Language: A handbook for Supervisors.* USA: Routledge.

Rivera, Jose David Herazo. 2012. Using A Genre-based Approach to Promote Oral Communication in the Colombian English Classroom. *Columbia Applied Linguistic Journal.* ISSN 0123-4641 • July - December 2012. Vol. 14 • Number 2 • Bogotá, Colombia. p. 109-126. Retrieved on October 7th 2018.

Swales, J.M. (1990). *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swales, J.M. and Christine B. Feak. 2012. *Academic Writing for Graduate Students. Essential Task and Skills, 3rd edition.* USA: University of Michigan Press

Suharsimi Arikunto. 2006. *Prosedur Penelitian. Suatu Pendekatan Praktik.* 4th Edition. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Weissberg, Robert and Suzanne Baker. 1990. *Writing Up Research, Experimental Research Report Writing for Students of English.* New Jersey: Prentice Hall. Wilkinson, A. M. 1991. *The Scientist's Handbook for Writing Papers and Dissertation.* Englewood Cliffs, Nj: Prentice Hall..