

INCREASING STUDENTS' WRITING ABILITY THROUGH INTERACTIVE WRITING MODEL AT SMAN 1 ENREKANG

Intan Hardiyanti Hasri¹, Andi Tenri Ampa², Ilmiah³

^{1,2,3}Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
<p>Article history: Received: November 20, 2020 Revised: November 22, 2020 Accepted: December 14, 2020 Published: January 19, 2021</p> <p>Keywords: Writing Interactive Writing Model Experimental Research</p>	<p>This research aimed to know the increasing students' writing ability in descriptive and recount text through Interactive Writing Model at the first grade SMAN 1 ENREKANG. The method of this research was pre-experimental research. The sample of this research. The sample of this research consisted of experiment class. Namely class X IPA 5 was 30 students. In the class used Interactive Writing Model. The sample was taken by Random Sampling Technique. Based on the findings, it was found that the value of t-test in writing is descriptive text is greater than the ratio on t-table $(3.770) > (2.756)$ and in recount text t-test is greater than ratio on t-table also $(5.420) > (2.756)$. Based on the table it can be conclude that the alternative hypothesis is accepted. It means that there was increased in the students' writing descriptive and recount text before and after gave treatment used interactive writing model. Therefore, that result of the pre-test and post-test was significance different. Based on the descriptive, the pre-test and post-test prove the post-test is higher. Based on the explanation, Interactive Writing Model can increase the students' writing ability in descriptive and recount text.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">This is an open access article under the CC BY-SA license.</p> 
<p>Intan Hardiyanti Hasri, Andi Tenri Ampa, & Ilmiah. (2020). Increasing Students' Writing Ability Through Interactive Writing Model At Sman 1 Enrekang. Journal of Language Testing and Assessment, Vol 1 (1), January 2021. doi: https://doi.org/10.22219/jpbi.vxiv.xxyy</p>	
<p>Corresponding Author: Intan Hardiyanti Hasri, English Education Department, Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar, 259 Sultan Alauddin Road, Makassar City, Rappocini 90221, Indonesia. Email: intanhasri011@gmail.com</p>	

INTRODUCTION

Writing has several forms, two of them are "descriptive" which focuses on describing people, place, things, emotion, and feelings and "recount" focuses tells events or experience in chronological sequence. State that in descriptive and recount text, we can capture and keep our memories for many years because they are our link to the past.

Based on the observation, the researcher at SMAN 1 Enrekang find there are some problems dealing with the lack of the students' ability in writing caused by several factors they are; grammar, vocabulary, content, and organization in writing, less of idea about topic, and the teacher just teaches the students without giving motivation and asking the students' problem in teaching writing.

Based on this research, the researcher chooses interactive writing as one of instruction in teaching writing for students. (Ontario, 2015), explained that there are several instructions in teaching writing, they are; shared writing, interactive writing, guided writing and independent writing.

Interactive writing is described that the teacher and students work together to produce text (Kronenberg, 2014). (el-salahat, 2014) in his dissertation “The Effectiveness of Using Interactive Writing Strategy on Developing Writing Skills among 7th Graders and their Attitudes toward writing”, explained that adopting interactive writing strategies of teaching writing skills helps the teacher to make the learning process to be more effective and dynamic. Interactive writing instruction means that the teacher helps students in writing to develop their ideas. Interactive writing can help students to be a good writer. Based on El-Salahat (2014), interactive writing is appropriate to adopt in teaching writing for EFL students to reduce students’ writing ability. Interactive writing is chosen in this research to be one of the instructions to look at the students to construct the next.

METHOD

The design of this research was a pre-experimental research. The treatment was conducted after the pre-test and before post-test.

- a) Pre-test, the researcher gave it before doing the treatment at the first meeting in class. In this case, the researcher was beginning the activity by giving the list of topic about descriptive text and recount text.
- b) Treatment, during the treatment, the student is given some material by applying interactive writing model.
- c) Post-test, the researcher is giving it after doing treatment in the class. It is aimed at finding out the value of treatment whether the result of the post-test is better than pre-test.

Instrument

In this research, the researcher was used pre-test and post-test. Pre-test aimed to find out the students’ writing ability. It was conducted at the first meeting. Post-test hold aims to find out the student achievement after applying interactive writing model and it was conducted after the treatment.

Technique of Data Analysis

The techniques of data analysis used are follows:

1. Scoring the students’ correct answer at the pretest and posttest by using this formula:

$$\text{Score} = \frac{\text{total correct answer}}{\text{total number of items}} \times 100$$

(shofa as cited in wahdania,2016)

2. Classifying the students' score into seven levels as follows':

- a. score 90-100 is classified as excellent
- b. score 80-89 is classified as very good
- c. score 70-79 is classified as good
- d. score 60-69 is classified as fairly good
- e. score 50-59 is classified as fair
- f. score $x < 50$ is classified as poor

(Depdiknas as cited in Susanti,2018)

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The Improving of students writing descriptive text

Table 1. The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of the Students Writing Descriptive Components in Pre-Test and Post-Test

	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1 Pretest	51,23	30	15,758	2,877
Poststt	67,30	30	16,808	3,069

The table above shows the mean score and standard deviation of the pre-test and post-test. The mean score of the pre-test was 51.23 with standard deviation 15.758. The result of the data analysis from the table above confirms that the mean score was almost the same before having treatment. Meanwhile the mean score of the students' post-test after the treatment was 67.30 with standard deviation was 16.808 and it classified in good classification.

Table 1.

Table 2. The Frequency and Percentage of the Students' Writing Descriptive Score in Pre-Test

Classification	Score	F	%
Excellent	90-100	-	-
Very Good	80-89	-	-
Good	70-79	5	16,7
Fairly Good	60-69	2	6,7
Fair	50-59	13	43.3
Poor	$X < 50$	10	33,3
Total		30	100

Based on the table above, it found that before having treatment the students 5 (16.7%) students had score good classification, there were 2 (6.7%) students categorized as fairly good classification, there were 13 (43.3%) students categorized as fair good classification, the students gained scores categorized as poor classification were 10 (33.3%) students and none of the students were in excellent and very good classification.

Table 3. The Frequency and Percentage of the Students' Writing Score of Writing Components in Post Test

Classification	Score	F	%
Excellent	90-100	2	6,7
Very Good	80-89	9	30
Good	70-79	2	6,7
Fairly Good	60-69	5	16,6
Fair	50-59	9	30
Poor	X<50	3	10
Total		30	100

Based on the table above it maintains that, there were 2 (6.7%) students categorized as excellent and good classification, there were 9 (30%) students categorized as very good and fair classification, the students gained scores categorized as fairly good classification were 5 (16.6%) students, the students gained scores categorized as poor classification were 3(10%).

The Improving of Students Writing Recount Text

Table 4. The mean score and standard deviation of the students writing recount text in pre-test and post-test

	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1 Pretest	36,93	30	13,889	2,536
posttest	60,47	30	17,971	3,281

The table above shows the mean score and standard deviation of experimental class in the pre-test and post-test. The mean score of experimental class in the pre-test was 36.93 with standard deviation 13.889. Based on the scoring classification of writing recount those score were poor classifications. Meanwhile the mean score of the students' post-test after the treatment was 60.47 with standard deviation was 17.971 and it classified in fairly good classification. The table above also shows that the mean score in post-test is higher than pre-test.

Table 5. The Frequency and Percentage of the Students' Writing Recount Text Score in Pre-Test

Classification	Score	experimental class	
		F	%
Excellent	90-100	-	-
Very Good	80-89	-	-
Good	70-79	-	-
Fairly Good	60-69	-	-
Fair	50-59	9	30
Poor	X<50	21	70
Total		30	100

Based on the table above, it found that before having treatment the students 9 (30%) students had scored fair classification, there were 21 (70%) students categorized as poor

classification and none of the students were in very good, fairly good, good and excellent classification.

Table 6. The Frequency and Percentage of the Students' Writing Recount Score of Writing Recount Text in Post-Test

Classification	Score	experimental class	
		F	%
Excellent	90-100	-	-
Very Good	80-89	6	20
Good	70-79	3	10
Fairly Good	60-69	5	16,7
Fair	50-59	10	33,3
Poor	X<50	6	20
Total		30	100

Based on the table above it maintains that, there were 6 (20%) students had scored very good classification, 3(10%) students categorized as good classification, the students Gained scores categorized as fairly good classification were 5(16.7%), 10(33.3%) obtained scores categorized as fair classification, 6(20%) obtained score categorized as poor classifications and none of the students were in excellent classification.

Sub Section 1 The Achievement of The Students' Writing Descriptive Text in Terms of Content

Students' writing skill in term content supported by the students' mean score in post-test higher than pre-test. Before applied treatment the students could not make a good content in writing descriptive text. After applied treatment, the students easily to make content in writing as well.

The students' mean score in pre-test was 53, 67 (Fair classification) become 65.47 (Fairly good classification) in the post-test. The students' result is significantly different between pre-test and poist-test. The students'score in term content of pre-test does not reflect careful thinking or was hurried written. But, after applied the treatment, they make a good writing. It suitable with the theory by Weigle (2009) stated that the content of writing should be clear to readers so that the readers can understand the message conveyed and gain information from it.

Sub Section 2 The Achievement of The Students' Writing Descriptive Text in Terms of Organization

Students' writing skill in organization was supported by the students mean score in post-test higher than pre-test. The improvement of students' writing skill in term of organization on pre-test and post-test. Mean score of the students' pre-test was 48.93 (poor classification) become 65.53 (Fairly good classification) in post-test. In this case, pre-test and post-test improved after giving the treatment. But, the post-test was higher than pre-test.

After applied treatment, they made a good conclusion in their writing, ideas and their messages could be organized. It was suitable with the theory by A.R Coulthard as cited in Hirsyam (2016) state that organization concern with the way how the writer arranges and organizes their idea and their messages in writing from which consist of some partial order. Therefore, it can conclude that the use interactive writing model can improve students writing ability in term of organization.

Sub Section 3 The Achievement of The Students' Writing Recount Text in Terms of Content

The improvement of students' writing skill in term content can be seen in pre-test and post-test. The mean score of the students' pre-test was 39.10 (poor classification) become 65.50 (fairly good classification in post-test. In this case, it improved after giving the treatment. But, the post-test was higher than pre-test.

Sub Section 4 The Achievement of The Students' Writing Recount Text in Terms of Organization

. The improvement of students' writing ability in term organization based on pre-test and post-test. Mean score of the students' pre-test in was 34.53 (poor classification) become 55.07 (fair classification) in post-test. In this case, students's pretest increased after giving the treatment. The post-test was higher than pre-test.

The students' pre-test in writing is very limited ideas well which affected the content and organization. But after applied the treatment, the result showed the students' conten and organization was increased.

CONCLUSION

Based on the finding and discussion in the previous chapter in this study, the researcher concludes that: The use of interactive writing model to increasing the students' writing skill in descriptive and recount text was significant. There were content and organization component of writing that significantly increased. The result of data analysis in writing descriptive text that t-test value 3.770 in writing is greater than t-table value 2.756 and p-value 0.001 in writing greater than p-value 0.05, and the result of data analysis in writing recount text that t-test value 5.420 in writing is greater than t-table value 2.756 and p-value 0.000 in writing greater than p-value 0.05. Based on the result, hypothesis test showed that H₀ was rejected and H₁ was accepted.

REFERENCE

- Creme, P. &. (2013). *Writing at University: A guide for Students*. New York: Open University Press.
- El-salahat. (2014). The effectiveness of using interactive writing strategy on developing writing skill among 7th graders and their attitudes towards writing. *A Thesis of Education of The Islamic University of Gaza*.
- Hirsyam, I. (2016). *Using Synergetic Teaching Strategy to Improve the Students Writing Ability*. Thesis.

Kronenberg. (2014). The Advantages and Challenges of Using Interactive Writing in A Writers' workshop. *The English Journal*.

Ontario. (2015). A guide to effective instruction in writing. *International Journal*.

Weige. (2009). *Assessing Writing*. Second Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.