



## IMPROVING WRITING ABILITY THROUGH DIRECTED WRITING ACTIVITY STRATEGY

**Hasbiyah Srianah Amir**

Institut Ilmu Sosial dan Bisnis Andi Sapada

Email: [hasbiyah.srianah@gmail.com](mailto:hasbiyah.srianah@gmail.com)

Orcid Id: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2497-3347>

Article received : 2022-06-18

Review process : 2022-06-25

Article published : 2022-06-30

### Abstract

*Improving writing ability through directed writing activity strategy of the tenth-year students. This research is to find out whether or not the Directed Writing Activity strategy able to improve the writing ability. The writer applied quasi-experimental method, with two group control and experimental class. The result of the data analysis on mean score of pre-tests was 60.23 and the mean score of post-tests was 83.97. After analyzing the data by using the test formula, the result of t-test value was 6.23 and t-table value was 1.671. It means that the t-test value was greater than t-table value (1.671). This indicated that  $H_1$  was accepted and  $H_0$  was rejected. It shows that directed writing activity strategy able to improve the students' writing ability and there is significant difference of the students' writing ability before and after giving treatment through directed writing activity strategy.*

**Keywords:** Writing ability; Directed writing activity strategy

### Abstrak

*Meningkatkan kemampuan menulis melalui Strategi Aktivitas Menulis Tertuntun pada kelas sepuluh. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui apakah pengajaran melalui strategi directed writing activity dapat memperbaiki kemampuan menulis. Penulis menerapkan desain penelitian quasi eksperimental, dengan dua kelompok yaitu kelas kontrol dan kelas eksperimen. Hasil dari data analisis nilai rata-rata pre-test adalah 60.23 dan nilai rata-rata post-test adalah 83.97. Setelah menganalisis dengan menggunakan rumus T-test, hasil dari T-test adalah 6.23 dan nilai t-table adalah 1.671. Itu menunjukkan bahwa nilai t-test lebih tinggi dari nilai t-table. Hal ini mengindikasikan bahwa  $H_1$  diterima dan  $H_0$  ditolak. Hal ini dapat dilihat bahwa Strategi Aktivitas Menulis Tertuntun dapat meningkatkan kemampuan menulis siswa dan ada perbedaan yang signifikan antara kemampuan menulissiswa sebelum dan sesudah diajarkan menggunakan Strategi Aktivitas Menulis Tertuntun*

**Kata Kunci:** Kemampuan Menulis; Strategi aktivitas menulis tertuntun.



## Introduction

Writing is basic skills that need high concentrate to do it. Writing use help us to give feedback to another people and express our feeling, idea, etc. Nowadays, writing still became subject which is not enjoyable. But not all students can write well when they are writing, their face some difficulties. They do not master vocabulary, punctuation, grammar, and how to use appropriate words. The condition is in line with the fact that the teaching of writing still remains a serious problem. One serious problem is the lack of ability of students to write. In addition, technique or media of the teacher does not make students interested to learn and made them got bored. The teacher should create comfortable learning situation to overcome the problems of the students, can help or motivate the students in order to express their ideas into writing.

Based on that problem, the writer offers one of the writing strategies namely, directed writing activity strategy. Directed Writing Activity Strategy is guided writing activity is based on the process approach designed by Blake and Spenato in Halik (2012). According to the designer, this strategy can improve students' writing skills. While Tompkins and Hoskinson in Halik (2012) says "The strategy is guided writing activities writing activity that provides the broadest opportunity to students to select and develop a topic that they enjoy so that students feel ownership and is responsible for writing". Directed Writing Activity Strategy has several stages: prewriting, writing, revising, and editing.

## Method

The method used by the writer in this research was quasi-experiment design which involved two classes with different treatment, namely experimental class and control class. Where the experimental class received a treatment through Directed Writing Activity strategy meanwhile the control class treated through a conventional method.

The population of this research was tenth students of senior high school in academic year 2013/2014. Consists of twelve classes. The sample was taken by using random sampling techniques. Writer used two classes, one class for experimental and one class for control class.

The data were collected from pre-test and post-test. The writer asked students to write the descriptive text with theme fruit and market with the title determined by the students. The writer divided the score into five criteria which are the scores of contents, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanics.

## Findings and Discussions

The present study was conducted to investigate The Implementation of Directed Writing Activity Strategy to Improve the Writing Ability of the Tenth Year Students of Senior high school. In this section the research findings are presented according to the research questions.

### 1. The result of pre-test and posttest on writing test in experimental class

The findings through pre-test and posttest on writing test of the tenth-year students of senior high school is tabulated as follow:



**Table 1** Rate frequency and percentage of the writing test score of pre-test and posttest in experimental and control class.

No.	Qualification	Score	Experimental		Control	
			Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-test
1	Very Good	86-100	0	17	3	1
2	Good	71-85	5	17	17	32
3	Fair	56-70	18	0	14	1
4	Poor	41-55	10	0	1	0
5	Very Poor	≤ 40	1	0	0	0
Total			34	34	34	34

The table showed that most students' achievement scores of experimental class was poor before gave a treatment .0 student got very good, 5 students got good, 18 students got fair, 10students got poor, and 1 students got very poor. After gave a treatment, most students' scores got good classification, 17 students got very good, 17 students got good, no one got fair, no one student got poor and no one got very poor classification for the experimental class.

The table shows that most students' achievement of control class was fair before gave a treatment. 0 student got very good. 3 students got good. 17 students got fair. 14 students got poor. 1 student got very poor. But after giving treatment most of students got good classification. 1 student got very good, 32 students got good, 1 (students got fair, and no one student got poor and very poor.

It means that before gave a treatment the writing scores of the students was categorized fair. After gave a treatment, the students' score was categorized good classification.

## 2. Mean score and standard deviation pre-test and posttest between experimental class and control class.

The mean score and standard deviation of the students in the pre-test and post-test between experimental class and control class presented as follow:

**Table 2** The mean score and standard deviation of the students' pre-test and post-test both experimental and control class

Group	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Experimental Class		
Pre-test	60.23	10.1
Post-test	83.97	6.23
Control Class		
Pre-test	57.79	7.29
Post-test	76.67	3.9



The table above indicated that the mean score of the students on pre-test both in experimental class and control class. The mean score of pre-tests in experimental class (60.23) with standard deviation (10.1) is higher than pre-test in control class (57.79) with standard deviation (7.29). It reveals that the mean score and the standard deviation of the pre-test both in experimental class and control class are not significances different. It means that the writing ability of the students both in experimental class and control class have the same ability before giving treatment.

As the consideration, the mean score of the students' post-test both in experimental class and control class. The mean score of the post-test in experimental class (83.97) with standard deviation (6.23) is the higher than post-test in control class (76.67) with standard deviation (3.9). It reveals that the mean score and standard deviation in both experimental class and control class are significance different.

### 3. Hypothesis Testing

In testing the hypothesis, the writer applied a t-test formula at the level of significance with  $\alpha = 0.05$  and with degree of freedom = 66

**Table 3** The t-table of the student's pre-test and post-test in experimental class and control class

Df	T-test value	T-Table value
66	<b>Pre-test</b> 0.60	1.671
66	<b>Post-test</b> 6.23	1.671

The t-table above shows that the t-table value (1.671) was higher than the t-test value (0.60). The analysis shows that  $H_1$  is rejected. It means that the writing ability of the tenth-year students of senior high school of academic year 2013/2014 was not significantly different. It means that the writing ability of control class and experimental class have the same ability before giving the treatment.

The table above shows that the t-test value (6.23) was higher than the t-table value (1.671). The analysis shows that the  $H_1$  was accepted. This indicated that null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) was rejected. It means that teaching writing through directed writing activity could improve the writing ability of the tenth-year students of senior high school.

At senior high school, especially in tenth year, the students categorized poor in writing ability. It can saw the mean score of the students under the criteria is 75. Most of the students difficult to write because of many reasons such as they are not master vocabulary, punctuation, grammar, and how to use appropriate words.

Because of that, the researcher interested to use directed writing activity strategy to improve the writing ability of the students. Based on Tompkins and Hoskinson in Halik (2012) says "The strategy is guided writing activities writing activity that provides the broadest opportunity to students to select and develop a topic that they enjoy so that students feel ownership and is responsible for writing".

In experimental class, the researcher gave treatment for four times with directed writing activity. The directed writing activity's stage is prewriting, writing (drafting), editing and revising. First stage the researcher explained about descriptive text, generic



structure, simple presents tense, and adjectives. Then, the prewriting stage the researcher asked to the students to write a framework with topic fruits for first and second meeting then market for third and fourth meeting. The students wrote the framework in worksheet that given. Then the writing stage, the students developed their framework into some paragraph. After they finished, the researcher called the students with random for recheck their descriptive text, it was called revising and editing stage.

In control class, the researcher gave treatment for four times with conventional way (three phase technique). The stage was making framework and develops it into some paragraph. Then they did exchange task for editing with bench friend.

After giving a treatment, the score classification of the students was good until very good classification (*see table 1*). The table discussed the percentage of the pre-test and post-test in experimental class. 15 students got very good classification and 19 students got good classification. It was significance different before giving a treatment, the score classification was poor classification (*see table 1*). 1 student got very poor classification, 15 students got poor classification, 14 students got fair classification, and 4 students got good classification. Its means teaching writing through directed writing activity strategy better than conventional way (three phase technique) because the percentage and frequencies of students' score improved significantly. As the comparison, in the table (*see table 1 p.14*) discussed the percentage of the pre-test and post-test in control class. The score classification before giving a treatment was fair classification score. 3 students got good classification, 17 students got fair classification, 14 students got poor classification and 1 student got very poor classification. After giving a treatment through conventional way (three phase technique) the score classification was good classification but one student still got fair classification and one student got very good classification. Its means teaching writing through conventional way (three phase technique) was not better that directed writing activity strategy because the percentage and frequencies of students' score improved not significantly.

From the table 2 (*see table 2*) discussed about the mean score and standard deviation of the student's pre-test both experimental class and control class. The table showed mean score of pre-tests in experimental class was 60.29 with standard deviation 10.15 was higher than the pre-test on control class was 57.79 with standard deviation 7.29. It reveals that the mean score and the standard deviation of pre-test both in experimental and control class were not different significantly.

As the comparison, the table (*see table 2.*) was the result of mean score and standard deviation of students in experimental and control class. The mean score of post-tests in experimental class was 83.32 with standard deviation 5.88 and the mean score of post-tests in control class was 76.67 with standard deviation 3.9. It reveals that the mean score and the standard deviation of pre-test both in experimental and control class were different significantly. It means that teaching writing through directed writing activity strategy better than conventional method (three phase technique).

At the table (*see table 3*), the table discussed about t-table and t-test value of the students' pre-test in experimental class and control class with degree of freedom ( $df$ ) =  $n_1 + n_2 - 2 = 34 + 34 - 2 = 66$  and level significant  $\alpha = 0.05$ , it is shown that t-table value (1.671) was higher than t-test value (0.61). This indicated that null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) was accepted and alternative hypothesis ( $H_1$ ) was rejected. It means that conventional way (three phase technique) was not effective to improve the writing ability.

From the table (*see table 3*) it shown that t-test value of post-test (5.88) higher than t-table value (1.671) with degree of freedom ( $df$ ) =  $n_1 + n_2 - 2 = 34 + 34 - 2 = 66$





and level significant  $\alpha = 0.05$ . This indicated that null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) was rejected and alternative hypothesis ( $H_1$ ) was accepted. It means that teaching writing through directed writing activity could improve the writing ability of the tenth-year students of senior high school.

The result of the test show most of the students' fair to poor classification score and only few students got good classification score in pre-test. It was shown that the researcher observation that indicated that the students' writing ability was poor before giving treatment. But in the post-test, most of them got good classification score, and even there was 1 student got fair classification score and no one student got very poor classification score again. It indicated that the students' achievement in the post-test increased because during the treatment they were taught through directed writing activity strategy to improve their writing ability. Its means that the students' achievement increased after being taught through directed writing activity strategy.

The students' writing ability achievement was also proved by their mean score and from the standard deviation in pre-test and post-test. The result of the students mean score both of the test in experimental class showed that the mean score in the post-test was higher than the mean score of pre-tests. The result of students' standard deviation for both of the test showed the standard deviation of pre-test was higher than post-test. It indicated that all the students showed an increased in their writing ability after giving the treatment through directed writing activity strategy.

Comparing the result of t-test value (5.88) with the t-table value (1.671) for  $\alpha = 0.05$  level of significant, the researcher found that through directed writing activity strategy in teaching writing ability was better than conventional way to improve the writing ability of the students.

From the discussion above, it could be concluded that alternative hypothesis ( $H_1$ ) was accepted and null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) was rejected. In other word, through directed writing activity strategy was able to improve the writing ability of the tenth-year students of senior high school.

This research was in line with previous research by Sarmidi (2009) entitled "the Directed Writing Activity strategy able to stimulate the students to be more actively involved in the writing activity so that their skill in writing could be enhanced".

## Conclusion

Based on the finding and discussion, the writer concluded that the students in experimental group who are taught through directed writing activity strategy was better than the students in control group who are taught by using conventional way. It is proved by t-test value was 6.23 was higher than t-table was 1,671 it means that null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) was rejected and alternative hypothesis ( $H_1$ ) was accepted. In addition, if the result of mean score of pre-test and post-test is compared with KKM in one of senior high school. The mean score of post-tests is higher than criteria minimum of senior high school. The researcher concluded that the Directed Writing Activity Strategy is able to improve the writing ability of the tenth-year students at one of senior high school at Parepare



## Bibliography

- Abidin, Yusran. 2012. *Pembelajaran Bahasa Berbasis Pendidikan Karakter*. Jakarta: RifikaAditama.
- Allen, Michael. 2003. *The Truth About Writing*.
- Brindley, Susan. 2005. *Teaching English*. Walton Hall, Milton Keynes: Taylor & Francis e-Library.
- Budiharso, Teguh. 2005. *Basic Writing: the Rethoric, Linguistics Features, and Material Development*. Surakarta: Pustaka Cakra.
- Halik, Abdul. 2012. *Pendidikan Bahasa Indonesia Kelas Tinggi*. Parepare: UPP PGSD Parepare
- Hornby, A, S. 1995. *Oxford Learner's Dictionary*. New York: oxford University Press.
- Oshima, Alice, et.al. 1971. *Writing Academic English, Second Edition*. Longman.
- Parker, John. F. 1983. *The Process of Writing*. United State of America: Addison-Wesley.
- Richards. C. Jack and Renandya. A. Willy. 2002. *Methodology in Language Teaching, An Anthology of Current Practice*. United State of America: Cambridge University Press.
- Ritawatidkk. 2005. *Peningkatan Keterampilan Membaca dan Menulis Di Kelas Tinggi*. Jakarta: Depdiknas Pusat Teknologi Komunikasi dan Informasi Pendidikan.
- Suparno and Muhammad Yunus. 2005. *Keterampilan Dasar Menulis*. Jakarta: Universitas Terbuka.