The Use of Participation Point System (PPS) Method in Writing

Syahban Mada Ali

(English Education Department, Tomakaka University, Indonesia)
Syahban.syan@gmail.com

Article info	Abstract
	Tujuan penelitian ini yaitu untuk mengetahui apakah penggunaan Teknik *Participation Point System (PPS) Method* Efektif dalam meningkatkan kemampuan menulis Mahasiswa Semester 2 di Universitas Tomakaka Mamuju. Penelitian ini bertempat di Universitas Tomakaka Mamuju, di mana metode penelitian menggunakan jenis Pre-Experimen. Populasi dari penelitian ini yaitu mahasiswa Semester II tahun ajaran 2020/2021. Jumlah sampel yang digunakan yaitu 20 orang melalui Purposive Sampel. Peneliti menggunakan instrument berupa tes menulis dalam mengumpulkan data. Hasil dari data menunjukkan bahwa nilai t-table n-1 = 20-1 = 19 = 2.09 and t-tes = 8.30. Data ini menunjukkan bahwa t-tes lebih tinggi daripada t-tabel yang berarti bahwa Hipotesis Nol tertolak dan hipotesis alternative diterima. Dengan demikian, peneliti menyimpulkan bahwa penggunaan tehnik *Participation Point System (PPS)* dapat meningkatkan kemampuan menulis pada Mahasiswa Semester II Universitas Tomakaka Mamuju. Hal ini didukung oleh hasil mean skor pre-tes dan post tes siswa di mana pre-tes = 67.15 kategori *fair* meningkat menjadi 78.50 kategori *Good* pada pos-tes. *The objective of the research is to find out the use of Participation Point System (PPS) method effective in improving the Students' writing at the second semester students English Education Study Program at Tomakaka University of Mamuju. This research took place at University of Tomakaka Mamuju which the researcher used pre-experimental. Population of research was the second grade students of English Education Study Program in academic year 2020/2021. Sample of the research was 20 students that take by purposive sampling technique. The researcher used writing test in paragraphs form as instrument of the research. Result of data analysis showed that t-table value at n-1 = 20-1=19 (at significant level α = 0,05) was 2.09 and t-test value was 8.30. It showed t-test was higher than t-table, it meant that null hypothesis was rejected and alternative hypothesis was accepted. Therefore, the researcher summarized that the use of Participation Point System (PPS) method could improve the students' writing at the second semester students of English Education Study Program at Tomakaka University of Mamuju. It was supported result of students' mean score at pre-test and post-test. Which mean score of pre-test was 67.15 (Fair score) improved to 78.50 (good score) at the post-test.* ***Key words: Participation Point System (PPS), Writing in Paragraphs and Pre-Experimental.***

BACKGROUND

English is a language that is used as a communication tool in the world. In this era of globalization, English has an important role in all aspects of life, including in the education aspect. As the youngest province, western Sulawesi need young people who are ready to compete with the world especially with the Asean Economic Community (AEC) was very spur of the development of English in Indonesia, including in West Sulawesi.

As other language skills, writing is a way of communicating massage in written form to a reader for a purpose. Through writing, one can explain or describe things and as a result, people miles from us can get information by reading the written message. Harmer (2004:31) states that writing is often not time-bound in the way conversation. He adds that writing encourages students to focus on accurate language use and, because they think as they write, it may well provoke language development as they resolve problems which the writing puts into their mind. When writing, students frequently have more time to think than they do in oral activities.

So writing as language teaching is considered a difficult subject for the students. Students usually have many ideas and experiences but they get difficulties in starting their writing. That will cause many students waste valuble time just for getting started. How to present poin systematicly also usually become students' difficulty in writing.

In the case Students of Tomakaka, the researcher found that the ability of the students to write were still low. Stated the most of students have difficulties to arrange word in to sentence because they have not been able to put them in their correct position in other words the students do not have enought knowledge to write effectivelly sentence.

This problem was identified when they had been given a test to describe and they found themselves unable to write well and even stammer as they were extremely low at five components of writing such as content, language use, organization, vocabulary, and mechanic. Besides that, it was so difficult for them to write about the topics given by the researcher on the diagnostic test. It is all about wanting in vocabulary. This situation definitely makes the students not highly motivated to write well as afraid of making mistakes. So, based on the situation it is needed one solution to solve the problem, one of them is by changing the method that used namely Participation Point System (PPS).

"Participation Point System (PPS)" is a method created by Hadley. The purpose of this is to have effective method to measure a participation mark of the student to see the students' progress and to make students get accustomed to write. Teachers usually write the point for active student secretly in their notes. As a result, only high motivated students who always get benefit of the point and students do not know their participating progress. So Hadley creates method that makes the point for student participation tangible.

The Hadley's "PPS" method is also adopted by another researcher (David Brown, 2006, p: 1). Brown did an action research to investigate whether the "PPS" method could be implemented in Thailand. The result of his study is that students can have courageousness to participate in class activity and it shows the improvement in their ability.

Based on the background above, it was decided to introduce Participation Point System (PPS) method to the students by conducting the research entitled: *The Use of Participation Point System Method in Writing.*

METHODS

This research was conducted at Tomakaka University of Mamuju, district, West Sulawesi. It is near with the central of Mamuju City. This research was conducted for two months in which it was consisted of six meetings. The first meeting was to give pre-test to the students, the second until five was to give treatment and the last meeting was to give post-test.

The Kind of this research was pre-experiment research. Experiment research was research method that used to find out the effects of one treatment to the others under control. The population of this research was all students of second semester students of English Education Study Program of Tomakaka University academic year 2020/2021. The design of this research was one group pre-test and post-test design. So sampling technique used in this research was Purposive Sampling. In which the researcher take the sample at second semester

with the number of student as many as 20 students.

The instrument of the research would give test in writing paragraphs to the Students in pre-test and post-test. It used to see the students' writing before giving treatment. While post-test use to know the students' writing in five components of writing after giving treatment by participation point system (PS) Method.

The procedure of this research was the first step doing pre-test. In this pre-test the students gave writing test in paragraph form.. The test run 60 minutes. After given pre-test, the students gave treatment. It belongs six meetings and in each meetings, it was applied participation point system (PS) Method in writing. After given treatment, the post-test was given for the students. The test was similar to pre-test.

The data obtained from student was analyzed in two ways, to analyze the data the researcher conclude the follow of procedure: Scoring the students answer follow the formulated show:

1. Scoring the students' value based on the criteria of writing :

$$Score = \frac{Students Correct Answer}{Total\ Number\ of\ Item} X100$$

2. The criteria of writing component

   a. Content

Content	30-27	Excellent to very good: knowledgeable, substantive, thorough, development of thesis, relevant to assigned topic
	26-22	Good to average: some knowledge of subject, adequate range, limited development of thesis, mostly relevant to topic, but lack detail
	21-17	Fair to Poor: limited knowledge of subject, little substance, inadequate development of topic
	16-13	Very poor: does not show knowledge of subject, non-substantive, not pertinent or not enough to evaluate

b. Language Use

Language use	25-22	Excellent to very good: effective complex constructions, few errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, article, pronouns, preposition
	21-18	Good to average: effective but simple construction, minor problems in complex construction, few errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, article, pronouns, preposition but meaning seldom obscured
	17-11	Fair to poor: major problem in simple/complex construction, frequent errors of negation, agreement, tense, number, word order/function, article, pronouns, preposition but meaning seldom obscured
	10-5	Very poor: virtually no mastery of sentence constructions rules. Dominated by errors, does not communicate, or not enough to evaluate

c. Vocabulary

Vocabulary	20-18	Excellent to very good: sophisticated range. Effective word/idiom choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register
	17-14	Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form, choice, usage but meaning not obscured
	13-10	Fair to poor: limited range, frequent errors of word/idiom form, choice, usage, meaning confused or obscure
	9-7	Very poor: essentially translation, little knowledge of English vocabulary, idioms, word form or not enough to evaluate

d. Organization

Organization	20-18	Excellent to very good: fluent expression, ideas supported, succinct, well-organized, logical sequencing, cohesive
	17-14	Good to average: somewhat choppy, loosely organized but main ideas stand out, limited support, logical but incomplete sequencing
	13-10	Fair to poor: non fluent, ideas confused or disconnected, lacks logical sequencing and development
	9-7	Very poor: does not communicate, no organization or not enough to evaluate

e. Mechanic

Organization	5	Excellent to very good: demonstrate mastery of convention, few errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing
	4	Good to average: occasional errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing but meaning not obscured
	3	Fair to poor: frequent errors or spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing, poor handwriting, meaning confused or obscured
	2	Very poor: no mastery of conventions, dominated by errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing, handwriting illegible or not enough to evaluate

(Jacobs, et al's in Ali. 2015:116)

3. The score of the test will be classified into seven :

Table 1. The score of classification

No.	Classifying	Score
1.	Excellent	96-100
2.	Very Good	86-95
3.	Good	76-85
4.	Fairly Good	66-75
5.	Fair	56-65
6.	Poor	36-55
7.	Very Poor	0-35

(Adapted from Arikunto in Saleh 2005)

4. Calculating the rate percentages of the students' score:

$$P = \frac{F}{N} \; x \; 100\%$$

Where:

P = Percentages

F = Frequency

N = Total number of samples

(Gay in saleh,1981:448)

5. The mean score of each group using the following formula:

$$\overline{X} = \frac{\sum X}{N}$$

Where:

$\overline{X}$ = Mean score

$\sum X$ = Sum of score in the group

N = Number of subject

(Gay in , Saleh 1981:331)

6. Calculating the value test to indicate the significance of difference between the two means. The following is Employed:

$$t = \frac{\overline{D}}{\sqrt{\dfrac{\sum D^2 - \dfrac{(\sum D)^2}{N}}{N(N-1)}}}$$

Where:

t = test of significance

$\overline{D}$ = the difference of mean score

$\sum D$ = the sum of difference

N = total number of samples.

(Gay in Saleh,1981:332)

THE RESULT OF RESEARCH

The findings consisted of the developing of the students' organization and language use in writing. The findings of the research detected that the use of Participation Point System (PPS) can develop the students' writing in making paragraphs . Then, the data is obtained on the following explanation:

The rate frequency and percentage of the students' score was obtained through the writing test. The researcher determines the writing of student uses of participation point System (PPS) method in improving students' writing ability, rate frequency, percentage and score classification as follows:

a. The Rate Frequency and Percentage of the writing in Pre-Test and Post Test

Table 1.
Frequency and Percentage of the writing in Pre-Test and Post Test

No	Classification	Score	Pre-test		Post-Test	
			F	%	F	%
1.	Excellent	96 – 100	0	0%	0	0%
2.	Very good	86 – 95	0	0%	3	15%
3.	Good	76 – 85	2	10%	9	45%
4.	Fairly Good	66 – 75	8	40%	8	40%
5.	Fair	56 – 65	10	50%	0	0
6.	Poor	36 – 45	0	0%	0	0
7.	Very poor	0 – 35	0	0%	0	0
	Total score		**20**	**100%**	**20**	**100%**

The table above illustrated that the first greatest frequency in pre-test was in good classification with 2 (10%) students. Then followed by Fairly good classification is 8 students (40%), and the third frequency was in fair with 10 (50%) students, not f0und students who were in excellent and very good classification and also not found students was on poor and very poor categorized.

In post-test, the highest frequency was very good categorized with 3 (15%) students. Then, in the second categorized was good that the number of the students was 9 (45%). And the last was fairly good categorized with 8 (40%) students.

Based on the result of pre-test, only 2 of students passed Good categorized. By seeing the result of pre-test, the researcher concluded that before gives treatment to students, the result of pre – test was still low, it means that students' writing ability still needed to be improved, because none student get excellent, very good and just three students got good score.

In contrast with the result of post-test, the students' score was improved. It can be seen from the score that there were 3 (15%) students reached very good categorized then 9 (45%) students who got good categorized. And there was 8 (40%) students stood in fairly good categorized. So, based on this result, it can be concluded that after giving treatment by using participation point System (PPS) method there was improvement of the students in students' writing of paragraphs.

b. The Mean Score of components of writing in Pre-Test

Table 2.
The mean Score of Components of Writing in Pre-Test

No	Component Of Writing	Pre-test	Classification
		Mean Score	

No	Component	Mean Score	Classification
1.	Contents	19.80	**Fair to Poor**
2.	Language Use	14.90	**Fair to Poor**
3.	Organization	15.50	**Good to Average**
4.	Vocabulary	15.00	**Good to Average**
5	Mechanic	2	**Very poor**

Based on the table 2 above described that the mean score of content was 19.80. then language use was 14.90, both of the components were same categories namely fair to poor. Next, it was also showed the same categories between organization and vocabulary, both of in good to average category. And the last, it was mechanic that placed in very poor category.

c. The Mean Score of components of writing in Post-test

Table 3.
The mean Score of Components of Writing in Post-Test

No	Component Of Writing	Post-test Mean Score	Classification
1.	Contents	23.90	**Good to Average**
2.	Language Use	18.85	**Good to Average**
3.	Organization	17.10	**Good to Average**
4.	Vocabulary	16.05	**Good to Average**
5	Mechanic	2.60	**Very poor**

Based on the table 3 above, it was showed that the mean score of each components has improved. The content was 23.90 that was in Good category. Then language use was 18.85 in good category. Next, it was also showed the same categories between organization and vocabulary, both of in good to average category. And the last was mechanic which placed in poor category with the mean score was 2.60.

d. The improvement of five categories writing in Pre-Test and post test

Table 4.
The Improvement of Writing in Pre-Test and Post-test

No	Component Of Writing	Pre-test Mean Score	Post Test Mean Score	Improve ment
1.	Contents	19.80	23.90	**4.1**
2.	Language Use	14.90	18.85	**3.95**
3.	Organization	15.50	17.10	**1.60**
4.	Vocabulary	15.00	16.05	**1.05**
5	Mechanic	2	2.60	**0.60**

Based on the table 4, it can be stated that, the highest improvement was content. It can be got 4.1 difference. Then, followed by Language use, organization, vocabulary and Mechanics. And the lowest improvement was mechanics category. It was 0.60 points.

e. Mean score and Standard Deviation of Writing in Pre-test and Post-test

Table 5.
Mean score and Standard Deviation of Writing in Pre-test and Post-test

Test	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Pre-test	67.15	5.72
Post-test	78.50	5.35

Based on the table 5 above, the mean score of the pre-test was 67.15 while the mean score of post-test was 78.50. The difference of the mean score between pre-test and post-test was 11.35 points. From this data shown, it concluded that there is an improvement significantly after given treatment for the second semester students of English Education Study Program of Tomakaka University of Mamuju by using participation point System (PPS) method.

f. T-test Value of the Students' Writing

Table 6.
T-test Value of the Students' Writing

VARIABLE	T-TEST VALUE	T-TABLE VALUE
X2 – X1	8.63	2.09

The result of the t-test analysis is 8.63 than t-table value was 2.09. It showed that the t-test value was greater than the t-table value (8.63 > 2.09). The degree of freedom (df) was 19 (n-1 or 20-1=19), the level of significant (p) =0.05, the t-test value = 8.63 and the t-table value = 2.09, this result pointed that there was a significant difference between the pre-test and the post-test of the students that taught by using participation point System (PPS) method in learning writing. It means that the Alternative Hypothesis (H_1) was accepted while the Null Hypothesis (H_0) was rejected.

Discussion

Based on previous finding on all writing components, it showed that the writing of the second semester students of Tomakaka University improved. It was also supported by the students' frequency and rate percentage of the students' pre-test and post-test.

The data in students' frequency and rate percentage of the students' pre-test showed that there were not excellent and very good classification while in post-test was found three (15%) students in very good. Then, in pre-test 2 (10%) students in good classification and it improved to become 9 (45%) in post-test. The same number occurred in fairly good category, both of were 8 (40%) students.

Then, in the fair category, it was found in pre-test there were 10 (50%) students. It was difference in post-test that non students were fair category. It indicated that the students' writing ability was improved after given treatment by using participation point System (PPS) method.

Referring to the result of the students' writing obtained the stated in finding previously, the researcher used t-test to test the hypothesis. Based on the statistic result, it was summarized that the t-test value was higher than t-table (8.30 > 2.09). It indicated there was significant different between the score of pre-test and post-test. Thus, the alternative hypothesis (H1) was accepted and the null hypothesis (H0) was rejected. Finally, the researcher states that the use of participation point System (PPS) method is able to give significantly improving to the students' writing in making paragraphs.

REFERENCES

1. Ali, S. M. 2015. The effects of Problem-based learning to Writing Achievement of the tenth graders of SMAN 1 Enrekang. *Thesis.* Unpublished PPs UNM. Makassar.
2. Arikunto Suharsimi. 2005. *Dasar-Dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan. Edisi Revisi.* Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
3. Brown, H Douglas. (2003). *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices.* San Francisco, California: Pearson Education.
4. Gay, L.R. 1981, *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application.* Second Edition, USA: Charles E. Meril Publishing Company.
5. Harmer, Jeremy. 1984. *The Practice of English Language Teaching.* New York: Grow Hill Press.
6. Hammerly, H. 1991. *Fluency and Accuracy.* New York: Multilingual Matters. Ltd.
7. Harmer, Jeremy. 2001. *The Practice of English Language Teaching.* London: Longman.
8. Harris, P. David. 1969. *Testing English as a Second Language.* New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc
9. Setiadi, Bambang. 2006. *Metode Penelitian untuk Pengajaran Bahasa Asing: Pendekatan Kuantitatif dan Kualitatif.* Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.
10. Sugiyono, Prof. DR. 2006. *Statistika untuk Penelitian*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

PROFIL

The researcher, Syahban Mada Ali was born on March 22nd, 1988 in Enrekang. He was the fourth child of three sisters (Radiyah Mada Ali S.Pd.I, Dewi Sartika Mada Ali S.Pd.I, and Nur Wahidah M. Rum Mada Ali) and four brothers (Muh.

Yusuf Mada Ali S.Pd.I, Ramadhan Mada Ali, S.Sos, Firman Mada Ali, S.Pd.I and Muh. Ali Akbar Mada Ali). He was born from the best couple Muh. Rum Mada Ali (Rahimahullah) and Hafidah Sagga. He has married with Mrs. Nurul Hasanah, S.Pd.,M.Pd and belongs a boy and a daughter .

He began his study at SDN 172 Enrekang in 1994 and finished in 2000. In the same year, he continued his study at MTs. (Madrasah Tsanawiyah) Miftahul Khair DDI Enrekang and in 2003 he continued his study at same school until finished MA (Madrasah Aliah) in 2006.

In 2006 He was accepted and continued his study in English Department of Tarbiyah and Teaching Faculty of UIN Alauddin Makassar. In 2010 he was successes to get his degree (S.Pd). In 2013, he was admitted as a student of English Education Study Program of Graduate Program State University of Makassar. Then, in 2015 he was success to get his Master degree (S-2). He is a Lecturer in Tomakaka University of West Sulawesi.

"Good for Goodness and Bad for badness (*in Khairan fa Khairan wa in Syarran Fasyarran*) is one of the principles in his life.