

Students' Writing Skills On Open-Ended Procedure At Second Year Students Of Smk Negeri 1 Baubau

La Mido

English Educational Study Program of Dayanu Ikhsanuddin University

Email : lamido1980@gmail.com

Abstrak

Keterampilan Menulis Siswa melalui metode open-ended procedure Pada Siswa Kelas Dua SMK Negeri 1 Baubau. Penelitian ini dimaksudkan untuk mendapatkan informasi tentang apakah penggunaan open-ended procedure meningkatkan keterampilan menulis siswa atau tidak. Pre-experimental sebagai desain dari penelitian ini. Satu kelas sebagai sampel penelitian ini. Data penelitian dikumpulkan dengan menggunakan tes sebagai instrumen penelitian. Statistik deskriptif dan inferensial sebagai statistik yang digunakan untuk menganalisis data keterampilan menulis siswa. Hasil dari penelitian ini adalah penggunaan open-ended procedure dalam pengajaran menulis meningkatkan keterampilan menulis siswa. Dapat disimpulkan bahwa penggunaan open-ended prosedur efektif untuk diterapkan dalam pengajaran menulis karena meningkatkan keterampilan menulis siswa dalam hal isi, content, organisasi paragraf, kosa kata, tata bahasa dan tanda baca.

Kata Kunci : *Open-ended procedure, Keterampilan Menulis*

Abstract

Students Writing Skills on Open-Ended Procedure at Second Year Students of SMK Negeri 1 Baubau. This study's goal was to determine whether or not the use of open – ended procedure developed students' writing skills. Pre-experimental design was used in this study. One class made up the sample. Tests were used as the researchs tools to gather the data for the study. To evaluate, descriptive and inferential statistics were employed data on the students' writing abilities. The findings supported the use of an open-ended approach to teaching writing. developed the students' writing skills. It can be said that the utilization of open-ended procedure was effective to be implemented in developing the students' writing skill in terms of content, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanics.

Keywords : *Open-Ended Procedure, Students Writing Skills*

INTRODUCTION

Language is a vital communication tool that is commonly used in many countries across the globe. Students should be proficient in English in all contexts. The four talents are speaking, reading, writing, and listening. These abilities are interrelated. The researcher in this instance will pay particular attention to writing skills. The process of writing needs a whole speaking, and requires a completely distinct set of skills, according to Brown (2001), who argues that writing would assume that written language is merely the graphic depiction of spoken language. Writing has a composing process by its very nature. Written work frequently involves thinking, creating, and revising processes that call for particular talents that not every speaker naturally acquires. Similar to this, Byrne (1988)

asserts that writing, despite the fact that it must be acknowledged as an additional means of communication, is a main method of recording speech.

The first meaning of writing is that it is the highest degree of communication in a language, it is the final macro skill that people who want to interact flawlessly must master the final macro ability. The second is that communication through writing is done. The ability to be productive rather than obtaining, it entails developing language. People can use written language to express themselves. Writing is the most nuanced macro ability in language mastery, which is the third importance of writing. In fiction, people put everything they've learned in the previous three stages to use. The fourth is the or the final meaning of writing is that it is the stage of language mastery at which people are able to generate ideas. People can create the concept perfectly in writing so that it is easily understood.

To teach students about literature is one technique to help them achieve this goal. Writing exercises help pupils recall what they've learned, according to some researchers. According to Chapman (2015), learners are more likely to retain and put new material to use when writing skills and techniques are given in a way that links their past knowledge to the new information and their actual lives. The connection between the two improves the learners' capacity to use prior or new knowledge. memory with enduring value According to Chapman and King, "If I see the puzzle, if I understand it, if I know how to use it, if I need it, I will remember and apply it".

Regardless of the difficulties students face, writing is a crucial skill. This is due to the fact that many who use technology as a means of communication these days seem unable to do without it. Writing activities range from the simplest, like sending text messages on cell phones, to formal business letters sent via e-mail. The significance of writing is also demonstrated by the following; it is now necessary for those who wish to compete in the global economy. Students who fail to write an essay will have limited future opportunities.

When pre observation done by the researcher at SMK Negeri 1 Baubau, the researcher found that the methods and the teacher role become the problem so the student become bored with English learning activity. First, the teaching learning process was less interesting as teacher gave monotonous method and also often uses the same method in teaching writing in class that made students become bored and cannot remember English learning activity in long period of time. According to the researcher, who is also an English teacher, many students at SMK Negeri 1 Baubau struggle with English lessons, particularly writing narrative paragraphs. According to the author's experience in English teaching, students rarely complete the task requiring them to write a paragraph. The main issues that led to the low achievement in writing narrative paragraphs were a lack of vocabulary, a lack of understanding of sentence structure, and a lack of motivation to learn English. This situation motivated the researcher to find out an appropriate teaching strategy to solve the problem of students' difficulties in writing narrative paragraph and tried to improve it all at once.

According to Shoimin (2014) the learning model with the open-ended learning approach has the advantages. Students get greater opportunity to voice their views and participate more actively in the learning process. When searching for solutions to problems, using their knowledge and abilities extensively, responding to issues in their own unique way—despite their low ability—and being intrinsically motivated to provide assistance or justification, students have a wealth of experience to draw upon.

Based on issue above, the researcher offers to use open-ended procedure when instructing students on how to write. Students would think it is easier to write if you use this approach.

METHOD

When conducting experiments, the researcher used pre-experimental design. Pre-experimental designs with only one group or class receiving pre- and post-tests are stated in (Sugiyono, 2009). Without using a control or comparison group, the one group pretest and posttest design was used on a single group. The design use in the treatment is formula as follows:

Pre test	Treatment	Post test
Y1	X	Y2

Remarks :

- Y 1 : Pre test
- X : Treatment by using Open-Ended
- Y 2 : Post tes

An independent variable and a dependent variable were both present in this study. An independent variable was one that was thought to have an impact on another variable. A dependent variable is a category that is influenced by or results from another category (Kerlinger, 1989). In this study, the open-ended teaching method was the independent variable and the students' writing skills were the dependent variables. Writing skills of students are based on content, structure, language use, vocabulary, and mechanics.

The target for this study consisted of the 30 second graders in each of the four classes at SMK Negeri 1 Baubau. Cluster random sampling of the population was used to choose the sample for this study, which consisted of 1 class. Tests were the research's primary tool. Pre- and post-tests made up the test. Both the pre- and post-tests, which are given prior to and following treatment. In gathering the information for the essay, the researcher drew on the subjects or themes covered in the SMKN 1 Baubau curriculum.

The researcher offered the students a writing test prior to the treatment in order to ascertain their prior knowledge. A subjective test with a narrative paragraph was employed as the pre-test. The researcher conducted a post after completing the treatment. To determine the students' writing improvement, the researcher employed a test that was subjective and included a narrative paragraph.

The following approaches were used to analyze the accomplishment data from the pre- and post-tests of the students:

evaluating the test results of the students. The researcher employed an analytical method to determine the writing exam results of the students on both the pretest and posttest. According to the assessment's objectives, this method centered students' writing scores on the following writing elements: content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics.

The following table lists the standards and the students' results for content, structure, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics was categorized:

Table 1. The Scheme for marking the five writing components that were assessed

No	elements of writing evaluation	Interval score	Indicators
1	Content	27 – 30	Very good to excellent: informed; substantial; etc.
		22 – 26	Good to average: acceptable range; some subject knowledge; etc.
		17 – 21	Fair to poor: little substance; limited topic understanding, etc.
		13 – 16	Very poor: lacks subject expertise, isn't substantive, etc.
2	Organization	18 – 20	Very good to excellent: clear ideas that are expressed fluently, etc.
		14 – 17	Good to average: a little choppy; a little disjointed, but the major points are clear; etc.
		10 – 13	Poor to fair: incoherent; concepts disjointed or jumbled; etc
		7 – 9	Very poor: does not organize or communicate, etc.
3	Vocabulary	18 – 20	between extremely good and excellent advanced vocabulary, effective word and idiom selection, etc.
		14 – 17	Good to average: acceptable range, occasional mistakes in word/idiom form, choice, and usage, but meaning is not lost.
		10 – 13	Fair to poor: Limited vocabulary; frequently incorrect word/idiom form; usage; etc.
		7 – 9	Extremely inadequate: fundamentally bad translation with limited vocabulary knowledge

4	Language use	22 – 25	Effective complex constructions, etc., range from excellent to very good.
		19 – 21	Good to average: efficient yet straightforward constructions, etc.
		11 – 17	Major issues with basic or sophisticated constructions, etc., are fair to poor.
		5 – 10	Very poor: hardly any command of rules governing sentence formation, etc.
5	Mechanics	5	superior to very good shows a command of protocols, etc.
		4	Good to average: a few spelling and punctuation blips, etc
		3	Fair to poor: several spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and other mistakes
		2	Very bad: no understanding of norms; filled with spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing, etc. problems.

(Heaton: 1993)

Using the score classification listed below, the five components of student writing quality were divided into five categories:

Table 2. The Scoring Classification of the Students' Writing Skills

No	Score	Classification
1	86 - 100	6 Excellent
2	71 – 85	5 Very Good
3	56 – 70	4 Good
4	41 – 55	3 Average
5	26 - 40	2 Poor
6	≤ - 25	1 Very Poor

(Adapted from Panduan Ujian Praktek Bahasa Inggris SMK; Balitbang Depdiknas, 2015)

The researcher employed both descriptive and inferential statistics to compute the frequency table, t-test result, mean score, standard deviation to distinguish between the pretest and posttest. Mean score, standard deviation, and frequency tables are descriptive statistics, while the t-test is an inferential statistic. Using the SPSS application, the researcher calculated the data.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

Writing Skills of the Students before and after treatment.

The scoring categories for the pretest and posttest on the research's content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics are used to describe the results of the study. The major score and standard deviation of the pretest and posttest results for the Experimental groups were also explained.

- a. Classification the result of the students' pretest and posttest scores

The researcher displayed the students' pre- and post-test writing components in the tables below.

Table 3. Pretest and posttest score for Open-Ended on Content Aspect

Classification	Range	Pretest		Posttest	
		F	%	F	%
Excellent to Very Good	27-30	0	0	1	7
Good to Average	22-26	1	7	6	40
Fair to Poor	17-21	11	73	8	53
Very Poor	13-16	3	20	0	0

Table 3 illustrates that the students' performance on the pretest and posttest improved as a result of the treatment. The combined percentage of students in both groups often tends to fall into the high achiever category. In total, 7 students scored high on the post-test (47 percent), while 53 percent of students scored poorly (53 percent) (8 students). On the pre-test, there were 93 percent of low achievers and 1 student in the 7 percent high achiever category (14 students).

The difference from the pretest was evident in the score distribution for the content component of the pretest and posttest. Both of them improved after the treatment was given, but their post-test scores were greater than their pre-test scores.

- a) Organization of the Paragraph

The result of the descriptive analysis of the Pre-experimental Class pretest and posttest can be seen in the following table.

Table 4. Pretest and Posttest score for Open-Ended on Organization Aspect

Classification	Range	Pretest		Posttest	
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Excellent to Very Good	20-18	2	13	6	40
Good to Average	17-14	9	60	9	60
Fair to Poor	13-10	4	27	0	0
Very Poor	9-7	0	0	0	0

Table 4 illustrates that the students' performance on the pretest and posttest improved as a result of the treatment. The combined percentage of students in both groups often tends to fall into the high achiever category. The overall post-test percentage for high achievers (15 students) and low achievers (0% each) was 100 percent and 0%, respectively (0 students). On the pre-test, 11 students were classified as high achievers, while 73 percent scored poorly (4 students).

b) Vocabulary

The result of the descriptive analysis of the Pre-experimental Class pretest and posttest can be seen in the following table

Table 5. Pretest and Posttest score for Open-Ended on Vocabulary Aspect

Classification	Range	Pretest		Posttest	
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Excellent to Very Good	20-18	3	20	8	53
Good to Average	17-14	9	60	7	47
Fair to Poor	13-10	3	20	0	0
Very Poor	9-7	0	0	0	0

Table 5 demonstrates how the students' performance on the pretest and posttest improved after the treatment. Both categories' combined percentages of students often fall into the high achiever category. The overall post-test percentage for high achievers (15 students) was 100%, whereas the rate for poor achievers was 0%. (0 students). On the pre-test, high achievers made up 80% (12 students), while low achievers made up 20%. (3 students).

c) Language Use

The following table shows the findings of the descriptive analysis of the pretest and posttest results for the Pre-experimental Class.

Table 6. Pretest and Posttest score for Open-Ended on Language Use Aspect

Classification	Range	Pretest		Posttest	
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Excellent to Very Good	25-22	0	0	2	13
Good to Average	21-18	5	33	7	47
Fair	17-11	10	67	6	40

Table 6 demonstrates how the students' performance on the pretest and posttest improved after the treatment. Both categories' combined percentages of students often fall into the high achiever category. The overall post-test percentage, divided into high achievers (9 students) and low achievers (40%), was 60%. (6 students). While taking the pre-test, the percentage of high achievers (5 students) was 33% while the percentage of low achievers (67%) was (10 students).

d) Mechanic

The following table shows the findings of the descriptive analysis of the Pre-experimental Class pretest and posttest.

Table 7. Pretest and Posttest score for Open-Ended on Mechanic Aspect

Classification	Range	Pretest		Posttest	
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Excellent to Very Good	5	0	0	1	7
Good to Average	4	1	6	6	40
Fair to Poor	3	10	67	8	53
Very Poor	2	4	27	0	0

Table 7 shows that the students' performance on the pretest and posttest improved after the treatment. The combined percentage of students in both groups often tends to fall into the high achiever category. In total, 7 students scored high on the post-test (47 percent), while 53 percent of students scored poorly (53 percent) (8 students). On the pre-test, there was one student who scored highly (6%) and 94 percent who scored poorly (14 students).

The distributions from all of the above aspects of the Open-Ended pretest and posttest in general can be seen in the following table.

Table 8. Pretest and posttest score for Pre-experimentl class in General

Classification	Range	Pretest		Posttest	
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Excellent	96-100	0	0	0	0
Very Good	86-95	0	0	3	20
Good	76-85	1	7	5	33
Fairly Good	66-75	9	60	7	46
Fair	56-65	5	33	0	0
Poor	46-55	0	0	0	0
Very Poor	0-45	0	0	0	0

Table 8 above demonstrates that in the pretest, 10 students or 34% of the students received high achiever classification scores, while 14 students or 93% of the students received low achiever classification ratings. In the meantime, on the posttest, 8 students or 53% of the students received high achiever classification scores, whereas 7 students or 46% received low achiever classification scores.

Based on the distribution of the pretest and posttest scores mentioned above, all of the students for both sets score were different but the difference is not so significant.

a. Test of Significance (T – Test).

Inferential analysis was used to examine the hypotheses. In this instance, the researcher used the t-test (testing of significance) for a paired sample test to determine whether there was a statistically significant difference between the scores of students from the pretest and posttest before and after treatment.

The following table shows the results of the t-test under the assumption that the level of significance (α) = 0.05 and the degree of freedom (df) = 14, where N - 1, respectively.

Table 9. The result of Paired sample T-test**Paired Samples Test**

	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Pair 1 PRE TEST - POST TEST	-11,66667	2,91956	,75383	-13,28346	-10,04987	-15,477	14	.000

Based on the table above, it can be obtained the number of sig. (2-tailed) was 0.000 which is it was between 0.05, means that value is significant. Beside that the number of t-count was -15.477 and the degree of freedom was 14. If the value were to be compared to the t-table result, the outcome would be t-count t-table (-15.477 2.144), meaning H_a is accepted and H_o is refused. It means that there is significant difference on students' writing narrative paragraph between the class before taught by using open-ended procedure and the class after taught with open-ended procedure at SMK Negeri 1 Baubau. The mean value difference between the pre-test and post-test following the application of treatment lends evidence to this. The pre-test mean, which was 66.73, was lower than the post-test mean, which was 78.40.

DISCUSSION**The Students' Writing Skill**

The greater score was 20 students or (3 students) according to the posttest score distribution since there was a difference in each writing achievement component, particularly the vocabulary and organization component. Since the students' theme was her own experience, this had an impact on the paragraph's higher score for vocabulary and order. According to Saraka (1988), it is simple to organize a paragraph that includes events based on students' experiences. It was further demonstrated by one of the respondents' assertion that it was simpler for her to write a narrative paragraph based on her personal experience than it was for her to draw on the experiences of others.

Furthermore, students' significant improvement on the language use component had an impact on her receiving a very high category. Since the properties of a narrative paragraph align with the usage of past tense, transition time, conjunction, and other grammar elements to establish a chronological sequence, the paragraph has these features. As they used to participate in the English competition and utilized it as the subject of experience when they produced the narrative paragraph, students improved their command of vocabulary and organizational skills. Extrinsic motivation is one of the aspects that can influence students' learning, according to Harmer (1992: 193). It speaks about the drive to carry out an action as a means to an end.

Additionally, the pretest's lower score of 5 students were classified as a fair classification. Each component has to be improved, notably the substance and mechanics since these grades differed significantly from other components' rankings based on the writing quality of the student body. There was no discernible difference between the pretest and posttest. This indicates that the student was unable to construct a narrative paragraph that utilized effective chronological sentence construction.

They did not include the story or the events in the paragraph of the narrative where they occurred. The writing paragraph because the events were not related in chronological sequence. That a paragraph contains coherence and good structure is a significant accomplishment in written form of second or foreign languages, according to Cecle Murcia as cited by Yavuz (2010) Similarly, cohesiveness is one of the major problems with students' writing, according to Bamberg, who was mentioned by Lixia Wang (2008: 164), and this greatly decreases their ratings.

The use of story in writing instruction, however, has been shown to increase students' writing skills at SMK Negeri 1 Baubau in terms of content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics, based on a broad study of both sets of scores and data analysis on each component. The findings show that the usage of stories improved the pupils' writing skills. If the P-value or sig. (2-tailed) value of the students' posttest is higher than P-value, then there is significance between the pretest and posttest, according to Gay et al. (2006: 358). (0.000). (0.05). Based on their pretest, students' prior knowledge was essentially the same. Before starting the treatment, the pretest was given. According to the pretest results, the majority of students struggled to write effectively in English. For instance, they didn't know how to structure a complete sentence, their paragraphs lacked coherence or involvement, their ideas were hard to understand because of their punctuation, etc.

Additionally, the average posttest score was 76.43 and was classified as "good," whereas the average pretest score was 61.43 and was classified as "average".

CONCLUSION

The use of open ended procedure in teaching writing gave differences on both pretest and posttest but it was so significant. The students who got treatment obtained high achiever category than pretest.

REFERENCES

- Brown, H. D. 2001. Teaching by principles: an interactive approach to language pedagogy: A Pearson Education Company, Second Edition.
- Byrne, D. 1988. Teaching Writing Skills. London: Longman Group Lt
- Chapman, 2015. Seaweeds and Their Uses. 3rd ed. London: Chapman and Hall
- Gay, L.R, and Mills, Geoffrey, 2006. Educational Research. Competencies for Analysis and Applications. Eighth Edition. New Jersey: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Harmer, Jeremy. 2004. How to Teach Writing. New York; Longman.
- Harmers, J. 1992. The Practice of English Language Teaching. London: Longman
- Heaton, J.B. (1993). Writing English Language Test. Singapore: Longman Group Limited.
- Kemendikbud, (2015) Permendikbud Nomor 103 Tahun 2014 Tentang Pembelajaran Pada Pendidikan Dasar dan Pendidikan Menengah. Jakarta : Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan RI.
- Saraka, 1988. From Paragraph to Essay, Concept and Practice. Jakarta: Lembaga Pendidikan Tenaga Kependidikan.
- Sugiono. 2009. Statistika untuk penelitian. Bandung, Alfabeta
- Shoimin, Aris. 2014. 68 Innovative Learning Models in the 2013 Curriculum. Yogyakarta: Ar-Ruzz Media
- Wang, Lixia. 2008. Theme and Rheme in the Thematic Organisation of Text: Implications for Teaching Academic Writing. Asian EFL Journal. (Online) (http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/June_2008_EBook_editions.pdf) Downloaded November 9, 2011
- Yavuz, Dilek. 2010. Writing Performance Relative to Writing Apprehension, Self-Efficacy in Writing, and Attitude toward Writing. Asian EFL Journal. (On line). (<http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/PDF/June-2010.pdf>). Downloaded on 17th November 2011.