



**THE REASON OF APPLYING PREWRITING PHASES
OF ARGUMENTATIVE WRITING**

**Dian Novita
Berlin Sibarani
Amrin Saragih**

**English Applied Linguistic Study Program
Postgraduate Program Universitas Negeri Medan**

Submitted September; Accepted October; Published December

ABSTRACT

The objectives of this study were to describe the cognitive process occurs during the prewriting phases of argumentative writing among the undergraduate students and to explain why such cognitive process are realized in undergraduate students of prewriting phases in argumentative writing. This study is limited to the study of the cognitive process in prewriting phases for undergraduate students. This study is followed the theory of Kellog (1990:327) about the the activities in prewriting phases consist of (1) Collecting Information, and (2) Planning text. In accordance to the theory and research purposes, descriptive qualitative research design was appropriately implemented in the study. The data of this research were the students' students utterances, which were collected through semi-structured interviews and interpreted through the Kellog's Theory. The reason why the students should apply the prewriting phases were: (1) there was misconception of argumentative writing, (2) there was no knowledge about the generic structure of argumentative, (3) there is no awareness that in argumentative writing, the students should talk the controversial part of the topic, and (4) the students do not know that they have to state explicitly their standing point towards an issue and provided the reasons, facts, and empirical evidences. This leads to conclusion that cognitive process in prewriting is important to be applied in students writing process.

Keywords: *Cognitive Process, Prewriting Phase, Argumentative Writing, Undergraduate Students*

How to Cite: *Dian Novita. (2022). Cognitive Process in Prewriting Phases of Argumentative Writing by Undergraduate Students. Jurnal Linguistik Terapan Pascasarjana Unimed. 19 (3): 161-166.*

INTRODUCTION

Cognitive process refers to the knowledge, information and what is going on in the writer's mind. Cognitive process is related to the writer's thinking skills which require them to think critically and logically in the phases of writing. According to Flower and Hayes (1981:367), cognitive process of writing can be identified by studying the writer's action about what should be done in writing phases.

Kellogg (1990:327) stated that in writing phases, there are some linear steps that the writer should follow, they are:

- (a) Prewriting Phases, the first phases of writing which the writer prepares all the information and plans what should be done along the writing process. In this phase, the writer must think about generating ideas based on the topic and organize the plan for the next phases.
- (b) First drafting, the writer transfers the generating ideas and plans into complete sentences. The writer should construct the sentence into a paragraph by relating each idea, then it can be a complete paragraph.
- (c) Subsequent draft, it is a revising phase of the writing. The writer revises the written text that has been written before based on the generating ideas.

Based on Kellogg (1990: 327) the qualities of writing documents in terms of content and style, the fluency of composing, and the characteristics of the prewriting plan (topic, ideas, and organization) are caused by clustering and outlining. That is why, prewriting phases are really important because they can help the writer to increase writing performance. Thus, the writer will not waste time just to think about what topic, ideas, and organization that will be presented in the written text.

Argumentative text is a kind of text that requires the writer to think critically and logically. In writing argumentative text the writer must do some creative and productive activities. Argumentative text is a text which brings the writer to the inquiry and critical thinking level. The aim in writing argumentative text is to persuade the reader to agree with the writer's point of view.

METHODOLOGY

Various ways experienced by every single writer in exploring inspiration, starting to write, developing ideas and arguments, revising drafts and determining them as final drafts. Learning from advanced writers is a fruitful effort to evolve the

writing competence. Experiences, cognitions, interests, values, stylistics, metaphors, and mechanics are influential aspects in enriching their works, Fadhy and Ratnaningsih (2017) According to this idea, the students' cognitive process can evolve the writing competence as the writer can explore many ideas and inspirations. Wahdan and Buragohain (2019) assert in integrating the process writing approach and the five writing strategies (cognitive, meta-cognitive, social, affective and compensation) into the three stages of writing: (1) The Pre-writing Stage, (2) The Writing Stage (drafting, revising and editing) and The Post-writing Stage (publishing and reflection). Various recommendations and suggestions for further research were provided. Cognitives process is relate to the writers' thinking skill which require them to think critically and logically in the phases of writing. Kellog stated that there are some important phases should be followed by the writer such as: (a) Prewriting; (b) First draft; and (c) Subsequent draft.

This study was conducted by using descriptive qualitative research design. The data of this research were the students's utterances of reasons why the students should apply the prewriting phases. Furthermore, the source of the data was an online undergraduate students of Universitas Negeri Medan. The data were collected by using interview techniques. Meanwhile, field notes used to avoid miss information that needed for the research. Data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing and verifying were technique of data analysis. Furthermore, to make the trustworthiness of this research, it applied audit trail which is provide a mechanism by which others can determine how decisions were made and the uniqueness of the situation.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

The answers of the research problem—the reasons why the subject apply these cognitive process are:

Data 1a

Interviewer : Menurut pendapatmu, apakah yang dimaksud dengan argumentative writing?

Interviewee: Menurut saya, argumentative teks itu adalah teks yang berisi tentang pendapat-pendapat yang saya miliki mengenai topiknya.

Based on the data above, the subjects have misconception of argumentative writing, they may think that writing argumentative writing does not need reasons,

empirical evidences to support their claim. They may think that writing is simply the expression of their thought, so what they have in their mind is simply needed to be expressed.

Data 1b

Interviewer: Apa saja generic structure yang terdapat dalam sebuah argumentative writing?

Interviewee: Generic sturcture argumentative writing yaitu: title, thesis statement, argument and conclusion.

Based on the data above, it showed tha the subjects do not realize or do not have the knowledge for the generic structure of argumentative, and consequently they just list what ever coming up in their mind. That is why, they do not put the information and ideas which is really need for the argumentative text.

Data 1c

Interviewer: Hal apa saja yang bisa kamu cantumkan saat menulis argumentative writing?

Interviewee: Hal yang bisa dicantumkan adalah argumen yang saya miliki dan beberapa pendapat ahli terkait topik yang ada

The subjects do not realize that in argumentative writing, the writer should talk the controversial part of the topic, and consequently they just write their opinions as if they were explaining something; not arguing something. In other words, the subjects just put on one side of the topic which show that they always stay on either pro or contra.

Data 2d

Interviewer: Bagaimana mendukung pendapat yang kamu tulis dalam sebuah argumentative text?

Interviewee: Untuk mendukung pendapat saya dalam teks argumentative yang saya tulis adalah memberikan bbrapa contoh kasus terkait dengan topik dan informasi dari beberapa sumber terkait dengan topik.

Based on the data above, the subjects do not know that they have to state explicitly their standing point towards an issue and provided the reasons, facts, and

empirical evidences to support their claim. The subject just put the case which happen in reality as the example relate to the topic. Consequently, the formulation of their standing points is not explicitly stated in the form of claim but preclaim.

Based on the data analysis, the result of this study was found that there are four reasons why the students apply this cognitive process, they are:

- (1) The subjects have misconception of argumentative writing, they may think that writing argumentative writing does not need reasons, empirical evidences to support their claim.
- (2) The subjects do not realize or do not have the knowledge the generic structure of argumentative, and consequently they just list what ever coming up in their mind.
- (3) The subjects do not realize that in argumentative writing, the writer should talk the controversial part of the topic, and consequently they just write their opinions as if they were explaining something; not arguing something.
- (4) The subjects do not know that they have to state explicitly their standing point towards an issue and provided the reasons, facts, and empirical evidences to support their claim. Consequently, the formulation of their standing points is not explicitly stated in the form of claim but preclaim.

CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis, the cognitive process of the students' prewriting phase does not give any effect to the quality of the argumentative writing unless they do not have any missconception about argumentative writing. It means that the subjects' should understand about argumentative writing, what should be put on it and what is needed.

REFERENCES

- Creswell, J. (2012). *Educational Research*. Boston: Pearson
- Danesi, M., and A. Rocci. (2009). *Global Linguistics: An Introduction*. New York: Walter De Gruyter.
- Deane, P., N. Odendhal, T. Quinlan, M. Fowles, C. Welsh, & J. B. Tatum. (2008). *Cognitive Models of Writing: Writing Proficiency as a Complex Integrated Skill*. Princeton: Educational Testing Service.

- Flower, L., and J. R. Hayes. (1981). A Cognitive Process Theory of Writing. College Composition and Communication.
- Gibson, W.J., and A. Brown. (2009). Working with Qualitative Data. London: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Heaton, J.B. (1988). *Writing English Language Test*. American: Longman
- Kellog, R. T. (1990). Effectiveness of Prewriting Strategies as a Function of Task Demand. *The American Journal of Psychology*, 327-342.
- Kellog, R. T. (1986). Designing Idea Processor for Documents Composition. *Behaviour Research Method, Instruments and Computers*, 118 – 128.
- Miles, M.B., A.M. Huberman, &J. Saldana. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis*. London: SAGE Publication, Inc.
- Nunan. D. (2003). Practical English Language teaching. New York: Mc-Graw-Hill, Inc.
- Permata, R. And Hamzah. (2018). Students' Ability in Developing the Paragraphs of Argumentative Essay. *International Journal of Science and Research*.
- Phei, Z., Zheng, C., Zang, M., and Liu, P. (2017). Critical Thinking and Argumentative Writing: Inspecting the Association among EFL Learners in China. *Canadian Center of Science and Education*.
- Pulungan, A.H. (2016). The Cognitive of Writing in English: Developing The Cognitive Based Learning Model. *Proceedings of the 1st English Education International Conference (EEIC) in Conjunction with the 2nd Reciprocal Graduate Research Symposium (RGRS) of the Consortium of Asia-Pacific Education Universities (CAPEU) between Sultan Idris Education University and Syiah Kuala*
- Ramage, J., J.C. Bean, & J. Johnson. (2016). Writing Argument: A Rhetoric with Readings. New York: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Sims, M. (2012). *The Write Stuff Thinking Through Essays*. London: Pearson Education.
- Wahdan, N.R. And Buragohain, D. (2019). Integrating The Writing Process Approach Into EFL Writing Instruction in Saudi Arabia. *European Centre for Research Training and Development UK*, 1-14.