

## IMPROVING STUDENTS' WRITING SKILL THROUGH PERSONAL PHOTOGRAPH AT THE SECOND GRADE OF SMPN 35 MAKASSAR

Abdul Rahim Bin Mustapa<sup>1</sup>, Andi Hamzah Fansury<sup>2</sup>, Nurfaizah Sahib<sup>3</sup>

<sup>123</sup>English Language Department, Bosowa University, Indonesia

### ABSTRACT

The objective of the research was to find out whether using personal photograph method was able to improve students' writing skill at second grade of SMP Negeri Makassar. This Research was used experiment method and research subjects are students of SMP Negeri 35 Makassar Class VII (1). This Research takes students of class VIII (1) totaling 30 Students. In this research was conducted pre-test, treatment, and post-test. Data obtained through the provision of pre-test and post-test. The result showed differences in the average value of the each test. The average value of students in pre-test 65.56 and post-test was 93.30. This shows that the personal photograph method the positive effect on students' writing skills class VIII (1) SMP Negeri 35 Makassar.

Key words : Personal Photograph, Writing, Effect.

### INTRODUCTION

English is an international language. It is used all over the world. For that reason, it is important for people to master English orally and in writing, in order to be able to communicate and socialize with the world community.

English is the first foreign language taught at every school in Indonesia. The Indonesian government chooses English as the first foreign language to be taught in schools and as a major subject for the students from elementary school to university students, they realize how important English in their life, so they intend to master it, in such a way that they can use that language to communicate with other people in the world. Students must master four language skills, listening, speaking, reading and writing. Based on the concept and function, English has the purpose to develop those four skills and also the language components: vocabulary, structure and pronunciation (in speech) or spelling (in writing) which supports students mastering well. In mastering English, students find problems dealing with language skills and language components as mentioned above. Most students in Indonesia consider English as a difficult subject which makes them frustrated. Many of them failed to graduate from SMP / SMA only because of their mark of English of national final examination doesn't fulfill the requirement in at the passing grade score. That is why the Indonesian government makes efforts to find the solution of those problems. For example they change the curriculum and introducing new approaches of teaching to English teacher. They also have to consider some factors such as quality of the

teacher, student interest, motivation, teaching techniques that play important roles to achieve the objective at school learning.

The writer is focusing her research on writing because writing is one of the four language skills that play a very important role in second language learning. Writing skill is more complex and difficult to teach, requiring the mastery not only the grammatical and theoretically devices but also the conceptual and judgment.

One of the visual aids that can be used in learning writing is personal photograph. The study is aimed at improving the writing ability of the Second Grade students of SMP Negeri 35 Makassar by using photographs, especially in writing skill. The strategy is selected since it can guide the students to generate idea into a meaningful composition. Photographs usually capture past events and photographs surely can help students remember details about people, places and events. In short, they can be powerful sources of text. Besides, a photograph is worth a thousand words because one picture can tell the students something even has sequences to study behind it.

Based on the usefulness of the photographs, the writer chooses photographs as media or technique to improve writing skill. It means that there is a significant relationship between writing text and using photograph, because writing text is one of the story genres. The purpose is to reconstruct past experiences by retelling events and incidents in the order in which they have occurred.

## METHOD

This Research was used experiment method and research subjects are students of SMP Negeri 35 Makassar Class VII (1). This Research takes students of class VIII (1) totaling 30 Students. In this research was conducted pre-test, treatment, and post-test. Data obtained through the provision of pre-test and post-test.

## FINDING AND DISCUSSIONS

### Findings

The finding of the research deal with scoring and classification of the students' pre-test and post-test, hypothesis testing of pairing sample containing mean score, standard deviation, and the test of significance.

**Table 1 Rate percentage and frequency of the students score of pre-test and post test in experimental class.**

NO	Classification	Range	Pre-test		Post-test	
			Freg	%	Freg	%
1	Very Good	87-100	1	3.33%	21	70%

2	Good	76-86	3	10%	9	30%
3	Fair	61-73	16	53.33%	-	-
4	Poor	47-60	10	33.33%	-	-
5	Very poor	34-46		-	-	-
Total			30	100%	30	100%

Based on about percentage of pre-test and post-test and post test in component of content, from this table it can be seen students got very good in post-test, percentage of students score in component of organization, from onn table pre-test and post-test got score different, in post-test students got most score excellent and very good , but in pre-test many students got score fair to poor, from the result it can be conclude that the students clasification in component of vocabulary in post –test is good average. The classification in component of language use in post-test is very good, the data in pre-test 26 students got score fair to poor but in post-test none of students got score very poor and fair to poor.

**Table 2. The Students' Writing Score In Pre-Test**

No	Stb	Experimental Class					Total Score	Classification
		component Writing.						
		C	O	V	LU	M		
1	AD	26	21	17	20	3	84	Good
2	AY	18	16	18	20	4	74	Good
3	AL	13	16	12	12	2	53	Poor
4	AA	15	15	13	11	2	56	Poor
5	AI	21	19	15	18	3	73	Fair
6	AJ	20	17	16	16	4	66	Fair
7	AP	16	17	14	15	2	62	Fair
8	WA	19	18	16	16	4	66	Fair
9	CA	27	21	18	21	4	87	Very Good
10	DW	25	20	16	18	4	75	Very Good
11	EK	18	16	16	13	3	63	Good
12	FE	17	17	13	12	2	59	Fair
13	HA	16	14	13	14	3	57	Poor
14	HI	13	13	14	14	3	54	Poor
15	HO	20	16	18	15	3	66	Fair
16	IF	19	17	17	17	4	66	Fair
17	IM	20	14	15	14	3	60	Poor
18	IN	17	18	16	17	4	64	Fair
19	IW	17	17	17	20	3	67	Fair

20	KR	16	18	14	12	3	60	Poor
21	MA	21	18	14	15	2	68	Fair
22	ME	20	16	14	15	3	68	Fair
23	MF	24	19	16	18	3	73	Fair
24	NF	22	18	16	16	4	69	Fair
25	ND	15	17	13	12	4	60	Poor
26	FZ	20	17	16	18	3	67	Fair
27	RS	24	17	18	13	3	72	Fair
28	RV	13	14	14	12	3	53	Poor
29	SR	20	19	16	17	2	68	Fair
30	JL	18	10	14	18	3	57	Poor
Sum		570	505	459	469	93	1967	

**Tabel 3 The Students' Writing Score In Post-Test.**

No	Stb	Experimental Class					Total Score	Classification
		Component Writing						
		C	O	V	LU	M		
1	AD	29	21	19	25	5	96	Very Good
2	AY	28	26	14	19	4	85	Good
3	AL	30	30	18	19	5	98	Very Good
4	AA	24	25	18	22	4	84	Good
5	AI	26	25	18	20	4	84	Good
6	AJ	26	26	16	19	4	91	Very Good
7	AP	30	26	18	20	5	90	Very Good
8	WA	29	27	28	22	4	90	Very Good
9	CA	30	27	19	23	5	94	Very Good
10	DW	30	28	20	25	5	98	Very Good
11	EK	27	24	17	21	4	93	Very Good
12	FE	30	30	18	22	4	94	Very Good
13	HA	27	26	17	20	4	85	Good
14	HI	28	27	18	20	5	89	Very Good
15	HO	25	24	17	20	4	81	Good
16	IF	30	26	18	20	4	86	Good
17	IM	30	25	16	20	4	86	Good
18	IN	30	25	16	20	4	86	Good
19	IW	28	28	18	20	4	89	Very Good
20	KR	30	29	19	25	5	98	Very Good
21	MA	28	26	18	22	4	89	Very Good
22	ME	28	26	17	20	4	86	Good
23	MF	28	26	17	20	4	86	Good
24	NF	30	29	20	22	5	96	Very Good
25	ND	30	29	20	20	5	94	Poor
26	FZ	26	27	20	24	5	92	Very Good

27	RS	30	28	20	22	5	95	Very Good
28	RV	29	27	18	22	5	91	Very Good
29	SR	30	25	20	25	4	94	Very Good
30	JL	28	28	18	20	4	89	Very Good
Sum		854	796	550	639	132	2709	

**Table 4 Students' Score and classification in post-test.**

No	Stb	Experimental Class					Total Score	Classification
		Component Writing						
		C	O	V	LU	M		
1	AD	29	21	19	25	5	96	Very Good
2	AY	28	26	14	19	4	85	Good
3	AL	30	30	18	19	5	98	Very Good
4	AA	24	25	18	22	4	84	Good
5	AI	26	25	18	20	4	84	Good
6	AJ	26	26	16	19	4	91	Very Good
7	AP	30	26	18	20	5	90	Very Good
8	WA	29	27	28	22	4	90	Very Good
9	CA	30	27	19	23	5	94	Very Good
10	DW	30	28	20	25	5	98	Very Good
11	EK	27	24	17	21	4	93	Very Good
12	FE	30	30	18	22	4	94	Very Good
13	HA	27	26	17	20	4	85	Good
14	HI	28	27	18	20	5	89	Very Good
15	HO	25	24	17	20	4	81	Good
16	IF	30	26	18	20	4	86	Good
17	IM	30	25	16	20	4	86	Good
18	IN	30	25	16	20	4	86	Good
19	IW	28	28	18	20	4	89	Very Good
20	KR	30	29	19	25	5	98	Very Good
21	MA	28	26	18	22	4	89	Very Good
22	ME	28	26	17	20	4	86	Good
23	MF	28	26	17	20	4	86	Good
24	NF	30	29	20	22	5	96	Very Good
25	ND	30	29	20	20	5	94	Poor
26	FZ	26	27	20	24	5	92	Very Good
27	RS	30	28	20	22	5	95	Very Good
28	RV	29	27	18	22	5	91	Very Good
29	SR	30	25	20	25	4	94	Very Good
30	JL	28	28	18	20	4	89	Very Good
Sum		854	796	550	639	132	2709	

**Table 5. Mean score and standard deviation of the students pre-test and post-test.**

Test	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Pre-test	65.56	5.28
Post-test	93.30	4.74

Thus the repective mean score of pre-test was 65.56 and pos-test was 93.30 it means that the mean score of post-test is greater than of the pre-test. The standard deviation of pre-test was 5.28 and post-test was 4.74.

**Table 6. The T-test of students' achievement.**

Variable	t-test	t-table
X2-X1	5.12	2.045

In order to know whether or not the difference between pre-test and post-test is statically significant, the t-test is  $t = 5.12$ .

The research use the following formula to find out the degree of freedom (df) :

$$df = N - 1$$

$$df = 30 - 1$$

$$= 29$$

The level of significance ( $\alpha$ ) = 0,05 and  $df = 29$  the value of t-table 2.042. Thus the value of the t-test was greater than the t-table ( $5.12 > 2.045$ ). It shows that there was a significant different between the pre-test and post-test on the students writing ability at the second years of SPMN 35 Makassar.

## Discussion

Before conducting the experiment and using personal photograph method in writing process, students ability is writing poor, for the students of SMPN 35 Makassar, poor nscore is not enough. The idea, content, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanics in construction text were still limited. This showed from a resut of pre-test many students has not a good knowledge in writing simple text and not develop a idea in writing. The use language is not effektive and vocabulary is very poor. When the students were given theme or title to writing simple paragraph text, they were confused tob start writing so they were given more practice about personal photograph method to deleveloped there idea to writing.

The first problem is that the difficulties in finding words. Placement of capital letter was not apporiate, cohension between the writing before and to next

writing, depiction of topic, Writer still finding difficult about the students' development in idea to write the simple paragraph text. Therefore they have much to learn and practice to write simple paragraph text.

Result of students rate percentage in component of content in pre-test, 1 student (3.33%) got excellent classification, 5 students (16.66%) got very good average classification, 16 students (53.33%) got fair classification, 8 students (26.66%) got very poor classification. Many students have limited knowledge of subject and little substantive to make writing text but some students is adequate.

In the post-test, 25 students (83.33%) got excellent classification, 5 students (16.66%) got very good classification. From the result it can be conclude that student classification in component for content is very good. Students have a good knowledge and substantive in make writing text. They were understood how to make a writing text.

Result of students rate percentage in component of organization in the pre test, none of the student got excellent and very good to good classification, 19 students (63.33%) got fair classification, 11 students (36.66%) got very poor classification. Many students were confused to develop there ideas and does not communicate.

In the post-test , there were 15 students (50%) got excellent classification, 15 students (50%) got very good classification, and none of the student got fair to poor and very poor classification. From this result it can organization in post-test is good to average. Half of students in my sample have a good fluent expression, and the ideas clearly stated. Other students is loosely organized but main ideas stand out.

Based on percentage of the students score in component of organization, from the table pre-test and post-test got score different, in post test student got most score very good, but in pre-test many student got score to poor.

Result of students rate percentage in component of vocabulary in pre-test none of students got very poor classification, 4 students (13.33%) got excellent classification, 21 students (69.99%) got very good classification, 5 students (16.66%) got fair classification. Many students have adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form, choice, usage but meaning not obscured, and other have a limited range.

In the post-test there were 22 students (73.33%) got excellent classification, 8 students (26.66%) got Very good to good classification, none students got fair and very poor classification.

Based on the percentage of the students score in component of vocabulary, from on the table pre\_test and post-test got score different. In post-test none student got fair classification. Students have a effective word/idiom choice and usage.

Result of students rate percentage in component of language use in pre-test, none of students got excellent and very poor classification, 4 students (13.33%) got very good classification, 26 students (86.66%) got fair classification. Many students have a major problem in simple/complex construction.



In the post-test, there 13 students (43.33%) got excellent classification, 17 students (86.66%) got very good to good classification, none student got fair and very poor classification. 17 students were effective but simple contruction and 13 students were effective complex contruction.

Based on the result it can be conclude that the students classification in component of Language use in post-test is very good to average. Result percentage of the students score in component of mechanics in pre-test, none of student got excellent classification, 9 students (30%) got very good classification, 15 students got fair classifications, 6 students (20%) got very poor classification. In post-test there were none of students got fair and very poor classification, 13 students (43.33%) got excellent classification, 17 students (56.66%) got very good classification. From this result it can be conclude that students classification in component mechanics in post-test is good to very good.

Based on the data in pre-test none of the student got score very poor, 10 students got score poor, 16 students got score poor, 3 students got score good, and 1 student got score very good.

The description of the data collected writing test using personal photograph method shows can influence to students writing skill. It is supported by the frequency and rate percentage of the result of the students pre-test and post-test.

The result of data analysis for the test on the table indicatyees that, in the pre-test just 1 student (3.33%) got very good classification, 3 students (10%) got good classification, 16 students (53.33%) got fair classification, 10 students (33.33%) got poor classification, none of the student got very poor classification.

After giving treatment, the result of the post-test showed 21 students (70%) got very good clasification and none of student got fair, poor and very poor classification.

The mean score of students pre test was 65.56 and post test was 90.3. It means that the mean score of post-test is greater than pre-test. Stadard deviation of students pre-test was 5.28, and standard deviation of students post-test was 4.74. The level of siognificance ( $p = 0,05$  and  $df = 29$  the value of the t-table 2.042. Thus value of the t-test was greater than t-table ( $5.12 > 2.045$ ). it shows that there was a significant different between the pre-test and post-test of the students writing ability. The students ability is more homogeneous.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the findings and discussion in the previous chapter, the students' writing skill through personal photograph method of the SMPN 35 Makassar. improve it is proven by significant difference between the score of experimental class after giving treatment. The post-test score in experimental class improve significantly compare to pre-test. After writer analyzed the result of the result personal photograph method is very good to use in learning and teaching process to develop students writing skill, especially of the students of SMP Negeri 35 Makassar, and personal photograph method is an effective for teaching english in developing student writing skill. The scoring classification of the students' pre-test in students writing ability was far from satisfaction because most of their



score were classified into fair score, 11 (16%). It mean that the students di not understand yet and mistake. The scoring classification of the students” post-test in students bwriting skill was satisfactory because most of their score were classofied into very good 21 (70%). It means that the students understand.

## REFERENCE

- Adams, M.J. 1990. *Thingking And Learning About Print*. MA : MIT Press.
- As, Hornby. 2007. *Oxford Advance Learners’ Dictionary of Current English*. England : Oxford University Press.
- Brown, H.G. 2004. *Language Assessment : Principles and Classroom Practice*. New York : Longman.
- Bachman, L.F. 1990. *Fundamental Consideration in Language Testing*, Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- Brown, H. Douglas. 2007. *Teaching by Principle: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy, Fourth Edition*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Brown, H. Douglas. 2000. *Principle of Language Learning and Teaching, Fourth Edition*. New York : The Free Press.
- Brown, J.D. & Bailey. M. 1984. *A Categorical Instrument For Scoring Second Language Writing Skill*. Learning Research Club. University of Michigan
- David, Nunan. 1992. *Research Method In Language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Depdikbud. 2000. *Kurikulum Pendidikan Dasar (GBPP)*. Depdikbud Jakarta.
- Djamarah, Syaiful Bahri & Aswan. 2007. *Strategi Belajar Mengajar*. Rineka Cipta Jakarta.
- Elbow, P. 1973. *Writing Without Teachers*. New York : Oxford University Press.
- Gay, C.R. 2006. *Educational Research. Competencies for Analisis and Aplication*. Second Edition. London Charles emaril Publishing Company.
- Halliday, M. A. K. 2008. *Introduction To Funtional Grammar. Fourth Edition*. London and New York : University of Birmingham,Uk.
- Harmer, J. (2004). *How to teach writing*. New York: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Harris, D. P. (1969). *Testing English as a second language*. New York: McGraw
- Harmer, Jeremy. 2004. *How to Teach Writing : Effective Sentence, Paragraph, And Essay*. New York : Longman.
- Heanton, J.B. 1975. *Writing Englis Language Test. New Edition*. ( Longman Handbooks For language Teachers). United State Of America : Longman Inc.
- Heanton, J.B. 2004. *Writing Englis Language Test. ( Longman Handbooks For language Teachers)*. United State Of America : Longman
- Kathleen M. Bailey, Pialorsi, F. and Zukowski/Faust, J (Eds.). 1984. *Foreign Teaching Assistants In United State University*. Washington, DC : National Association For Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA).
- Kellner, H. (2009). *Using photography to inspire writing*. Retrieved February 22, 2009 from <http://www.creativity-portal.com/prompts/using-photography->

- John Langan. 2008. *College writing skills with reading*. Seventh Edition. New York : McGraw Hill.
- Mclver. 2005. *Teaching writing In The Content Areas*. Virginia : ASCD.
- Munadi, Y. (2008). *Media pembelajaran: Sebuah pendekatan baru*. Jakarta: Gaung Persada Press.
- Oshim a & Hogue 2006 . *Writing Academic English*.Fourth Edition Longman : Pearson.
- Petty. T. Walter. 1980. *Developing Children's Laguage / Walter T. Petty, Jullie, M. Jensen*. Boston : Alyn & Bacon.
- Raines, A. 1983. *Techniques in Teaching Writing*. New York : National University.
- Rivers, W.M. 2003. *Teaching foreign Language skill*. Second edition. United State Of America : The University Of Chicago.
- Saudjana, Nana, Bkk. 2010. *Penelitian dan penilaian pendidikan*. Cetvi Bandung: Sinar Baru Agensindo.
- Sieber, E. 2012. *Teaching with Objects and Photographs*. Indiana, Bloomington: Trustees of Indiana University.
- Source of *t-table* <http://www.sthda.com/english/wiki/t-distribution-table>
- Syamsidar, 2004. *The Use Of Picture Series In Improving Students' Writing Quantity Unpublished Thesis*, Bengkulu : Universitas Bengkulu.
- Youra, S., (2009). *Writing to photography/photography to writing*. Retrieved February 22, 2009 from <http://www.kodak.com/global/en/consumer/education/>