THE USE OF FRESH TECHNIQUE IN TEACHING WRITING DESCRIPTIVE TEXT TO THE EIGHTH GRADE STUDENTS OF SMP PGRI SUKAMORO

Nita Ria & Ratih Novtapianti
University of Tridinanti Palembang
rnita656@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: Writing is one of important skills to transfer knowledge between teacher and students. The objective of the study was to find out whether or not there was any significant difference on writing achievement between the students who were taught by using FRESH technique in writing descriptive text and those who were not. The population of the study was the eighth grade students of SMP PGRI Sukamoro in academic year 2017/2018. The purposive sampling was used on this study. In conducting the study, the writers did experimental method by using quasi-experimental design to the two groups of students. Class VIII 1 became the experimental group and VIII 2 became the control group. The two classes were chosen because they had same level of competency in learning English. Instrument for collecting the data was test. The result of the data showed that the mean score of post-test of experimental group was 74.11 and post-test of control group was 59.75. It means that there was a significant difference on writing achievement between the students who were taught by using FRESH technique in writing descriptive text and those who were not.

Keywords: FRESH technique, descriptive text, teaching writing.

MENGGUNAKAN FRESH TEKNIK DALAM MENGAJAR MENULIS TEKS DESKRIPTIF PADA SISWA KELAS VIII SMP PGRI SUKAMORO

ABSTRAK: Menulis adalah salah satu keterampilan yang penting untuk menyalurkan pengetahuan antara guru dan siswa. Tujuan penelitian ini adalah untuk mencari apakah ada atau tidak perbedaan yang signifikan di dalam prestasi menulis antara siswa yang diajarkan menggunakan FRESH teknik di dalam menulis teks deskriptif dan yang tidak diajarkan dengan teknik tersebut. Populasi dari penelitian ini adalah siswa kelas VIII SMP PGRI Sukomoro tahun pelajaran 2017/2018. Pada penelitian ini menggunakan sampel purposive. Penulis menggunakan metode eksperimen melalui disain quasi experimen ke dalam dua kelompok, yaitu kelas VIII.1 sebagai kelompok eksperimen dan kelas VIII.2 sebagai kelompok kontrol. Kedua kelas tersebut dipilih karena mereka memiliki kemampuan kompetensi yang sama di dalam pembelajaran bahasa Inggris. Instrument dalam pengumpulan data melalui tes. Hasil data menunjukkan rata-rata nilai posttest pada kelompok eksperimen adalah 74,11 dan posttest pada kelompok kontrol adalah 59,75. Itu berarti bahwa terdapat perbedaan yang signifikan di dalam prestasi menulis antara siswa yang diajarkan menggunakan FRESH teknik di dalam menulis teks deskriptif dan yang tidak diajarkan dengan teknik tersebut.

Kata kunci: FRESH teknik, teks deskriptif, mengajar menulis.

INTRODUCTION

Human being as part of social community part needs language to express their ideas. Moreover, they use language to communicate with other people. Language is a tool to make human relationship in social life. Language makes human easier to exchange information and to express their ideas. Therefore, language as means of communication which is used by people to convey messages, ideas, feelings, and information.

In Indonesia, English has been compulsory subject which is learnt from Junior High School to University level (National Education Department No 22, 2006, p. 10). English has been compulsory subject because most of scientific book written in English and a lot of electronic appliances use English as a direction. Peregoy and Owen (2008, p.117) state that English has four skills which are not separated and isolated from one another. They are listening, speaking, reading and writing. Langan (2006) mentions that writing is not just talking about the post but also process of writing that would make a lot a writing that makes people interest.

The essential writing will need a long process from planning, drafting, writing and revising (p. 20). Horsburgh (2009, p 9) defines writing as a laborious activity for students since it is not a natural activity and requires strong motivation and great deal of practice. In addition, Lyons and Heasley (2009) explain that writing is clearly a complex process, and is frequently accepted as being the last languge skill to be required (p.13). Richards and Renandya (2002, p. 303) add that another difficulty in writing is not only in generating and composing the ideas, but also in presenting the ideas into the text.

Writing is one of the four skills which is difficult to be mastered because it needs more components and attention. Therefore, writing needs more time to learn and much practice. Learning to write involves being able to communicate and convey ideas meaningfully. In writing process, there are three things should be considered they are structure, vocabulary, and conjuction word. According to Ghaith (2002), there were four problems encountered by the students when they were asked to write a text. They had problems in content, organiz, vocabulary and grammar (p. 11). The

problems above can be solved by using technique in the learning process. According to Faisal and Suwandita (2010, p.8), " FRESH technique is a technique that can help students in writing descriptive text, especially in organizing their ideas was proposed FRESH. FRESH technique is the new one of generating ideas to write a descriptive text in which each letter of the acronym has meaning. FRESH technique is a technique in which each of its letter has own meaning. F stands for "Fact" in this study means the identification of the object or it can be called general description of subject. Usually it contains object's name, kind of the object, etc. R stands for "Reason", it means a supporting idea that strengthen the fact. E stands for "Elaboration". Elaboration means the explanation of the reason. The teacher should elaborate it in detail, so the students can get clear description of the object. SH stands for "Shift" which also can mean decision or conclusion. It is the conclusion of the information before.

Based on the above explanation it can be concluded that FRESH technique is a technique of study that ables to make students easier to write

descriptive text. FRESH technique has clear instructions organization

METHODOLOGY

In conducting this research, the writers used a quasi-experimental design. The design involved an experimental group and control group. Both of them were given pre-test and post-test. A pre-test was administered before the treatment and the post-test was administered after the treatment. Experimental group used FRESH technique and control group used conventional method.

Population

The population of this study was the eighth grade students of SMP PGRI Sukamoro in academic year 2017/2018 with the total number was 212 students. There were 6 classes of the first year students.

Sample

In this study, the writers selected the sample by using purposive sampling. According to Fraenkel, Wallen and Hyun (2012, p.100), purposive sampling is different from convenience sampling in that researchers do not simply study who ever is available but rather use their

judgment to select a sample that they believe, based on prior information to provide the data they need.The sample of this study was VIII.1 and VIII.2 chosen by using purposive sampling technique based on informal interview with the English teacher, VIII.1 and VIII.2 had the same background knowledge and difficulties of writing ability. After the pretest, the result of VIII.2 was higher than VIII.1. Therefore, VIII.2 was selected as control group and VIII.1 as experimental group. The total sample of this study was 72 students.

Technique for Collecting Data

Brown (2004, p. 3) stated that test is a method of measuring a person's ability, knowledge, or performance in a given domain. In this study, the writers administered pre test and post test. The pretest was given to the students in order to measure their skill in writing before exposing the treatment. Then, the posttest was given to the students in order to measure their skill in writing after giving the treatment. So, the writers created a schedule before giving pre test, treatment and post test to be more structured in the implementation.

Validity of the Test

In this study, the writers used the content validity of the test. Content validity is a matter of determining if the content that the instrument contains is an adequate sample that supposed to represent (Fraenkel et al., 2012, p.150). In order to judge whether or not a test has content validity, a specification of the skills or structures should be made based on the curriculum and syllabus. Then, the result analysis in constructing the content validity is presented in the test of specification table including objective of the test, test indicators, text's title, type of the test, number of test items, total of questions and answer keys.

Reliability of the Test

In this study, the writers used inter rater reliability. Inter rater reliability is the consistency of score by two or more raters Brown (2004, p. 21). In this study, the writers used two raters in order to score students' writing skill. They are the English teacher at the eighth grade students of SMP PGRI Sukamoro and the lecturer at University of Tridinanti Palembang. To find out the consistency between the two raters' scoring result, the writers used Pearson

Product Moment Correlation. The Pearson correlation coefficient (**r**), can take a range of values from +1 to -1. If $_{value}$ is greater than 0, it indicates a positive association between two raters, if value is less than 0, it indicates a negative association between two raters.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

The findings of this study were based on the analysis of pre-test and post-test. The writers presented the students' writing achievement before and after being taught by using FRESH technique. The result of this study were calculated using descriptive analysis and inferential statistical analysis.

Descriptive Analysis

The Results of Pre-test and Post-test for Experimental Group

The pre-test and post-test for experimental group were done in VIII.1. The students' pre-test and post-test result for this group is presented in table 1 below.

Table 1. Descriptive Analysis for Experimental Group

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean		Std. Deviation
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic
Pre_EXP	36	36	69	45.72	1.296	7.778
Post_EXP	36	48	89	67.53	1.560	9.358
Valid N (listwise)	36					

Based on the table above, the result showed that in pre-test of experimental group, the highest score was 69 and the lowest score was 36. The mean score was 45.72 and standard deviation was 7.778. Then, in post-test of experimental group, the highest score was 89 and the lowest score was 48. The mean score was 67.53, and standard deviation was 9.358.

The Results of Pre-test and Post-test for Control Group

The pre-test and post-test for control group were done in VIII.2. The students' pre-test and post-test result for control group is presented in the table below.

Table 2. Descriptive Analysis for Control Group

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean		Std. Deviation
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic
PreCON	36	38	63	44.81	1.093	6.559
PostCON	36	45	73	56.25	1.259	7.553
Valid N (listwise)	36					

The result showed that in pre-test of control group, the highest score was 63, and the lowest score was 38. The mean score was 44.81 and standard deviation was 6.559. In post-test result of control group, the highest score was 73 and the lowest score was 45. The mean score was 56.25 and standard deviation was 7.553.

The Test of Normality

Before administering inferential analysis, the writers examined the normality of post-test results for both experimental and control group using Kolmogorov-Smirnov because the data of this study was more than 50 in order to see whether or not the data were distributed normally. Table 3 showed the normality of posttest.

Table 3. Normality of Post-test Result

	Post_exp	Post_Con
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z	.595	.781
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.871	.576

The result indicated that the significant coefficient (Sig.2-tailed) of Kolmogorov-Smirnov test from post-test for experimental group was 0.871, and for control group was 0.576. Since both the significant coefficient were higher than 0.05, it could be concluded that the data of the two test results were normally distributed.

Homogeneity of Post test

The writers measured the homogeneity of post-test for both experiment and control group. Basrowi (2007, p. 106) states that the score was categorized homogeneous when the p-output was higher than mean significant difference at 0.005, it was clear that the data had the same variances.

Table 4.

Homogeneity of the Post-Test Result

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
0.354	1	70	.071

Based on the homogeneity test of posttest result , it indicated that the significant coffecient of Levene Statistic Test from posttest was 0.354. If the homogeneity spread is > 0.05 then it is homogeneous and if <0.05 it is not homogeneous. Based on the test result it can be concluded that the data was homogeneous.

Jurnal Didascein Bahasa, Mei 2019, Vol 4 No 2

P-ISSN 2477-1910
E-ISSN 2621-3877

Paired Sample T-test

 A. Experimental Group

The writers administered the paired sample t-test to see whether or not there was a significant difference between pre-test and post-test result.

Based on the paired sample t-test of the pre-test and post-test result for experimental group, it was found that the correlation between two variables was 0.857. The significance (2 tailed) was .000 < 0.05 with degree of freedom was 35. The t-obtained was 27.069 which was higher than t-table (2.0301). The mean was 45.72 in pre-test and 67.53 in post-test. The standard deviation was 4.833. It means that the students' skill of writing of descriptive text was significantly improved. The result of paired sample t-test of the pre-test and post-test for experimental group was presented in the Table 5 below.

Table 5. Paired Sample T-test

for Experimental Group

	Paired Differences					T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Pre_exp Post_exp	-21.806	4.833	.806	-23.441	-20.170	27.069	35	.000

Based on the paired sample t-test of pre-test and post-test result for control group, it was found that the correlation between two variables was 0.874. The significance (2 tailed) 0.000 which was lower than 0.05 with degree of freedom 35. The t-obtained was 18.681 which was higher than t-table (2.0301). The mean was 44.81 in pre-test and 56.25 in post-test. It means that even though there was a difference between the pre-test and post-test result for control group, it was not more significant than experimental group. The result of paired sample t-test of the pre-test and post-test for control group is presented in the Table 6 below.

Table 6

Paired Sample T-test for Control Group

	Paired Differences					T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Pre_cntrl Post_cntrl	-11.444	3.676	.613	-12.688	-10.201	18.681	35	.000

Independent Sample T-test

Based on the data collected from both experimental and control group, the writers used independent sample t-test in SPSS program to compare the result of post-test between experimental group and control group. The result of this analysis is shown in the table below.

Table 7

Independent Sample T-test

Post-test of exp and cntrl	Levene's test for Equality of all variances				
	F	Sig	T	Df	Sig. (2 tailed)
Equal variances assumed	.354	.071	9.706	70	.000
Equal variances not assumed			9.706	61.182	.000

Based on the independent sample t-test of post-test result for both groups, it was found that the significance (2-tailed) was 0.000. which was lower than 0.05 with the degree of freedom 70. The t-obtained was 9.706 which was higher than t value (1.994). It means that there was a significant difference between post-test of experimental and control group.

Interpretation

Based on the findings above, there were some interpretations of the study. After the results were calculated, there was significant difference between the students who were taught by using FRESH Technique and those who were not. The students in experimental group

were taught by using FRESH Technique in 10 meetings while the students in control group was taught by using lecturing method. The students in experimental group were asked to find vocabularies by looking the familiar objects and actions in the picture. After being given the treatment, the students in experimental group showed their significant improvement in post-test result. Their ability in using elements of writing improved. They have significant progress in developing idea and arranged sentences into a good writing product, and their motivation in learning writing so increased than before they were given treatment.

Finally, the writers calculated the pretest and posttest result of experimental group by using paired sample t-test in order to know wheter or not there was any significant improvement before and after giving the treatment. It meant that the students' skill of writing a descriptive text was significantly improved after getting treatment. Then, the writers also calculated the posttest result between experimental and control group by using independent sample t-test in order to know wheter or not there was any significant difference on writing skill achievement between students who were taught by using FRESH Technique in teaching writing and those who were not. It can be concluded that there was any significant difference of the posttest score between experimental and control group. The use of FRESH Technique was effective to help the students in improving their writing achievement.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings and interpretations of this study, there were some points that could be concluded. First, it was significant using FRESH technique to improve students' skill in writing descriptive text of the eighth grade students of SMP PGRI Sukamoro. It could be seen from the students' writing progress after the post-test was given. Second, there was a significant difference between students who were taught by using FRESH technique and students who were not.

REFERENCES

Basrowi. (2007). *Metode Analisis Data Sosial.* Kediri: CV. Jenggala Pustaka Utama.

Brown, H. D. (2004). *Teaching by principle: An interactive approach to language pedagogy.* New York: Longman.

Faisal & Suwandita, K. (2010). Improving students' competence in writing descriptive text through "FRESH" technique. *Journal of English Education, 2*(1), 57-56. Retrieved from http://journal.uniku.ac.id/index.php/ERJEE.

Fraenkel, J. R.., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education (8th Ed).* Buston: McGraw-Hill.

Ghaith, G. (2002). *The problem of teaching writing. American University of Beiru.* Retrieved from http://nadabs.tripod.com/writing.

Horsburgh, N. (2009). *New Oxford modern English.* Karachi, Pakistan: Oxford University Press.

.

Langan, J. (2006). *English skill (7th ed).* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lyon, L.H., & Heasley, B. (2009). *Study writing (2nd ed.).* Cambridge, UK : Cambridge University Press.

National Education Department. (2006). KTSP: *Standard kompetensi mata pelajaran bahasa Inggris sekolah menengah pertama.* Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.

Peregoy, S. F. & Owen F. B. (2008). *Reading, writing, and learning in ESL.* Boston, U.S.A: Pearson Education.

Richards, J.C., & Renandya, W. A (2002). *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.