

Developing the Writing Ability of the Second Year Students of SMA Negeri 12 Bulukumba through the Use of Problem-Based Illustration Strategy

Hasri*

Master's Program of English Language Education, Universitas Muhammadiyah
Makassar, Indonesia

*E-mail: asrihaz@gmail.com

Abstract: This research applied a pre-experimental method. This thesis discusses Developing the Writing Ability of the Second Year Students of SMA Negeri 12 Bulukumba through the Use of Problem Based Illustration Strategy (*An Experimental Research*). The population was the second-year students of SMA Negeri 12 Bulukumba. This research used a one-group pre-test and post-test design. The sample for this research comprised second-year students of SMA Negeri 12 Bulukumba, and a cluster random sampling technique was used. The instrument of the research was a writing test. The writing test consisted of a pre-test and a post-test to assess students' writing ability after the treatment. The result of this research was obtained by comparing the pre-test and post-test scores, then analyzing it by using the t-test formula and finally shows $t\text{-test} = 17.63$ than this value is measured into t-table with the level of significance (α) 0.05, degree of freedom (df) = 19, and finally, it was found that the value of the t-table shows = 2.093. Based on the results, the researcher concludes that there is significant development in the students' writing ability after the treatment.

Keywords: Problem-Based Illustration Strategy; Writing Ability; Experimental Research

INTRODUCTION

Writing is an aid to both written communication and self-expression. Many people use it primarily to communicate with other members of their own community or the wider world (Pincas in Sumarni, 2005). Furthermore, Raimes, in Nurzaitun (1996), says that writing helps students learn two languages. Firstly, reinforce the grammatical structure, idioms, and vocabulary. Secondly, when the students write, they also have two chances to be adventurous with the language, going beyond what they have just learned to say, and taking risks. Thirdly, they become involved with the new language.

Writing is an important and practical skill. Writing is considered the most difficult of the four language skills. Heaton (1988) says that writing skills are complex and difficult to teach, requiring mastery not only of grammatical and rhetorical devices but also of conceptual and judgment elements.

Among all language skills, writing is the most difficult because it demands accuracy. As Harmer (1991) points out, writing skills are expected to be correct. From the point of view of language teaching, therefore, there is often far greater pressure for written accuracy than

there is for accuracy in speaking.

Two factors affect the difficulty of writing: a lack of knowledge of how to express ideas in writing, and a lack of background knowledge about what to present to readers. The first concerns the writing process, and the second concerns the idea. Both are important to consider in teaching writing, especially to secondary high school students.

One method that can entice students to develop their writing is to use problem-based illustrations that depict specific situations, making it easier for students to grasp ideas and formulate sentences. Besides, they will also describe the pictures in such a way that they are expected to learn to write more easily and meaningfully, since they are presented with pictures of certain events in the world.

Using illustrations is one of the best ways to demonstrate students' worth. There is a good deal of truth in the idea that pictures say things that words cannot. However, the reverse is also true: the researcher can draw pictures with their words and paint them as well so that the reader can understand their ideas. Illustrations and examples are among the best tools for explaining things. Illustrations do not have to be true; the researcher can make them up. Illustration is an example used to explain (Brock & Howard, 1978). Related to the description above, the researcher intends to do research under the title "Developing the Writing Ability of the Second Year Students Through the Use of Problem-Based Illustration Strategy."

METHOD

This section discusses the research methodology. The Method consists of the research design, setting, and participants or data source, data collection (practical procedures), and data analysis (practical procedures). A reference should indicate methods already published; only relevant modifications should be described. Do not repeat the details of established methods. The Method section can be a unified form or use sub-sections. The proportion is 10-15% of the total article length, all presented as paragraphs.

This research employed a pre-experimental design with two groups: a pre-test group and a post-test group. Pre-experimental research design is a type of research design that lacks a control group (Creswell, 2013; Fетters et al., 2013). It is a relatively simple research design that involves a single group of participants and does not include randomization or variable manipulation. This type of design is commonly used in exploratory studies or when the resources or time constraints are limited. One-shot case study aimed at describing the ability of second-year students to understand and write a short paragraph through problem-based illustration. This design is presented in the figure as follows: $O_1 \times O_2$, where: O_1 : Mean score of pre-test on the language proficiency, X : Treatment using problem-based illustration, and O_2 : Mean score of post-test on the language proficiency (Arikunto, 1997, p. 243)

There were two variables in this research: the independent and the dependent. The independent variable was the use of problem-based illustration, in which students were asked to imagine and retell an event based on the given illustration. The variable was the students' achievement in writing recount texts. Indicators of the recount paragraph were: content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. The population of this research was the second-year students of SMA Negeri 12 Bulukumba in the academic year 2013/2014. The population consisted of 60 students in 3 classes. Each class consists of 20

students. This research applied a cluster random sampling technique, in which the research sample consisted of one class of 20 students.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The results of this research concern the scoring and classification of students' pre-test and post-test scores, hypothesis testing for the paired sample, including the mean score, standard deviation, and the significance test. These findings are described as follows.

Scoring Classification of the Students' Pre-test and Post-test

The raw scores for students' writing ability were obtained by tabulating the five components of writing: content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics. The students' scores on the pre-test and post-test are as follows:

Table 1

Rate, Percentage, and Frequency of the Students' Scores

Classification	Range	Pre-test		Post-test	
		F	%	F	%
Excellent	30-27	0	0	3	15%
Very Good to Good	26-22	3	15%	12	60%
Fair to Poor	21-17	11	55%	5	25%
Very Poor	16-13	6	30%	0	0%
Total		20	100%	20	100%

Table 1 indicates that in the pre-test, 3 (15%) students received very good to good scores, 11 (55%) received fair to poor scores, 6 (30%) received very poor scores, and none received excellent to very good scores. In the post-test, 3 (15%) students received excellent to very good scores, 12 (60%) received very good to good scores, 5 (25%) received fair to poor scores, and none received very poor scores.

Table 2

Rate, Percentage, and Frequency of the Students' Scores

Classification	Range	Pre-test		Post-test	
		F	%	F	%
Excellent	20-18	0	0	5	25%
Very Good to Good	17-14	8	40%	9	45%
Fair to Poor	13-10	9	45%	3	15%
Very Poor	9-7	3	15%	3	15%
Total		20	100%	20	100%

Table 2 indicates that in the pre-test, 8 (40%) students received very good to good scores, 9 (45%) received fair to poor scores, 3 (15%) received very poor scores, and none received excellent to very good scores. In the post-test, 5 (25%) students received excellent to very good scores, 9 (45%) received very good to good scores, 3 (15%) received fair to

poor scores, and 3 (15%) received very poor scores.

Table 3

Rate, Percentage, and Frequency of the Students' Scores

Classification	Range	Pre-test		Post-test	
		F	%	F	%
Excellent	20-18	0	0	8	40%
Very Good to Good	17-14	9	45%	9	45%
Fair to Poor	13-10	8	40%	3	15%
Very Poor	9-7	3	15%	0	0%
Total		20	100%	20	100%

Table 3 above indicates that in the pre-test, 9 (45%) students received very good to good scores, 8 (40%) received fair to poor scores, 3 (15%) received very poor scores, and none received excellent to very good scores. In the post-test, 8 (40%) students received excellent to very good scores, 9 (45%) received very good to good scores, 3 (15%) received fair to poor scores, and none received very poor scores.

Table 4

Rate, Percentage, and Frequency of the Students' Scores

Classification	Range	Pre-test		Post-test	
		F	%	F	%
Excellent	20-18	0	0	9	45%
Very Good to Good	17-14	6	30%	11	55%
Fair to Poor	13-10	11	55%	0	0%
Very Poor	9-7	3	15%	0	0%
Total		20	100%	20	100%

Table 4 above indicates that in the pre-test, 6 (30%) students received very good to good scores, 11 (55%) received fair to poor scores, 3 (15%) received very poor scores, and none received excellent to very good scores. In the post-test, 9 (45%) students received excellent to very good scores, 11 (55%) received very good to good scores, and none received fair to poor or very poor scores.

Table 5

Rate, Percentage, and Frequency of the Students' Scores

Classification	Range	Pre-test		Post-test	
		F	%	F	%
Excellent to Very Good	5	3	15%	14	70%
Very Good to Good	4	14	70%	6	30%
Fair to Poor	3	3	15%	0	0%
Very Poor	2	0	0%	0	0%

Total	20	100%	20	100%
-------	----	------	----	------

Table 5 above indicates that in the pre-test, 3 (15%) students received excellent to very good scores, 14 (70%) received very good to good scores, 3 (15%) received fair to poor scores, and none received very poor scores. In the post-test, 14 (70%) students received excellent to very good scores, 6 (30%) received very good to good scores, and none received fair to poor or very poor scores.

The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of the Students' Pre-test and Post-test

After calculating the results of the students' pre-test and post-test, the mean scores are presented in the following table

Table 6

Mean Score and Standard Deviation of the Students' Pre-Test and Post-Test

Type of Test	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Pre-test	6.165	1.491
Post-test	7.875	1.146

Table 8 above shows the statistical summary of the students' scores and standard deviations for both the pre-test and post-test. The mean scores of the students' pre-test and post-test differed, with the post-test mean higher than the pre-test mean. So, it means that problem-based illustration can develop students' writing in recount texts. The table above also shows that the standard deviations of the students' pre-test and post-test scores were different. The standard deviation of the students' pre-test was 1.491, whereas the standard deviation of the students' post-test was 1.146. It reveals that the students' pre-test results have more varied scores than their post-test results.

Test of Significance

In order to know whether or not the mean score is different between two variables (pre-test and post-test) at the level of significance (0.05) with degree of freedom (df) = $N - 1$, where N = the total number of students (20). The following table shows the result of the t-test calculation.

Table 7

Test of Significance

Post-test and Pre-test	t-test	t-table
$X_2 - X_1$	17.63	2.093

Table 7 above indicates that the t-test value exceeds the t-table value. It shows a significant difference between students' pre-test and post-test results.

Hypothesis Testing

The result of the statistical analysis at the significance level (α) of 0.05, with degrees of freedom (df) = $N - 1 = 20 - 1 = 19$, indicated that there was a significant difference between the mean scores of the pre-test and post-test, with the post-test mean higher than the pre-test mean. In addition, the t-test value is $17.63 > 2.093$. Based on the result above, the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis (H_1) is accepted. It means there is a significant difference in the writing development of students who are through problem-

based learning and those who are not.

The description of data collected from the writing test, as explained in the previous section, shows that students' writing ability develops. It is supported by the frequency and percentage of students' pre-test and post-test scores across the five components of writing. In the content component of the pre-test, 3 (15%) students received very good to good scores, while most students were in the fair to very poor range. In the post-test, the data show that 3 (15%) students scored in the excellent to very good range. In the organization component of the pre-test, 8 (40%) students received very good to good scores, while most students were in the fair to very poor range. In the post-test, the data show that 5 (25%) received an excellent to very good score range. In the vocabulary component of the pre-test, 9 (45%) students scored very good to good, while most students were in the fair to very poor range. In the post-test, the data show that 8 (40%) students got excellent to very good scores, most students are in fair to poor, and none of them got a very poor score. In the grammar component of the pre-test, 6 (30%) students scored very good to good, and most students were in the fair to very poor range. In the post-test, the data show that 9 (45%) students received excellent to very good scores, and none received fair, poor, or very poor scores. In the mechanics component of the pre-test, 3 (15%) students got excellent to very good scores, most students were in the very good to good range, and none were in the very poor range.

The mean score on the students' pre-test is 6.165, classified as poor, and the post-test is 7.875, classified as good. It shows that the mean score on the students' post-test is higher than on the pre-test. The standard deviation of the students' pre-test is 1.491, and the post-test is 1.146.

The value of the t-test is greater than the t-table ($17.63 > 2.093$). Based on the t-test, the researcher finds a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test results. In other words, the students' writing ability develops after receiving treatment.

From the discussion above, the second-year students of SMA Negeri 12 Bulukumba have a good ability in writing, particularly in writing through illustration. Finally, the researcher concludes that the use of problem-based illustration can help the students increase their writing ability.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results and discussion of the research, problem-based illustration can develop the writing ability of second-year students at SMA Negeri 12 Bulukumba. The t-test value is 17.63, which is greater than the t-table value of 2.093. This means that the hypothesis is accepted: the problem-based strategy illustration develops students' writing ability. It is very helpful in activating students to describe their own pictures based on their imagination.

REFERENCES

- Adelstein. M.E Pival. 1980. *The Writing Commitment*. 2nd Education. New York: Harcaut Brace Jovanovic.
- Arikunto, suharsini. 1997. *Prosedur penelitian*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta
- Brock and Howard. 1978. *Writing for a Reason*. United States of America: John Wiley and Sons. Inc

- Byrne Donn. 1984. *English Teaching Perspective*. London: Longman.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *John W. Creswell-Research Design_ Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Method Approaches-SAGE Publications (2013).pdf* (p. 273)
- Depdikbud. 1986. *Garis-Garis Besar Program Pengajaran Bahasa Inggris*. Jakarta: Depdikbud.
- Dumains, L. wullur. 1988. *Writing in English*. Jakarta: Depdikbud.
- Elizabeth and a friend. 1990. *The Writer's Rhetoric and Handbook*. Second edition. New York: Merrill Public Company.
- Gay, L.R. 1981. *Education Research*. USA: Bell and Howell Company.
- Gay, L. R. 1987. *Education Research, Competences for Analysis and Application*. New York: Merrill Public Company.
- Gagne, E. 1985. *The Cognitive Psychology of School Learning*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company.
- Hariston. Maxine. 1986. *Contemporary Composition*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Harmer. 1991. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. New York: Longman.
- Heaton, J.E 1988. *Writing English Language Laboratory Language Tests*. Longman Handbooks for Language Teachers (UK) Ltd.
- Iryani. 1998. *The Ability of the Fifth Semester Students of English Department of FBS IKIP Ujung Pandang to Compose Descriptive Paragraph Using Familiar Pictures*. Thesis FBS. UNM Makassar.
- Jacobs, Holly L. 1981. *Testing ESL Composotion: A practical approach*. Rowley, Massachusset: Newbury. House Publisher. Inc.
- James M. Mc. Crimon 1976. *Writing with a Purpose* (6th edition). USA: Florida State University. Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Joseph P. Daghter. 1976. *Writing*. USA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Kartini. 1995. *The Students' SAbility To Compose Narrative Essay Using Story Picture at English Department of FPBS IKIP Ujung Pandang*. Thesis FBS S1 FPBS IKIP Ujung Pandang.
- Lesnusa. Wate Irawan. 1998. *Teaching Write to the First Year Students at the SMU Negeri 1 Parigi by Using Pictures*. Thesis FBS S1 UNM Makassar.
- Meyer, Alan. 1992. *Writing with Confidence*. New York: Harper Collins. Publish.
- Muhyiddin. 1985. *Improving Writing Ability Through Arrange Paragraph*. Thesis FPBS IKIP Ujung Pandang.
- Nurzaitun.1996. *The Ability to Write an English Composition Through Parallel Writing Technique. A Case Study on Third Grade Students of SMU 8 Ujung Pandang*. Thesis FBS UNM Makassar.
- Saraka, 1988. *From Paragraph to Essay*. Jakarta: Depdikbud.
- Sears, S. 2002. *Teaching English A Foreign Language*. American: Ministry of National Education.
- Sumarni. 2005. *Developing the Students' Ability to Write Short Paragraphs Through Childhood Experience*. Theisis FBS UNM Makassar.
- Taylor, Gorden. 1993. *The Students' Writing Guide for the Arts and Social Sciences*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Umar, Azis P. 2002. *Developing the Writing Ability of the Third Year Students of SLTPN 11 Makassar through Guided Paragraph*. Theisis FBS UNM Makassar.
- Winn, W. 2013. *The Psychology of Illustration (Volume 1)*, New York: Spring-Verlag, 152-198.