

Getting Students to Write English Articles for Publication: Student Writers' Responses

Bambang Suwarno*, Arasuli

Faculty of Education and Teacher Training, University of Bengkulu, Bengkulu 38371, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: Bambang Suwarno, E-mail: wdsaraswati@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Article history

Received: July 26, 2018

Accepted: October 15, 2018

Published: December 01, 2018

Volume: 7 Issue: 7

Advance access: October 2018

Special Issue on Language & Literature

Conflicts of interest: None

Funding: The research was financed by the Directorate General of Higher Education, Ministry of Research, Technology and Higher Education, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

There has been a scarcity of writing instruction that aims to enable EFL students to write English articles for publication. This study aims to fill out the gap by developing a procedure for such an instruction and exploring student writers' responses to the procedure. The design was descriptive, within the context of project-based learning. The subjects comprised some students of an English program at a public university in Bengkulu, Indonesia. Sampling was purposive and included 2 groups. The instrument was a questionnaire. The result showed that the subjects generally *agreed* to the steps for the writing instruction. The benefit levels of instructor's activities were generally viewed as *high*; however, the benefit levels of students' activities were perceived from *low* to *high*. Skills cultivated in the instruction were viewed as transferable to other tasks. The students wanted the final drafts to be directly processed by the editor prior to publication. Adequacy of access for electronic source was *high* while that of print source was *moderate*. The students expected that reference tools were provided by the institution. Students' overall productivity was low. Further study is recommended to refine the instruction.

Key words: Writing Instruction for Publication, Writing in EFL, Subjects' Responses, English Article

INTRODUCTION

The era of globalization has arrived in South East Asia, with the implementation of AEC (ASEAN Economic Community) since 2016. Globalization is a process of continuous integration between various countries (Mrak, 2000), in which goods and services move freely across the countries. As a result, various companies and institutions need to produce goods and services that are competitive to those produced by other countries (Pekerti, 1998). In particular, educational institutions in the area need to improve their educational practice, in order to prepare students and teachers for the challenge.

Indonesia may need to improve its competitiveness. As an example, the three best universities in the country are ranked at 839th, 859th, and 1129th, respectively (Ranking Web of Universities, 2018). Publication is included in performance indicators; thus, one factor that may affect the rank is the low volume of scientific publication, in which one of the main causes is poor English writing skills, as observed by Sangkot Marzuki, the chair person of Indonesian Science Academy (Hermansyah, 2016). Mr. Marzuki further states that English is important in writing in scientific journals and students need to be able to elaborate ideas and express them in writing.

If the end goal is to produce publishable writing in English, it is essential to develop an instruction to lay the foundation for improving students' skill for writing publishable works. In tertiary institutions, writing is generally associated with academic writing while publication is associated with getting articles accepted in academic journals. However, a program to enable undergraduate students to publish articles in academic journals might not be doable, as a similar program for postgraduates, who have higher capabilities, might not yield publication (Nielsen & Rocco, 2002).

What might be doable is a program to engage student to write for publishable general articles. In reading and writing courses, some materials consist of general articles. It stands to reason that a course for enabling students to publish also deals with general articles. Hopefully, the skills and procedures, which are cultivated in the program, could later be applied when the students need to write academic articles.

While there is an extensive body of literature on improving students' writing skill, there is a scarcity of studies that discuss programs for improving students' writing skills for publication. While models for such programs might be available from project-based instruction studies, not all such studies deal with publication. For example, Thitivesa (2014), Kovalyova, Soboleva, & Kerimkulov (2016), and Kusmar-

tini (2018) offered insights on the benefits of project-based learning; however, they did not deal with writing instruction for publication.

Thus, the few studies that dealt with project-based instruction that aimed for publication merited closer attention. For example, Minerich (2001) implemented a project-based learning in various ESL and EFL classes in South East Asia. The students managed to publish newsletters and were generally interested in the program, as they could view the result of their hard work in the published articles. Meanwhile, Foss, Carney, McDonald, & Rooks (2008) implemented project-based learning in their English classes. The publication consisted of Wikipedia and student newspaper projects. The students managed to publish both types of publication and were excited about the projects. However, there were two difficulties. One was a shortage of resources in English, while another was lack of sufficient time for writing and revising drafts so that their final products were less refined.

In a previously unpublished study, the writers introduced a simple instruction model, at a public university in Bengkulu, Indonesia, to enable students to write articles for publication in a public newspaper. The simple model was based on Reid's (1988, 1993) writing procedures. The outlet for publication was a supplement in a local weekly newspaper in Bengkulu city. Within the period of the study, a dozen of articles got published in the newspaper. It might be the first time that student initiated English articles appeared in a local public newspaper. In a post study review, it was concluded that the benefit of the published articles might be greater if these articles could be collectively published in a book or anthology, as this could last longer for retention and provide models for future students.

Accordingly, the study aims to develop a simple procedure for engaging students to write English articles for possible publication in an anthology. The simple procedure, described in section 3.3., incorporates steps for writing that are recommended by Reid's (1988, 1993), within the frame of project-based learning (Thomas, 2000, and Kriwas, in Fragoulis & Tsiplakides, 2009). As the procedure needs to benefit students, a crucial aspect in project-based learning is to explore how the participating students view the model.

Therefore, the specific goal of this study is to find out student writers' views on *various aspects* of the procedure for enabling students to write English articles for possible publication in an anthology. The *various aspects* include (1) general aspects, (2) instructor's activities, (3) students' activities, (4) track record attachment, (5) preparation of manuscripts before publication, (6) dictionary and thesaurus and (7) access to material resources. The students were limited to those from an English program of a public university in Bengkulu, Indonesia. The articles were limited to general articles.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The core foundation of this activity is authentic writing instruction, to provide students with authentic tasks to produce authentic materials/products, in the form of publishable articles. Authentic instruction consists of authentic materials

and authentic tasks. Authentic materials are the ones that are not produced for the purposes of language learning (Nunan, 1988). In other words, an authentic material is not specifically designed for language learning but to meet the needs in the real world. Examples of authentic materials are articles (newsletters, newspapers, and magazines), brochures, and announcements.

On the other hand, real-world tasks require learners to engage in behavior that is required outside of the language class (Nunan, 2001). In other words, a real-world task is one that is intended to meet the needs in the real world or is commonly run in the real world. The benefits of authentic tasks and materials were shown e.g. by Losada, Insuasty, and Osorio (2017), in which teachers were made to reflect on their practice while students got positive impacts in linguistic and affective domains.

Instruction on writing English articles for possible publication involves authentic tasks and materials. The tasks in preparing such articles need to follow the steps in preparing for publication in the real world, if they are to satisfy the required standard. The materials sources for writing needs to be taken from public newspapers and magazines while the articles for publication are not specifically produced for classroom learning, but for reading by customers.

With respect to instruction, one model that could be employed is some type of project-based learning (PBL). Based on a review on PBL literature, Thomas (2000) concludes that it is a model that organizes learning around projects. Furthermore, a project is a complex task that engages students in problem-solving or decision-making that allows them to work autonomously for some time and facilitates them to deliver realistic products or presentations. Meanwhile, Kriwas, in Fragoulis & Tsiplakides (2009), states that PBL involve four stages, namely, speculation, designing a project, conducting the project, and evaluation. The speculation stage aims to arouse students' interest and get them to choose a topic. The designing stage involves students to form groups and locate sources of information. The conducting stage engages students to collect information, process it, and synthesize it to develop a product, which would be displayed in school or community. The last stage, evaluation, encourages students to assess activities. In this study, the stages are somewhat modified, as shown in the method section.

An assumption underlying the instruction is possibility of transfer of some skills from writing general articles to writing academic articles. Justice, Rice, & Warry (2009) declare that "transfer is the process of using knowledge or skills acquired in one context in a new or context" (p. 2). James (2010) revealed that transfer occurred, although in a varying degree. It occurred more in some grammar aspect to others, more in some disciplines (such as humanities) than others (such as natural sciences), and more to specific tasks (such as synthesizing materials) than others (such as explaining calculations).

In this study, the intended product is an article or a feature, which needs the following elements (Mappatoto, 1993, 1994):

1. Theme, or core idea, which guides the whole writing and can be expressed implicitly or explicitly

2. Title, which should attract the readers' attention
3. Lead, which is an early paragraph to capture readers' attention, to encourage them to read on
4. Body, which develops the theme in paragraphs and needs to be written coherently, in order that readers could understand the author's ideas
5. End, which should be expressed convincingly.

Reid (1988, 1993) states that the composition writing process includes several stages, namely: a) setting a topic, b) writing an outline/framework, c) reading references and making notes, d) writing a draft, e) making revisions, if necessary several times, f) editing, g) preparing the final manuscript. Stages (d) and (e) are spiral processes, i.e. revision to a draft produces a new draft that needs to be revised further. The revisions to the drafts should not be done instantly, but be given a delayed period, from several hours to several days. The goal is to allow the subconscious mind to work and possibly provides new input at the next revision stage. Editing is mainly done after the last revision, to produce the final script.

This study employed both teacher and peer feedbacks. Miao, Badger, & Zhen (2006) indicated that peer and teacher feedbacks had their own roles. Peer's feedback increased student's autonomy while teacher's feedback led to improvement in writing. However, if the goal is to enable students to write publishable articles, what is crucial in the writing process is peer cooperation, as writing can be viewed as an interaction between individual authors and peers, whose benefits were shown to apply to the receiver (Behin & Hamidi, 2011), as well as to the giver (Rouhi & Azizian, 2013).

Minerich (2001) argues that a publication project offers stimulating challenges for the students. Publication projects give opportunities for ELS students to practice all skills. They use reading skills in reading sources and review peers' drafts. They use listening and speaking skills when they work together or consult the instructor. They use writing skills to develop drafts and perform revision and editing. The collaborative process helps students to view writing as a process. As the products are targeted for real audience, students might be motivated to pay attention to each stage during the writing process. If the articles get published, the students have visible products as proofs of their commitment. Apart from increasing their motivation, the products could also benefit the institution as a proof of their success. In this project, a teacher needs to serve multiple roles, such as an advisor, director, or facilitator, depending on the circumstances. In general, the teacher has to establish a structure but allows students to work independently on their own or with colleagues.

METHOD

This study constituted a part of a wider research that employed simple research and development design (Borg and Gall, 1989), which essentially comprises four elements, namely, need analysis, development of a product, evaluation and revision. The need was established by the necessity for a simple teaching and learning procedure for writing in English for publication; the development consisted of

incorporating the writing instruction procedures from Reid (1988, 1993), within the frame of simple project-based learning (Kriwas, in Fragoulis & Tsiplakides, 2009). The evaluation comprised elicitation of views from student participants. Revision would be performed after this study was finished. This study deals with the evaluation, through the elicitation of the student writers' views on the procedure. Thus, the design was descriptive.

Population and Sample

The population consisted of the undergraduate students of an English program at a public university in Bengkulu, Indonesia. The samples, selected purposively, comprised two advanced writing classes, namely, group 1 (semester 4, 32 students) and group 2 (semester 6, 34 students).

Instrument

The instrument was a questionnaire, which elicited students' views on various aspects of the writing instruction procedure. The Likert scale was used with various options but similar values (see table 1).

Procedure

The simple procedure for writing instruction for publication was developed, based on the steps suggested by Reid (1988, 1993) and Zhang et al. (2014), within the frame of project-based learning, as suggested by Kriwas, in Fragoulis & Tsiplakides (2009). The procedure proceeded as follows:

- a. Performing initial activity and designing the project

Here there were two parallel activities.

 - 1) The lecturer gave some sort of workshop for article writing. The workshop contained aspects such as learning sample articles, learning to recognize plagiarism, learning to read materials and to paraphrase or summarize pertinent information on cards. The stress was on cultivating originality, as this is strictly required for publication. The lecturer also informed the students that the articles were to be 1250-1500 words in length.
 - 2) The students were required to read up to 30 articles. They needed to consider 3 tentative topics, select a definite topic, and write an outline.
- b. Conducting the project: writing a draft

Basically, article writing was done independently. However, the students were also engaged in peer review and correction. The instructor gave a general suggestion for the initial drafts. However, in subsequent activities, the instructor only gave a suggestion if a student requested it. He also checked students' drafts randomly, in particular to point out whether or not the language used in a piece of text was original.

Steps were applied as follows:

- 1) Students wrote an initial draft, using materials that they had read.
- 2) Students printed out the initial draft and performed peer correction. The emphasis was on revision, involving

Table 1. Alternative choices of the questionnaire

Op.	Value					
	5	4	3	2	1	0
1	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No answer
2	Very high	High	Moderate	Low	Very low	No answer

Op.: Option

content and organization. The peer needed to provide written feedback on the initial draft.

- 3) Students revised the initial draft, using the peer's suggestions as well as adding new materials; the revised draft was prepared in two versions: the marked file (with revision marks) and the clean file (without any marks).
- 4) Students were encouraged to use standard dictionaries. The researchers provided standard thesauri.
- 5) Students printed the second draft, the clean version.
- 6) Students performed another peer correction on the second draft. Now the emphasis was on editing, involving structure, vocabulary, and mechanics.
- 7) Students made another revision, using suggestions from peers and adding more materials, if necessary. Students performed the last check, using grammar and spelling check from the word processing application. The results were final drafts, which were prepared in two versions, i.e., the marked file and the clean file.
- 8) Students submitted folders, containing the final manuscript.

Each folder contained the final manuscript and track record attachment, which consisted of drafts, in both marked and clean versions, cards, and revised drafts, in both marked and clean versions.

c. Evaluation and further processing

There were two kinds of evaluation. The first concerned the evaluation of the procedure and constituted the topic of this article. The other, an evaluation of drafts by potential users, was beyond the scope of the article.

After submission of the first article, every student developed the second article. The steps for writing the second article were similar to those for the first article. The instructional period lasted for three months.

Technique for Data Analysis

The questionnaire results were analyzed in simple descriptive statistics. To process the data from the administration of the questionnaire, the weighted average was used, as follows:

$$\frac{\sum fxw}{\sum f}$$

Note:

$\sum fxw$: Sum of (frequency of selection times weight of selection)

$\sum f$: Sum of frequencies

The interpretation for the weighted average is described in table 2.

Table 2. Interpretation of weighted average

No	Interval range	Category	
1	4.3-5.0	Very high	Strongly agree
2	3.5-4.2	High	Agree
3	2.7-3.4	Moderate	Neutral
4	1.9-2.6	Low	Disagree
5	1.1-1.8	Very low	Strongly disagree

Conventional rounding was used

For questionnaire data that are not of Likert scale, frequency and percentage were used.

FINDING

This study aims to develop a *procedure*, within the context of project-based learning, as described in sub-section 3.3, to enable EFL students to write general English articles for publication. The procedure consisted of (1) performing initial activity, combined with designing the project, and (2) conducting the project. After the project was completed, evaluation on the *procedure* was performed by the student writers.

Accordingly, the specific goals of the study are to explore student writers' views on *various aspects* of the *procedure*. The students views, which are described in the following sub-sections, consist of (1) their views on writing instruction in general, (2) their views on instructor's activities, (3) their views on their own activities, (4) their views on track record attachment, (5) their views on preparation of manuscripts before publication, (6) their views on dictionary and thesaurus, (7) their views on access to material resources.

Student' Views on Writing Instruction for Publication in General

Learning article writing for publications constitutes authentic learning, which aims at meeting the needs of the real world. Students' responses on the general aspects of the instruction are presented in table 3.

The two student groups gave responses that ranged from *agree* to *strongly agree* on the need for writing instruction to (1) produce authentic writing, (2) produce original writings, (3) lead to publication, and (4) have the necessary stages to produce genuine/original writing. Group 2 responded better than group 1. This was likely because group 2 belonged to a higher semester, and thus might be more mature.

Students' Views on Instructor's Activities

The instructor provided a general introduction for article writing. He proceeded by supplying sample of articles. He stressed the need for originality and gave instruction on how to recognize and avoid plagiarism. Then, he provided instruction on doing paraphrase and summary. He proceeded with lectures on techniques, with accompanying materials, to write articles. Students' responses on instructor's activities are outlined in table 4.

The table shows that instructor's activities were perceived as offering generally *high* benefits and the views were uniform across all activities and for both groups.

Students' Views on Students' Activities

Prior to instruction on paraphrase and summary, attention was given to students' ability to detect plagiarism, using exercises from Bailey (2006). One thing that was revealed in this session was that quotations that the students thought as accept-

able, as the paragraphs contained a lot of new words while retaining the structure, turned out to be unacceptable in Bailey (2006). Thus, the students needed to be made aware that acceptable restatement consisted of more than changing words.

Every student was required to start with an initial draft. Then, they needed to collect pieces of information and to write them in cards, to conduct discussions with peers (twice), and to refine the drafts, using 'track change' feature and feedbacks from the peer discussions. The responses are presented in table 5.

Both groups' responses generally ranged from *moderate* to *high*. Again, group 2 had a better response than group 1. Benefits of student activities were generally perceived as lower than those of instructor's activities. This may be due to reluctance for expressing unfavorable view to instructor activities or because they thought that interaction among students had less value than those with the instructor.

What was surprising was the response to 'track change', a facility in word application to monitor revisions and edit-

Table 3. Students' responses on general features of the writing instruction

No	Aspect	Group 1		Group 2	
		Mean	Cat.	Mean	Cat.
1	Writing lessons need to produce authentic writing, such as articles for publication	3.9	A	4.4	SA
2	Learning to write publishable articles needs to produce genuine writing, by avoiding plagiarism as far as possible	4.1	A	4.6	SA
3	Learning to write articles for publication is a helpful process for producing authentic writing	4	A	4.2	A
4	The learning process of writing articles for publication needs to have stages that can produce genuine writing	4	A	4.4	SA

SA: Strongly agree, A: Agree, N: Neutral, D: Disagree, SD: Strongly disagree, Cat: Category, n1: 32 (group 1), n2: 34(group2)

Table 4. Students' responses on the benefit of instructor's activities

No	Aspect	Group 1		Group 2	
		Mean	Cat.	Mean	Cat.
5	Preliminary explanation on writing authentic and original articles, including providing samples	4	H	4.1	H
6	Explanation of paraphrase and summary	3.4	M	4.1	H
7	Materials on paraphrase and summary	3.5	H	4.1	H
8	Lecture on how to write article	4	H	4.1	H
9	Materials on how to write article	3.8	H	4.1	H

VH: Very high, H: High, M: Moderate, L: Low, VL: Very low, Cat: Category

Table 5. Students' responses on the benefit of their activities

No	Aspect	Group 1		Group 2	
		Mean	Cat.	Mean	Cat.
10	Writing paraphrase/summary cards	3.5	H	3.6	H
11	Discussion with colleagues, stage 1	3.3	M	3.4	M
12	Discussion with colleagues, stage 2	3.8	H	4	H
13	Using 'track change' feature, which shows marks for revision	2.6	L	3.6	H
14	Transfer of skills from article writing to paper/ assignment writing	3.5	H	4	H

VH: Very high, H: High, M: Moderate, L: Low, VL: Very low, Cat: Category

ing. Group 1 viewed that benefit of the ‘track change’ facility was *low*, although it is very helpful for the writing process. Perhaps this was because they were not used to it.

The students perceived that there was a transfer of skills from article writing, in this study, to paper writing, when they wrote assignments. The responses from both groups were *high*, although the mean from group 1 was lower than the mean from group 2. This may mean that the transfer of skill gives more benefit for more advanced students.

Students’ Views on Track Record Attachment Requirement

When submitting the final draft for an article, each student was required to submit a folder with track record attachment. Each folder consisted of initial drafts, in marked and clean versions, cards--which contained paraphrases or summaries of materials, and revised drafts, in marked versions (containing markings) and clean versions (without marking). Students’ responses are presented in table 6. Both groups gave *agree* response to the obligation to submit track record attachment.

Students’ Views on Improvements Before Publication

Writing for publication needs to attain a very high degree of language standard and there can be no errors. Students’ works generally still contained errors, although the levels of errors vary. In this case there are two possibilities for improvement before publication. The responses are presented in table 7.

Most students in both groups expected editors to make direct corrections in preparing final drafts for publication. What is interesting is that the percentage of group 1, although group 2 came from a higher semester. This may mean that the language awareness of group 2 was higher than that of group 1.

Students’ Views on Tools: Standard Dictionary and Standard Thesaurus

The standard dictionary refers to “Oxford advanced learners dictionary” (Hornby, 2015) or a comparable dictionary, while standard thesaurus refers to “Webster’s new world thesaurus” (Laird, 1997) or a comparable thesaurus.

On the benefit of standard dictionary and thesaurus, both groups responded *high*. Most students hoped that dictionaries and thesauri could be provided by the institution, such as the library (see table 8), while expectation of access is shown in table 9.

Further check revealed that standard dictionary owners constituted 3 (9%), out of 32 students in group 1 and 6 (18%), out of 34 students in group 2. All students possessed other types of dictionaries, such as standard bilingual dictionary ‘*Kamus Inggris Indonesia*’ (An English Indonesian Dictionary) (Echols & Shadily, 1990). For thesaurus, this is acceptable, since standard thesaurus is difficult to obtain. However, for standard dictionary, their expectation may reflect a negative finding. Both groups were undergraduate English students and are expected to become professionals in English. Thus, possession of standard dictionary is an absolute necessity.

In order to develop publishable works, students need to get the best tools. While the short Oxford dictionary and a bilingual dictionary provide some help, maximum help could only be obtained from more comprehensive references, such as Oxford Learner’s Dictionary (Hornby, 2015). Low ownership of standard references meant that their attitude towards references needs to be improved.

Students’ Views on Material Sources

To write adequately, students need adequate material sources. There are two sources of material, i.e. print and electronic. Both can be accessed from the institution or from personal network. Student responses on sources are presented in table 10 while their responses for access to sources are shown in table 11.

Table 6. Students’ responses on the evidence of the writing record

No	Aspect	Group 1		Group 2	
		Mean	Cat.	Mean	Cat.
15	The final draft submission needs to have track record attachment (cards, initial and revised drafts in clean and marked versions)	3.5	A	3.9	A

SA: Strongly agree, A: Agree, N: Neutral, D: Disagree, SD: Strongly disagree, Cat.: Category

Table 7. Students’ responses on draft improvement prior to publication

No	Aspect	Group 1		Group 2	
		N	%	N	%
16	Expected final correction on final draft, before publication				
	a. Indirectly (editor indicates the location/nature of the error, but let students to fix their mistakes)	12	38%	9	26%
	b. Directly (editor performs correction to the manuscript so it could be worthy of publication)	14	44%	23	68%
	c. Do not choose	6	19%	2	6%

N: Number of subjects

Table 8. Students' responses on benefit of dictionary and thesaurus

No	Aspect	Group 1		Group 2	
		Mean	Cat.	Mean	Cat.
17	Standard dictionary	3.69	H	4.2	H
18	Standard thesaurus	3.69	H	4.1	H

VH: Very high, H: High, M: Moderate, L: Low, VL: Very low, Cat: Category

Table 9. Students' responses on access for dictionary and thesaurus

No	Aspect	Group 1		Group 2	
		N	%	N	%
17.b	Expected access to dictionary				
	1) Student must have it	6	19%	12	35%
	2) Provided by institution	21	66%	20	59%
	3) No opinion	5	16%	2	6%
18.b	Expected access to thesaurus				
	1) Student must have it	3	9%	2	6%
	2) Provided by institution	22	69%	30	88%
	3) No opinion	7	22%	2	6%

N: Number of subjects

Most students either used mostly electronic materials or a balanced proportion between electronic and printed materials. For group 2, adequacy of access was *high* for electronic materials and was also *high* for print materials. For group 1, adequacy of access for electronic material was *moderate* while that for printed material ranged from *low* to *moderate*. In general, group 2 had better access, from institutions or private sources, for both electronic and printed materials. This suggests that academic maturity may affect the students' efforts to gain access.

Additional Steps

After students' views were obtained, the views were used to modify the procedure when necessary. There was also an evaluation of the drafts by potential users, based on originality, clarity of writing, and attractiveness. However, this second evaluation is beyond the scope of this article. Suffice it to say that from 144 submitted drafts, only 15 drafts were adequate for possible publication.

DISCUSSION

This study aims to develop a *procedure*, within the context of project-based learning, to enable EFL students to write general English articles for publication. As described in sub-section 3.3, the procedure consisted of performing initial activity, combined with designing the project, and conducting the project. After the project was finished, an evaluation was performed on the procedure by the student writers.

The student writers' views on various aspects of the *procedure* showed that the procedure was generally viewed as

Table 10. Students' responses on composition of material sources

	Access to materials	Group 1		Group 2	
		N	%	N	%
19	a. Mostly electronic	16	50%	15	44%
	b. Mostly printed	1	3%	9	26%
	c. Balanced	13	41%	10	29%
	d. No answer	2	6%		

N: Number of subjects

Table 11. Participants' responses on adequacy of access to materials

Aspect	Mean	Group 1		Group 2	
		Cat.	Mean	Cat.	Mean
20	Adequacy of access to electronic material sources				
	a. Institution	3.03	M	4	H
	b. Private	2.84	M	4	H
21	Adequacy of access to printed material sources				
	a. Institution	2.91	M	3.5	H
	b. Private	2.34	L	3.5	H

VH: Very high, H: High, M: Moderate, L: Low, VL: Very low, Cat: Category electronic and printed materials

favorable, as their responses tend to consist of favorable options, such as *high* or *agree*. However, the responses from the junior group (semester IV) was generally less favorable than those from the senior group (semester VI). This indicates that the senior group might be more aware of the significance of this procedure.

The students' views were elicited to find out whether any revision is required for the procedure. Concerning the general steps of performing initial activity and designing the projects, the low number of adequate drafts suggests that the required length (1250-1500 words) might be too difficult to achieve. Thus, for a future project, the required length might need to be reduced, for example, to 1000 words.

As for the general steps of conducting the project, in the earlier stage it was observed that students were rather reluctant to perform self-review and peer-review. This was confirmed in the evaluation, in which teacher's feedbacks were perceived to have greater values than peers' feedbacks. Some informal discussions revealed that the students thought that (1) reading and correcting drafts were instructor's activities, in the process of giving marks, (2) peer correction only gave advantage to the other party, (3) rushed job could be applied to the writing of the articles in this study.

As a result, the teacher had to remind them that reading and correcting own works were essential for writing articles, as well as for writing assignments in other courses and writing scripts at the end of their undergraduate years. The teacher pointed out that peer-review gave new insights

and pointed out the mistakes that the original writer did not notice. The teacher also told the students that they already knew that rushed job was not satisfactory, and that they need to cultivate self-discipline. This was the reason that the final submission was required to contain track record attachment, which included marked and clean drafts and cards. This requirement was made to ensure that students performed self-review and peer-review and that their articles were prepared in stages, as contrasted to being submitted as rushed works. Fortunately, by the end of the study, the students managed to comply with the requirement. In addition, the extensive time they had spent on article writing was hopefully worthwhile, as they perceived that there was skill transfer from article writing to other tasks, such as paper/assignment writing, (Justice et al., 2009).

In a future study, the teacher needs to give more emphasis on these self-review and peer-review. The teacher may need to remind the students that they could learn from their peers and that the benefits applied to both the giver and receiver of the feedbacks (Behin & Hamidi, 2011, and Rouhi & Azizian, 2013), and that teacher and peer feedback had their own roles (Miao, Badger, and Zhen, 2006).

In this study, the number of peer reviews was twice for each article. As the number of adequate drafts was low, in the future it might be necessary to increase the number of peer reviews, perhaps to four times at least. However, this might run in to another difficulty. In Minerich (2001), Foss et al. (2008) and this study, there is a common problem that the students experienced lack of time for finishing the work. Therefore, in the future, the writing instruction may need to be extended to at least four months.

There was an issue concerning resources, which consisted of standard dictionary and thesaurus, computer and network. On standard dictionary, a significant number of students still expected that the institutions provided it. This is rather undesirable, as every English department student needs to own a standard dictionary. It is to be noted that, based on a recent observation, most of the students have the standard dictionary. This might happen because the teacher constantly urges them to own the dictionary. As for thesaurus, it is understandable if they expect the institution to provide it.

Teacher may contend, rightly, that provision of such tools is not part of their responsibility. However, if the tools are not available, the instruction might not meet its goal of getting students to write good articles. Thus, teachers need to find ways to make these tools available. In this study, the writers took initiatives to make standard thesauri available to the students in the classroom.

Meanwhile, computers are particularly beneficial for improving writing, as various features in word processing provide a lot of helps in revising and editing. Many students did have their own personal computers; however, some still did not have it. Thus, institutional computers need to be available, so that students could have access to them. A more important facility is access to network. On the whole, materials come mostly from electronic sources rather than from printed ones. This underscores a trend to depend more on the

electronic materials. For example, in study on English students in Algeria, Amina (2014) revealed that most students used electronic resource exclusively (66.66%) or a combination of electronic and printed resources (26.66%). Thus, institutional internet network needs to be adequate. Preferably, access to computer lab and network needs to be available at all times. However, at present, such unlimited access was not available.

While these issues might seem mundane, from the theoretical point of view, they are not trivial, particularly in the context of developing countries, where students may face challenges, e.g. resources, which may not be faced by their counterparts in developed countries. Therefore, it is hoped that this study may offer some meaningful contribution and stimulate interest for similar studies in other areas, in the hope of preparing students, in the developing countries, to write English articles for publication, a skill that would be beneficial in the age of globalization.

CONCLUSION

While there is a great need for authentic writing instruction for publication, there is still a lack of study that engages EFL students to write for publication. To fill out the gap, this study aims to develop a procedure, within the context of project-based learning, to enable EFL students to write English articles for publication. The procedure consisted of performing initial activity, combined with designing the project, and conducting the project. After the project was finished, evaluation of various aspects of the procedure was performed by the student writers. The students' views were generally favorable.

On some aspects on writing instruction for publication, such as authentic writing for publication, avoiding plagiarism, and process for authentic and genuine writing, the students responses varied from *agree* to *strongly agree*. On the benefits of instructor's activities, such as giving preliminary explanation and examples, offering explanation on summary and paraphrasing, and providing explanation on how to write an article, their responses were uniformly *high*. However, on the benefits of their own activities, such as writing cards, discussing with peers, and using 'track change' feature, the students' views ranged from *low* to *high*.

The students *agreed* to the requirement to provide submission with track record attachment. On improvement of final manuscript for publication, they preferred the editor to provide the improvement directly. The students thought that standard dictionary and thesaurus were beneficial; however, they preferred that the institution provide the resources. The students got more materials from electronic sources. Access to materials was generally *moderate* and there were some constraints regarding network.

The low number of adequate articles suggests that the frequency of peer reviews needs to be increased, perhaps to at least four times. As a result, the whole instruction also needs to be extended, perhaps to four months.

Further study is required to refine the procedure, through the incorporation of feedbacks from the participants. Through this manner, it is hoped that a satisfactory model could be de-

vised, one that could engage students to write more adequate articles for possible publication in an anthology.

REFERENCES

- Amina, M. (2015). *The use of educational technology in EFL teaching and learning: Case study of second year students at Tlemcen University*. Unpublished master thesis, Department of English, University of Tlemcen, Tlemcen, Algeria. Retrieved July 1, 2018, from <http://dspace.univ-tlemcen.dz/bitstream/112/7904/1/meilou-di-amina.pdf>
- Bailey, S. (2006). *Academic writing: A handbook for international students*. 2nd ed. London, England: Routledge.
- Behin, B. & Hamidi, S. (2011). Peer correction: The key to improve the Iranian English as a foreign language learners' productive writing skill. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 30, 1057-1060. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.10.206>
- Borg, W.R., & Gall, M.D. (1989). *Educational research: An introduction*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Echols, J. & Shadily, H. (2005). *Kamus Inggris Indonesia [An English Indonesian dictionary]*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Gramedia.
- Foss, P., Carney, N., McDonald, K., & Rooks, M. (2008). Project-based learning activities for short-term intensive English programs. *Philippine ESL Journal*, 1, 57-76. Retrieved June 25, 2018, from <https://www.philippine-esl-journal.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/August-2008-Vol1.pdf>
- Fragoulis, I., & Tsiplakides, I. (2009). Project-based learning in the teaching of English as a foreign language in Greek primary schools: From theory to practice. *English Language Teaching*, 2(3), 113-119. Retrieved May 5, 2018, from: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1083088.pdf>
- Hermansyah, A. (2016, April 25). Indonesia lags behind in scientific publications: Expert. *The Jakarta Post*. Retrieved June 12, 2017, from <http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2016/04/25/indonesia-lags-behind-in-scientific-publications-expert.html>
- Hornby, A.S. (2015). *Oxford advanced learner's dictionary*. 8th ed. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- James, M.A. (2010). An investigation of learning transfer in English-for-general-academic-purposes writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 19(4), 183-206. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2010.09.003>
- Justice, C., Rice, J., & Warry, W. (2009). Developing useful and transferable skills: Course design to prepare students for a life of learning. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* 3(2), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.20429/ijstl.2009.030209>
- Kovalyova, Y., Soboleva, A.V., & Kerimkulov, A. (2016). Project based learning in teaching communication skills in English as a foreign language to engineering students. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (IJET)*, 11(04), 153-156. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v11i04.5416>
- Kusmartini, S.E., (2018). Project-based learning and library access towards writing achievement of the students. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 7(4), 63-67. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v7n.4p.63>
- Laird, C. (1997). *Webster's new world thesaurus*. New revised edition. New York, NY: Prentice Hall.
- Losada, C.A.C., Insuasty, E.A., & Osorio, M.F.J. (2017). The impact of authentic materials and tasks on students' communicative competence at a Columbian language school. *Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 19(1), 89-104. Retrieved June 20, 2018, from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15446/profile.v19n1.56763>
- Mappatoto, A.B. (1993). *Siaran pers [Press Release]*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Gramedia.
- Mappatoto, A.B. (1994). *Teknik penulisan feature [Technique for writing features]*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Gramedia.
- Miao, Y., Badger, R., & Zhen, Y. (2006). A comparative study of peer and teacher feedback in a Chinese EFL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 15, 179-200. Retrieved May 5, 2018, from: <https://lms.cit.cyut.edu.tw/sysdata/63/32963/doc/a247e0d7d397e0f6/attach/1819936.pdf>
- Minerich, A.A. (2001). Publication projects with ESL/EFL students: A handbook for teachers. Unpublished MA project. Adam State College, Alamosa, Colorado, USA. Retrieved June 30, 2018, from http://digitalcollections.sit.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1432&context=ipp_collection.
- Mrak, M. (2000). *Globalization and the integration of industry in the region*. Vienna, Austria: UNIDO.
- Nielsen, S. M., & Rocco, T. S. (2002, May). *Joining the conversation: Graduate students' perceptions of writing for publication*, Paper presented at the 43rd Annual Meeting of the Adult Education Research Conference, Raleigh, NC. Retrieved April, 21, 2018, from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED471830.pdf>
- Nunan, D. (1988) Principles for designing language teaching materials. *Guidelines*, 10(2), 1-24.
- Nunan, D. (2001). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Pekerti, A. (1998). Globalisasi, pembelajaran, dan kemanusiaan [Globalization, instruction, and humanity]. In S. Sopater, B. Subandriyo, & Sutarno (Eds.). *Pembelajaran memasuki era kesejagatan [Instruction in the era of globalization]*, pp. 91-100. Jakarta, Indonesia: Sinar Harapan.
- Ranking Web of Universities. (2018). Ranking web of universities: Indonesia. Retrieved September 30, 2018, from: http://www.webometrics.info/en/Asia_es/Indonesia
- Reid, J.M. (1988). *The process of composition*, 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Reid, J.M. (1993). *Teaching ESL writing*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Rouhi, A., & Azizian, E. (2013). Peer review: Is giving corrective feedback better than receiving it in L2 writing? *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 93, 1349-1354. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.10.042>

- Thitivesa, D. (2014). The academic achievement of writing via project-based learning. *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology, International Science Index 93, International Journal of Social, Behavioral, Educational, Economic, Business and Industrial Engineering*, 8(9), 2994 - 2997. Retrieved May 25,, 2018, from <https://waset.org/publications/9999384/the-academic-achievement-of-writing-via-project-based-learning>
- Thomas, J.W. (2000). *A review of research on project-based learning*. San Rafael, CA: The Autodesk foundation.
- Retrieved May 6, 2018, from: https://documents.sd61.bc.ca/ANED/educationalResources/StudentSuccess/A_Review_of_Research_on_Project_Based_Learning.pdf
- Zhang, L., Yue, S., & Lan, L. (2014). Evaluating an academic course-based on an integrated model. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 11(1), 95-124. Retrieved March 23, 2018, from http://journal.asiatefl.org/main/main.php?inx_journals=39&inx_contents=45&main=1&sub=3&submode=3&PageMode=JournalView&s_title=Evaluating_an_Academic_Writing_Course_based_on_an_Integrated_Model