

TEACHING NARRATIVE WRITING BY USING ROUNDTABLE STRATEGY TO ISLAMIC JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

Muammar Khadafi

State Islamic University of Raden Fatah, Palembang, South Sumatra

muammark083@gmail.com

Abstract

The objectives of this study were to find out whether or not (1) there was a significant improvement on the eighth grade students' writing achievement between those who were taught by using roundtable strategy, and (2) there was a significant difference on the eighth grade students' writing achievement between those who were taught by using Roundtable strategy. The population of this study consisted of 147 students. In this study, quasi experimental design, especially pretest-posttest non-equivalent groups design was used. The instrument used in collecting the data was writing test. The result showed that (1) there was a significant improvement from students' pretest to posttest scores in experimental group taught by using Roundtable strategy since the p-output (0.000) was lower than 0.05 and t-obtained is higher than t-table $df=31$ (2.042) and (2) there was a significant difference from students' posttest scores in control and experimental groups, since p-output (0.000) was lower than (0.05) and t-obtained is higher than t-table ($df 62 = 2.000$). So, the H_0 (the null hypothesis) was rejected and H_a (the alternative hypothesis) was accepted. It means that there was significant difference on students' narrative writing achievement taught using Roundtable than those who are not.

Keywords: writing achievement, roundtable strategy

Introduction

English is one of languages that used for communication all over the world; therefore English has become a global language. English has become the dominant language of science, technology and commerce, and universal language. It is the main language of books, newspapers, airports and air-traffic control, international business and academic conferences, science, technology, medicine, diplomacy, sports, international competitions, pop music, and advertising. Therefore, reality encourages many countries to put English as a subject that must be learned in world education, one of those countries is Indonesia, English is used as first language, second language, or foreign language and also it can become a lingua franca (Mukminin, Ali, & Fadloan, 2015; Mukminin, Muazza, Hustarna, & Sari, 2015; Makmur, Ismiyati, Mukminin, & Verawaty, 2016).

In learning English there are four language skills learned by students. One of the four skills of English is writing, a system to record language meaning and word symbol (Coulmas, 2003). Writing is one of difficult skills in learning English because there are many aspects to be considered in writing such as, word choices, grammar, punctuation, spelling, coherence and still many others. Those should be integrated to produce meaningful and good coherence writing. In addition, Heaton (1988) states that writing skills are complex and sometimes difficult to teach, requiring mastery was not only of grammatical and rhetorical devices but also of conceptual and judgmental elements. Likewise, Asaro (2008) states that writing is difficult because of student's inability to organize, start, and thoughts, or write essays that forced them to rely on previous knowledge.

It can be concluded that writing is not an easy skill because there are many components that should be assessed; unfortunately, mastering the skill of writing in English is not an easy job for almost all of students, especially in schools, which suffer from limited, resources, facilities, equipment and possibilities. There are four kinds of texts in junior high school to be learned, such as narrative text, descriptive text, and recount text. Narrative is a kind of genre aimed to entertain, to gain and to hold the readers' interest in a story. Narrative is text type that tells about story whether true story (problematic personal experience) or fictional that has purpose to entertain or amuse the readers with the story. Langan (2005) explains that narrative is storytelling, whether relating a single story or several related ones. Through narration, a statement can be clear by relating in detail with something that has happened.

Practically, there were difficulties in writing narrative text. The difficulties were stated by teacher English of MTs Patra Mandiri Palembang. First, some of the students had difficulties to start writing because they only translated their thoughts from their native language into English. Besides, some of the students were lack of grammar and knowledge. Second, they were also lack of vocabulary and the students did not know what they had to write, so they made many mistakes when they wrote. These problems make the students dislike writing and get some difficulties in starting writing and making composition. And the last, they were still confused to start writing narrative text based on the generic structure of narrative text; orientation, complication and resolution.

One teaching strategy that could help the students in writing subject is roundtable strategy. According to Lie (2000), learning cooperative strategy of roundtable can be used in all the subjects and for all levels of students, roundtable is technique of writing that apply in learning with pointed each group members to participate in turn in its group by forming the roundtable or sits around in a circle.

Based on background above, the aims of this study are to find significant improvement on the eighth grade students' achievement in writing narrative text before and after the treatment at MTs Patra Mandiri Palembang, and to find significant difference on the eighth grade students' writing achievement between those who are taught by using roundtable strategy and those who are not at MTs Patra Mandiri Palembang.

Concept of writing

Writing is the most difficult subject in the school since the students have to produce a text by using English. They have to write about what they think in their mind and state it on a paper by using the correct procedure. Meyers (2005) states that writing is a way to produce language you do naturally when you speak, writing is speaking to other on paper – or on a computer screen. Writing is also an action – a process of discovering and organizing the ideas, putting them on a paper and reshaping and revising them, then another step will be followed by another mistake connected to the previous step. Hedge (2000) states that:

“Writing is the result of employing strategies to manage the composing process, which is one of gradually developing a text. It involves a number of activities: setting goals, generating ideas, organizing information, selecting appropriate language, making a draft, reading and reviewing it, then revising and editing. It is a complex process which is neither easy nor spontaneous for many second language researchers”.

Concept of narrative paragraph

Langan (2005) explains that narrative is storytelling, whether relating a single story or several related ones. Narrative text is a story conveyed to entertain the reader or listeners. According to Wardiman (2008) narrative text is a true or an imaginary story containing conflict

and resolution which function to entertain listener or readers. In addition, Dietsch (2006) states that:

“Narrative paragraph tell a story or relate an event or anecdote. The researcher often sets the scene first, telling who or what when and where. Description, dialogue, or illustrations may be included to kindle interest and to clarify. Action verbs keep the story moving. Narratives often build suspense, reversing a surprise for the end”.

According to Wardiman (2008) there are generic structures of narrative text: 1) Orientation, this part introduces the characters of the story, the time and the place of the story happened. 2) Complication, in this part, tells the beginning of the problem which leads to the crisis (climax) of the main participants. 3) Resolution, this part tells the problem (the crisis) is resolved, either in a happy ending or a sad (tragic) ending. 4) Re-orientations, this is the closing remark to the story and it is optional.

Concept of roundtable strategy

According to Heartland (2006) states that roundtable strategy where one paper and pencil are systematically pass around the group, each member writes an idea and then pass it into the person on their left who then writes an idea. Utilizing different colors for each person reinforces that all team members are contributing equally. In addition, from roundtable activity, the students can explore their ideas as much as possible in the group, in writing the students need the ideas to write. Through roundtable strategy, in this study the researcher used the step in roundtable strategy in planning and writing process.

Advantages of roundtable strategy

According to Trys (1999) mentions some benefits of Roundtable as follows: The responsibility of each group, the contribution idea in the group, more than just learning in group, expressed opinion, views as well as the results thought, The thought some students better than one student, build and regulate emotional. Kagan (1990) has opinion Roundtable technique will achieve some advantages in terms of academic and social point of view. The advantages of Roundtable strategy are: Assessing prior knowledge, practicing skill especially writing skill, recalling information, creating cooperative art, teambuilding, and participation of all groups.

Procedure by using roundtable strategy

According to Lie (2000) proposed the following steps for teaching writing by using Roundtable as follows: 1. Students are formed in some groups, each group consists of four to six students in heterogeneous. Each student sits in accordance with the group to the position of form a small circle around the table. 2) Students discuss in its group on a theme and equalize perception. Each member group gives the idea related to the theme in turn the paper that has been distributed. 3) The first student, donates the idea, continued next students, and so on until the last student. The compiling of the ideas should be made in collaboration. 4) Ideas accumulated used as group members to draw up a wreath individually, each story of students has been created be exchanged and discussed in the group to repairing or editing. 5) Each group asked to choose and determine one of the story or theme its group to be shown on the front of the class. 6) The representation of each group should read the best writing that had been made by each group as well as to determine one to three of the best writing in each large groups (class). 7) Under the guidance of teachers, writing that is best used as the large group discussions (class).

Methodology

In this study, the writer used a quasi-experimental design. Specifically, one of the quasi experimental designs used in this research was pretest-posttest non-equivalent group design. There were two groups, they were experimental and control group which both were given the pretest and posttest. The writer did the treatments by using roundtable strategy to the experimental group only.

The population in this research was the students of the eighth grade students of MTs Patra Mandiri. Based on the data, there were 147 students consisting of four classes. Furthermore, the sample of this study was taken by using convenience sampling technique. In other words, the total numbers of students as the sample in this study were 64 students. It would be the students in VIII.C as an experimental group and VIII.D as control group.

In this research, the test-question items used for students' pre-test was the same as it was given for students' post-test activities and the result of students' work was checked and scored by three raters. Before they implemented as research instrument, it had to be analyzed or checked for their validity and reliability tests. The writer had consulted the instrument with three validators to evaluate whether the components of the instrument are valid or not to be applied in research activities. The result from the validators showed that the test instrument and lesson plan are appropriate to be used in this research study. After the try out, to measure the test, the writer calculated the students' score from the three raters using inter-rater reliability with Spearman Rank Order in internal consistency reliability. The result of reliability test was 0.93. From the score it can be stated that the reliability of the test was reliable since the reliability was higher than 0.70.

Findings

In distribution of frequency data, score, frequency, and percentage were analyzed. The scores were got from; (1) pretest scores in control group; (2) posttest scores in control group; (3) pretest scores in experimental group; and (4) posttest scores in experimental group was described in Table 1.

Table 1. Distribution of frequency data

Score intrval	Category	<u>Pre-Exp</u>		<u>Post-Exp</u>		<u>Pre-Ctrl</u>		<u>Post-Ctrl</u>	
		Freq	Perc	Freq	Perc	Freq	Perc	Freq	Perc
91 - 100	Excellent	0	0 %	0	0 %	0	0 %	0	0 %
81 – 90	Very Good	0	0 %	0	0 %	0	0 %	0	0 %
	Good	0	0 %	8	24.9%	0	0 %	4	12.4%
61 – 70	Fair	0	0 %	22	68.8%	0	0 %	25	78%
51 – 60	Poor	4	12.5 %	2	6.2%	7	21.8%	3	9.4%
0 – 50	Very Poor	28	87.5 %	0	0 %	25	78%	0	0 %
	Total	32	100.0 %	32	100.0%	32	100.0%	32	100.0%

Based on the result analysis of students' pretest scores in control group, it shows that thirty two students (78%) got the score between 50 or below in category very poor, and seven students (21.8 %) got the score between 51-60 in category poor, after showed the result above in analysis

of students' posttest scores in control group, it shows that three students (9.4%) got the score between 51-60 in category poor, twenty five students (78 %) got the score between 61-70 in the category fair, and four students (12.4 %) got the score between 71-80 in category good, and then on the result analysis of students' pretest scores in experimental group, it shows that twenty eight students (87.5 %) got the score 50 or bellow in category very poor and four students (12.5 %) got the score in poor category, after showed the result analysis of students' posttest scores in experimental group, it shows that,two students (6.2%) got the score between 51-60 in category poor, twenty two students (68.8%) got the score between 61-70 in category fair, eigh students (24.9%) got the score between 71-80 in category good. Furthermore, the writer analyzed the normality and homogeneity of students' pretest and posttest scores in experimental and control group. The result analysis of descriptive statistics in experimental group was described in Table 2

Table 2. Descriptive statistics of the students both of group

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
pretest_exprmnt	32	36.67	51.67	44.6875	4.34691
pretest_control	32	38.33	60.00	46.3021	5.46633
posttest_expermnt	32	60.00	76.67	69.2187	4.03800
posttest_control	32	60.00	75.00	66.5104	3.67495
Valid N (listwise)	32				

To compute homogeneity test, *Levene statistics* in SPSS 20 was applied. In the pre-test of experimental and control group were found that the p-output is 0.184. From the result, it could be stated that the obtained score from students' pretest in experimental and control groups are homogenous, because it is higher than 0.05. Furthermore, in the posttest of experimental and control group were found that the p-output was 0.400. From the result, it could be stated that the obtained score from students' post-test in experimental and control groups are homogenous, because it was higher than 0.05

Table 3. One sample kolmogorv-smirnov

		pretest_exp	pretest_ctrl	posttest_exp	posttest_ctrl
N		32	32	32	32
Normal Parameters ^a	Mean	44.6875	46.3021	69.2187	66.5104
	Std. Deviation	4.34691	5.46633	4.03800	3.67495
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.128	.175	.173	.185
	Positive	.128	.175	.173	.185
	Negative	-.096	-.136	-.170	-.173
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.722	.991	.980	1.046
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.675	.280	.292	.224
Test distribution is Normal.					

Table 4. Test of Homogeneity of Variances
ss_score2

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
.400	1	62	.530

Table 5. Test of Homogeneity of Variances
ss_score

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
1.807	1	62	.184

In this result of hypothesis testing, paired sample t-test was measuring means significant improvement and independent sample t-test was measuring means significant difference on student's writing narrative score by using roundtable of MTs Patra Mandiri, showed on the table analysis, it was found that the p-output was 0.000 with $df=31$ (2.042), and t-value = 42.956. It could be stated that there was a significant improvement from students' pretest to posttest scores in experimental group taught by using roundtable strategy since the p-output was lower than 0.05. It can be stated that the null hypothesis (H_0) was rejected, and the alternative hypothesis (H_a) was accepted. The analysis result of paired sample t-test is figured out in table 6 below.

Table 6. Result analysis in measuring significant improvement on students' narrative writing by using roundtable strategy

Roundtable Strategy	Paired Sample T-Test			Ha
	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
	42.956	31	0.000	Accepted

After analysis data significant improvement next, independent t-test was used to measure a significant difference on students' narrative writing score taught by using roundtable strategy and those who were not at MTs Patra Mandiri Palembang. The analysis result of independent sample t-test is figured out in table 7 below.

Table 7. Result analysis of independent sample t-test

Using Roundtable Strategy and Those who are Taught Using Teacher's Method	Independent Sample T-test			Ha
	T	Df	Sig.(2-tailed)	
	2.806	62	0.007	Accepted

From the table analysis, it was found that the p-output was 0.007 and the t-value was 2.806. It could be stated that there was significant difference on students' narrative writing score taught by using roundtable strategy and those who were not at MTs Patra Mandiri Palembang since the p-output was lower than 0.05 and the t-value was higher than t-table (df 62 = 2.000). So, it was concluded that the null hypothesis (H_0) was rejected, and the alternative hypothesis (H_a) was accepted.

Discussion

Based on the findings above, some interpretation were made as follows: In doing this research, the samples of study were given the pretest by two reasons, the first was to know the mean score of their narrative writing before the treatments given and the second was to know which the group would become control and experimental groups. The researcher chose VIII.D as a control group and VIII.C as experimental group. It was because the students' scores in control group was higher than the students' scores in experimental group. It was also proved that the mean of pretest in VIII.D was higher than VIII.C.

During the pretest in control and experimental groups, the researcher found students' difficulties in writing, such as the students could not write the narrative text well based on the generic structure, the tense of narrative text, sometimes the students used the other tenses such like simple present tense, and they get bored in writing because their teacher seldom asked them to write composition, especially narrative text. These factors made them less motivated in writing. Then, the researcher did treatments in experimental group by using roundtable strategy to help students in narrative writing.

First, there was significantly achievement in experimental group through Roundtable strategy during the treatment in 12 meetings include pre-test and posttest. In the first to third meeting, when the researcher implemented roundtable strategy in experimental group, the students' difficulty was found such as they got confused to follow the steps of roundtable strategy. To overcome this problem, the researcher had to explain them again to stimulate their critical thinking. Nevertheless, the media such as pictures used by the students made them interested to learn. In the fourth to sixth meeting, the students could adapt in using this strategy. The students began to use the carried out concepts to create their narrative story. In the seventh to ten meetings, they used to apply roundtable strategy as their new strategy in learning writing skill. They also felt the advantages when they used the strategy, such as there was responsibility each group, the contribution idea in the group build, regulate emotional and the students got motivation to write and learn. The students also produced the narrative story easily. It is supported by Kagan (1990, p. 21) roundtable create cooperative art and team building participation of all, so the students in produced narrative text make easier. Those findings could be supported by the differences between the students' pretest and posttest scores in experimental group from category poor to category good. Nevertheless, there were some students could not reach the minimum criterion. It was because they did not focus and learn seriously during the treatment.

Second, the significant difference scores in both groups could be drawn from result of the pretest scores (before treatment) and post test scores (after treatment) got better narrative writing achievement progress. Although, these two groups of students progressed, the progress of the students in control group was not as high as the progress of the students in experimental group. It was because the teacher also taught narrative writing which became the focus on the eighth grade classes. As a result, it could be interpreted that there was a significant difference on students' writing scores between the students who were taught by Roundtable strategy and those who were taught by teacher's strategy.

Third, based on the result in the research, Roundtable strategy was successfully applied to the eighth grade students of MTs Patra Mandiri Palembang. The researcher hope interpreted that the strategy for teaching narrative writing was appropriate to English Foreign Learners setting in Indonesia. It was in line to Beers (2003) who emphasizes that the struggling readers are faced whether native or students use English as a foreign language such as Vietnam, or Cambodia, Russia or Mexico, etc and Roundtable was the solution. It was also supported by two previous studies Adityawati (2014) and Ambarawati (2013) that had proven the strategy enabled to apply to English foreign learners in Indonesia.

Finally, this research revealed that there was a significant difference on students' writing scores between the students who were taught by roundtable strategy and those who were taught by teacher's strategy. It was because the benefits from the implementation of roundtable strategy. The benefits of this strategy were; they got more interested to learn English and they felt exited to write narrative text because this strategy provided the key concepts (keywords) or vocabularies for students to help them easier in composing narrative text. In addition, the pictures of roundtable strategy were given for make them in writing narrative easily. These statements are supported by Barkley, Cross and Major (2005) who mention that Roundtable strategy involved students to take turn responding to a prompt by writing one or two words before passing paper

along to others who do the same. Therefore, the teacher of English can use roundtable strategy in teaching and learning process to improve the students' English writing achievement.

Conclusion

There are some conclusion of this research referred to the findings and interpretation presented in the previous chapter. First, based on the result of pretest to posttest, roundtable strategy significantly improved students' writing narrative score to the eighth grade students of MTs Patra Mandiri Palembang. Second, there was significant difference on students' writing narrative score to the eighth grade students who were taught by using roundtable strategy and those who were taught by using strategy that usually used by the teacher of MTs Patra Mandiri Palembang. Therefore, it can be inferred that the teaching writing in narrative text by using roundtable strategy can be considered as one of alternative strategy to be used.

References

- Algeo, J. (2010). *The origins and development of the English language* (6th Ed): wads worth, City, State: Public.
- Asaro. K. (2008). *The effect of Planning instruction and self-regulation training on the writing performance of young writers with autism spectrum disorders*. (Unpublished Dissertation) New York University, New York. NY.
- Barkley, E, Cross, K and Major, C. 2005. *Collaborative Learning Techniques: A handbookforCollegeFaculty*,(Online),(writingcenter.utk.edu/files/2012/04/Round-Table-Small-Group-Writing, retrieved on February, 10th 2015).
- Beers, Kylene. (2003). *When children can't read. What teacher can do*. Portsmouth, UK: Heinemann.
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. San Francisco, CA: Academic Press.
- Coulmas, F. (2003). *Writing systems : An introduce to their linguistic analysis*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Dietsch, B. M. (2006). *Reasoning and writing well* (4th ed). New York, NY : McGraw Hill,Inc.
- Frankel, J R, Norman E. W & Hellen H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching* (3th edition). Cambridge, UK: Longman, Inc.
- Heartland. (2006). *Strategies and tools for group processing*. Chicago: Area education agency.
- Heaton, J. B. (1988). *Writing English language tests*. New York: Longman,Inc
- Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and learning in the classroom*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press
- Kagan, S. (1990). *Kagan Cooperative Learning*. CA.
- Langan, J. (2005). *College writing skills with readings*. (7th Ed.). New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Lie, Anita. (2000). *Cooperative learning*. Jakarta: PT. Grasindo.
- Makmur, Ismiyati, Y., Mukminin, A., & Verawaty. (2016). In search of good student teachers in writing skill: The impact of different task variance on EFL writing proficiency. *International Journal of Academic Research in Education*, 2 (1). <http://dx.doi.org/10.17985/ijare.45901>
- Meyers, A. 2005. *Gateways to academic writing: Effective sentences paragraph an essay*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Mukminin, A., Ali, Rd. M., & Fadloan, M.J. (2015). Voices from Within: Student Teachers' Experiences in English Academic Writing Socialization at One Indonesian Teacher Training Program. *The Qualitative Report*, 20 (9), 1394-1407.

- Mukminin, A., Muazza, Hustarna, & Sari, S.R. (2015). Stories from the frontlines: In-service teachers' demotivating factors and policy recommendations. *International Journal of Academic Research in Education*, 1(2), 40-52. DOI: 10.17985/ijare.56085
- Moore, K. D. (2005). *Effective instructional strategies from theory to practice*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publication.
- Tyrs. (1999). Model pembelajaran round club atau keliling kelompok. Retrieved from <https://tiestraysna.wordpress.com/2014/09/24/model-pembelajaran-round-club-atau-keliling-kelompok/>
- Wardiman, A. (2008). *English in Focus for Grade VII Junior High School (SMP/MTS)*. Jakarta: Pusat Perbukuan Depdiknas.