

Teaching Narrative Text By Using Brainwriting Learning Model

Fibri Indira Lisanty AD¹

Sri Rahayu ²

Nur Tanti Aulia ³

¹²³ Cokroaminoto Palopo University

¹ indirafibrie@uncp.ac.id

² ayuahlakania@yahoo.com

³ Nurtanti123@gmail.com

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to prove effectiveness of brainwriting learning model in teaching student writing, especially narrative text. This research used pre-experimental method. The population of this research was grade 3 students of UPT SMA NEGERI 5 LUWU TIMUR which was consisted of 3 classes, each class consisted 30-33 students. This research used purposive sampling. The sample of this research was 30 students of class XII MIA 1 and XII MIA 2. This research used SPSS 20 to analyze the data. The data was taken by used test. The result of this research showed that used Brainwriting Learning Model in teaching narrative text can improve students' narrative text skills. This is evidenced by seeing a significant difference between the mean scores of students in the pre-test and post-test. In the pre-test the mean score of the students was 42.23 and the mean score of the post-test was 63.67, it means that there was a significant increase between the pre-test and the post-test. The standard deviation of the pre-test value is 12.339 and the standard deviation of the post-test is 9.007. This shows that the mean post-test score is higher than the pre-test after treatment ($42.23 < 63.67$). Then the significant test value of the T-test of 0.000 is calculated using SPSS, and the results of statistical analysis for the significant level (α) = 0.05 therefore the probability results are $0.000 < 0.05$, then H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted, it means that there is a significant increase between the pre-test and post-test results of students in narrative text using brainwriting learning model.

Keywords: *Narrative; Brainwriting Learning Model; Writing*

Introduction

English is an international language that used as a universal language between countries to establish communication, facilitate communication between countries and some countries use English as a second language. One important part in English is mastering writing, in writing we are required to understand the grammar used. Writing is one of the important things that must be mastered when learning English if writing is wrong of course the meaning will be wrong and the results will not match with the sentence we want to say. And not all students can write down a text into english that's all because they don't mastering one of skill communication that is writing. When we learn languages especially English, we must know and understand some important things from the language. We communicate using 4 skills, namely: listening, speaking, reading, and writing .especially for writing, writing skills is a rather complicated ability

because in writing English we have to know grammar, language use and one of genre text in writing is narrative text.

Narrative text is a type of text in the form of a story or text written that aims to entertain the reader. In narrative text must pay attention to the writing such as orientation, compliment, resolution etc. In writing narrative text there are still many students who are not very interesting in writing and fell difficult in writing. Students not really interesting in english beacause most of them low basic in english they frustrated about the meaning of english and it make some of students not want to study english. Most of students still difficult to choice their words and make it into some sentence. For students it's difficult to make a sentence with right structure grammatical they still confused with kind of grammar use, and the language use. Some of students still confused because some of them didn't like english, lack understand and lack vocabulary it make them felt boring and not excited to study english. Because of that, we need a learning model that can help upgrade and teaching students' writing abilities espescially in narrative text. Based on the problem above, researcher are interested in examining the ability of students in the title "teaching student's narrative text by using brainwriting learning models at the ninth grade of UPT SMA Negeri 5 LUWU TIMUR.

Method

In this research, the researcher applied a pre experimental method. The design research was:

Design of the research

O1 X O2

Source: (Amriani, 2016)

Where:

O1 : Pre-test

X : Treatment

O2 : Post-test

Population of this research was the nineth years students of UPT SMA NEGERI 5 LUWU TIMUR, academic year class namely MIA 1 and XII MIA 2 with total population about 135 students. The technique to collected the sample in this research was purposive sampling. The researcher took two classes as the sample of this research and the sample of this research were XII MIA 1 and XII MIA 2. The researcher took about 30 students. Instrument of this research was writing test. The researcher gave pre-test and post-test about narrative text.

The Procedure of Collecting Data

The procedure of collecting data in this research was pre-experimental research as follows:

1. Pre-test

The researcher asked students make a narrative text based on the topic researcher decided minimally 100 words to known the students writing ability before the treatment.

2. Treatment

The treatment held in six meetings. Procedure of the treatment were described as follow:

a. First meeting

- 1) The reseracher prepared the students
- 2) The researcher explained all about narrative text
- 3) The reseracher devided students into some group
- 4) The researcher explained about brainwriting and how to apply
- 5) The researcher analysed an example of narrative text together

b. Second meetings

- 1) The researcher gave students example of narrative text with topic "The Malin Kundang"
- 2) The researcher asked students to analysed the example with their group

c. Third meetings

- 1) The researcher asked students to make example of narrative text with the topic they want
- 2) The researcher asked students to working the assignment together with their groups

d. Fourth meetings

- 1) The researcher asked students to change their sitting with their groups
- 2) The researcher gave students worksheet with one topic.
- 3) The researcher asked students to working the assignment together with their groups
- 4) Each group have one worksheet and they have to do brainwriting

3. Post-test

- a. The researcher asked students to working the worksheet individually based on the topic
- b. The researcher asked students to make it into a narraive text minimally 100 words
- c. The result of their worksheet was collect by reseacher
- d. The researcher gave closing for the last meeting.

Calculating the mean score Standard Deviation (SD) and significant differences in Pre-test and Post-test of the students answer used SPSS 20 application.

Result

The Students' Score of Narrative Text in Pre-test

The Score of students in pre-test:

Table 1. The Students' score in pre-test

No	Name	Score (Pre-test)	Classification
1.	EMT	50	Fairly Poor
2.	NAL	66	Fairly Good
3.	NR	35	Poor
4.	AA	35	Poor
5.	ADS	35	Poor
6.	AS	35	Poor
7.	A	35	Poor
8.	EAT	35	Poor
9.	IL	35	Poor
10.	ERR	45	Fairly Poor
11.	L	35	Poor
12.	M	35	Poor
13.	MA	35	Poor
14.	MF	35	Poor
15.	S	71	Fairly Good
16.	SIA	35	Poor
17.	SA	56	Fairly
18.	MM	70	Fairly Good
19.	RS	35	Poor
20.	IR	56	Poor
21.	S	70	Fairly Good
22.	K	35	Poor
23.	A	35	Poor
24.	D	35	Poor
25.	D	63	Fairly
26.	DU	48	Fairly Poor
27.	N	35	Poor
28.	RC	35	Poor
29.	R	35	Poor
30.	RC	35	Poor

Based on table 9 above it, is shown there are 21 people got 35 with classification poor. There are 3 people got 48 with classification fairly Poor. There are 2 people got 56 with classification fairly. There are 4 people got 66 with classification fairly good. It can be concluded that the score for the narrative text obtained by the students was still very low in the pre-test before treatment.

The students' Score of Narrative Text in Post-test

The Score of students in post-test:

Table 2. The Students' score in post-test

No	Name	Score (Pre-test)	Classification
1.	EMT	56	Fairly
2.	NAL	68	Fairly Good
3.	NR	70	Fairly Good
4.	AA	67	Fairly Good
5.	ADS	52	Fairly Good

6.	AS	65	Fairly
7.	A	50	Fairly Poor
8.	EAT	59	Fairly Good
9.	IL	72	Fairly Good
10.	ERR	61	Fairly
11.	L	68	Fairly Good
12.	M	78	Good
13.	MA	49	Fairly Poor
14.	MF	62	Fairly
15.	S	69	Fairly Good
16.	SIA	52	Fairly Poor
17.	SA	63	Fairly
18.	MM	58	Fairly
19.	RS	50	Fairly Poor
20.	IR	50	Fairly Poor
21.	S	81	Good
22.	K	62	Fairly
23.	A	70	Fairly Good
24.	D	71	Fairly Good
25.	D	72	Fairly Good
26.	DU	65	Fairly
27.	N	69	Fairly Good
28.	RC	59	Fairly
29.	R	62	Fairly
30.	RC	80	Good

Based on table 10 above it, is shown that there are 3 people who got 81 with classification good. There are 10 people got 73 with classification fairly good. There are 11 people got 65 with classification fairly. There are 6 people with classification fairly poor. It can be conclude that the score of students are increasing after treatment.

The Classification and Student's Percentage in Pre-test and Post test

Based on table 1 above it, is shown there are 21 people got 35 with classification poor. There are 3 people got 48 with classification fairly Poor. There are 2 people got 56 with classification fairly. There are 4 people got 66 with classification fairly good. It can be concluded that the score for the narrative text obtained by the students was still very low in the pre-test before treatment. is shown the frequency and percentage of students' narrative text skills in the pre-test and post-test. In the pre-test, no students were classified as excellent, very good and good. in fairly good classification there were 4 (13.3%) students, 2 (6.7%) students were classified as fairly, 3 (10.00%) students were classified as fairly poor and the last, 21 (70%) students were classified as poor, it means that the students' narrative text skills used brainwriting learning model were still lower.

Table 3. Classification and student's percentage in pre-test and post-test

No	Classification	Score	Pre-test		Post-test	
			Frequenc y	Percentag e (%)	Frequenc y	Percentag e (%)
1	Excellent	96-100	0	0	0	0

2	Very good	86-95	0	0	0	0
3	Good	76-85	0	0	3	10.0
4	Fairly good	66-75	4	13.3	10	33.3
5	Fairly	56-65	2	6.7	11	36.7
6	Fairly poor	36-55	3	10.0	6	20.0
7	Poor	0-35	21	70.0	0	0
Total			30	100%	30	100%

In the post-test, no students get an excellent and very good classification scores. There were 3 (10.0%) students classified as good, and 10 (33.3%) students classified as fairly good classifications, 11 (36.7%) students were classified as fairly, and the last 6 (20.0%) students were classified as fairly poor. Based on the table and explanation above, it can be concluded that the frequency and percentage of students 'post-test results were higher than the frequency and percentage in the pre-test, it means that the students' narrative text skills improved after treatment using brainwriting learning model.

The Mean Score and Standard Deviation (SD) Pre-Test and Post-Test

Table 4. The Mean score and Standard Deviation (SD) pre-test and post-test.

Type of Test	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Pre-test	42.23	12.339
Post-test	63.67	9.007

On the table 4 above, it shows that the pre-test results are different from the post-test results after being given treatment on calculations using SPSS. The mean score of students in the pre-test was 42.23 and the mean score of students in the post-test was 63.6 it showed that the mean score of the students 'post-test were higher than the pre-test after being given treatment. The students' narrative text ability improved 21.44 after treatment by used brainwriting learning model ($63.67 > 42.23$).

Data Analysis

In analyzing the data there are the normality test and homogeneity test. Each test was presented in the following section.

1. Normality Test

Normality test was used to find out whether data of pre-test and post-test normal or not. The researcher used SPSS program to analyzed the normality test. The researcher used kolmogorov-smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk to check the normality test.

Normality test using kolmogorov-smirnov from the calculating results obtained that for the pre-test, the Sig $0.000 < 0.05$, it shown that the distribution of the pre- test variable data is not normally distributed, while the post-test, the Sig $0.293 > 0.05$, it shown that the distribution of the post-test variable data is normally distributed.

Table 13. Normality pre-test and post-test.

	Tests of Normality					
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.
Pre Test	.421	30	.000	.633	30	.000
Post Test	.102	30	.200*	.959	30	.293

*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Hypothesis:

H_0 : Data is normally distributed

H_1 : Data is not normally distributed

Based on table 13 above it, is shown that the results of the normality test. Based on the Shapiro-Wilk normality test the significance value of the pre-test is 0.000 and the post-test is .293, therefore from the calculation results obtained that for the pre-test the significant number is $0.000 < 0.05$, then the distribution of the pre-test variable data is not normally distributed, and for the post-test, the significant number is $0.293 > 0.05$, therefore the distribution of the post-test variable data is normally distributed.

2. Homogeneity Test

After getting the normality test, the next step is homogeneity test. It purposed to test the similarity of the sample in pre-test and post-test. The formulation was if significance level $\alpha = 0,05$. The result can be seen as follows:

Hypothesis

H_0 : Data is homogeny distributed

H_1 : Data is not homogeny distributed

Table test of homogeneity of variances

a. Pre-test and Post-test

Table 5. Test Pre-test and Post-test

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
3.266	1	58	.076

Criteria:

- If probability (sig.) > 0.05 then H_0 is accepted

- If probability (sig.) < 0.05 then H_0 is rejected

From the test of homogeneity of variances table, the probability value (sig.) of $0.076 > 0.05$ is obtained, therefore it can be concluded that H_1 is rejected and H_0 is

accepted, moreover the sample data has a homogeneous variance.

3. T-test

In this research, the researcher used t-test or paired sample test for independent sample test that is a test to know the significant difference between of students mean score in pre-test and post-test.

Table 6. Paired Samples Test

	Paired Differences				T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Sd.	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference			
				Lower Upper			
Pre Test	-	13.58	2.480	- -	-	2	.000
Post Test	21.433	4		26.506 16.361	8.642	9	

Based on table 6 above it, is shown the output of the paired test sample is 0.000. The results of the statistical analysis were for the significance level (α) = 0.05. The probability result is $0.000 < 0.05$, then H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted, the meaning that there is a significant increase between the students' pre-test and post-test results regarding narrative text after treatment using brainwriting learning model.

Discussion

In this research, the researcher explained about the effectiveness brainwriting learning model in teaching narrative text students of UPT SMA NEGERI 5 LUWU TIMUR. The description of the data collected through test. The are two type of the test is pre-test and post-test. At the pre-test, shows that student narrative text skill are still low, it can be proven from the score of pre-test. From 30 samples In the pre-test, there were 4 (13.3%) students in fairly good classification, 2 (6.7%) students were classified as fairly, 3 (10.00%) students were classified as fairly poor and the last, 21 (70%) students were classified as poor, it means that the students' narrative text skills used brainwriting learning model were still lower. The result of post-test shows that student's narrative text skill had increased significant from pre-test result after treatment. It can be proven through classification of the level students score show there were 3 (10.0%) students classified as good, and 10 (33.3%) students classified as fairly good classifications, 11 (36.7%) students were classified as fairly, and the last 6 (20.0%) students were classified as fairly poor. Based on the table and explanation above, it can be concluded that the frequency and percentage of students 'post-test results were higher than the frequency and percentage in the pre-test, it means that the students' narrative text skills improved after treatment 21.44 using brainwriting learning model. The researcher gave a comparison between pre-test and post-test result. From the classification and

percentage data it shown that there is a significant increase between pre-test and post test result. Moreover, the researcher used SPSS to analysed the data. Based on the result mean score and t-test value from pre-test shows mean score of post-test is higher than the mean score of pre-test. It can be provent whit the mean score of pre-test was 42.23 and mean score of post-test was 63.67, It means that students narrative text skill improved 21.44 after treatment ($42.23 < 63.67$). The calculation result from t-test value to find out a significant difference in comparison of pre-test and post-test. The result of paired sample test is 0,000. The statistical analysis were for the significance level (α) = 0.05. from the explanation shows that $0,000 < 0.05$, it is mean H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted.

From the data analysis, it shows that there is an increase in the scores obtained by students after the treatment, in this research, the treatment was carried out for four meetings. The researcher provided different material from each meeting using brainwriting learning model. In the learning process there are some students who are felt difficult learn about narrative text and how to make a narrative text. The researcher provided help students to understand with a lot of example narrative text so they can easily learning and had more knowing about narrative text. Based on the explanation above, it shows that after treatment by using brainwriting learning model, the researcher concluded that brainwriting learning model is effective in teaching narrative text. It can be proven from the result of data analysis it show that significant value for the t-test is 0,000 and for the significant level (α) = 0,05, it can be concluded that $0,000 < 0,05$. It means H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted. Based on the hypothesis above, it shows that there is significant difference between the result of the pre-test and post-test after the treatment of using by brainwriting learning model in teaching narrative text at the third year students of UPT SMA Negeri 5 Luwu Timur.

Conclusion

Based on the findings and discussion in the previous chapter, the researcher concluded that using brainwriting learning model is effective in teaching and improving student narrative texty in third grade at UPT SMA NEGERI 5 LUWU TIMUR. This is evidenced by seeing a significant difference between the mean scores of students in the pre-test and post-test. In the pre-test the mean score of the students was 42.23 and the mean score of the post-test was 63.67, it means that there was a significant increase between the pre-test and the post-test. The standard deviation of the pre-test value is 12.339 and the standard deviation of the post-test is 9.007. This shows that the mean post-test score is higher than the pre- test after treatment ($42.23 < 63.67$). Then the significant test value of the T-test of 0.000 is calculated using SPSS, and the results of statistical analysis for the significant level (α) = 0.05 therefore the probability results are $0.000 < 0.05$, then H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted, it means that there is a significant increase between the pre-test and post-test.

Acknowledgment

As a result, the researcher wants to highly express her sincere gratitude and appreciation to the following person for their valuable contributions.

1. Muhammad Naim S.P, M.P as the dean of FAPERTA, Cokroaminoto Palopo University for giving support in administrating
2. All the lecturers in UNCP for giving ideas and helps.
3. Our beloved parents for their endless love, pray, supports and patiences.
4. The researchers also shows thanks to their love family.

References

- Anderson. (1997). In Indriati. 2015. *Language Features of Narrative Text*. Thesis. Yogyakarta: English Language Education Department Faculty of Languages and Arts- Yogyakarta.
- Brown. In Mungka. 2018. *The Classification Score and Criteria of the Components*. Thesis. Palopo: Faculty of Teacher Training and Education UNCP.
- Budiyantri, M. Pd. 2009. *Improving Students' Writing Skills of Narrative Text through Brainstorming*, Journal of Education and Islamic Studies (online), 5, 1. <http://ejournal.uin-suska.ac.id>. Access February 2020.
- Callella. 2001. In Maulidiansyah. 2017. *Types of writing*. Thesis. Aceh. : Faculty of Tarbiyah and Teacher Training Ar-Raniry State Islamic University Darussalam-Banda Aceh.
- Depdikbud. (1996:3). In Mungka. 2018. *Calculating of Students' Point In Writing Ability Narrative Text*. Thesis. Palopo: Faculty of Teacher Training and Education-UNCP.
- Depdikbud. 1985. In Mungka. 2018. *Classifying the Students' Score Into Some Classification*. Thesis. Palopo: Faculty of Teacher Training and Education-UNCP.
- Derewianka (1990). In Indriati. 2015. *Generic Structure of Narrative Text*. Thesis. Yogyakarta: English Language Education Department Faculty of Languages and Arts- Yogyakarta.
- Dewi, Hulwani. 2015. *The Use of Brainwriting 6-3-5 Technique to Improve Students' Writing Ability of Recount Text*. Undergraduate (S1) Thesis. Semarang: Islamic Education and Teacher Teaching Faculty-UIN.
- Gay. (1981:223). In Amriani. 2016. *Design of the Research*. Thesis. Palopo: Faculty of Teacher Training and Education-UNCP.
- Heaton. In Mungka. 2018. *The Criteria of Assesing Writing*. Thesis. Palopo: Faculty of

Teacher Training and Education-UNCP.

- Istiqomah. 2018. *Improving Students' Writing Skills Using Cooperative Learning*. Thesis. Salatiga: English Education Department of Teacher Training and Education Faculty of State Institute of Islamic Studies- IAIN.
- Meiranti. 2015. *Improving Students' Writing Skills Through Field Trip Method*: Journal of English Education (online), 1, 1. <http://journal.uniku.ac.id/index.php/ERJEE>. Access Mei 2020.
- Michalko (2004: 315). Brocop, et.al. (2009: 9). Baxter (2001: 81). In Purwati. 2016. *Definition of Brainwriting*. Thesis. Salatiga: English Education Department of Teacher Training and Education Faculty State Institute for Islamic Studies- IAIN.
- Nurgiantoro. (2001: 306-308). In Hotimah. 2015. *Components of writing*. Thesis. Purwokerto: English Education Departement of Teacher Training and Education-Muhammadiyah University of Purwokerto.
- Rebecca 2003, Anderson (2003a, Widayati, 2003. *Defenition of narrative text*. Discussion List, (online), Access 2 July 2010.
- Ruangbaca. June 2019. *Langkah-Langkah Metode Brainwriting*. Discussion List (Online), Access June 2019.
- Tarigan. (1985:5). Harmer. (2001:79). Jonah. (2006:29). Nation 2009:112. *WRITING ACCORDING TO SOME EXPERT*. Discussion List, (online), ([@DelmiSastra](http://delmi.sastra.ac.id), Access 10 March 2015.
- Tarigan. (1994 : 24). In Hotimah. 2015. *Purpose of Writing*. Thesis. Purwokerto: English Education Departement of Teacher Training and Education-Muhammadiyah University of Purwokerto.
- Virdyna. 2016. *Teaching Writing Skill by Using Brainwriting Strategy*, OKARA Journal of Languages and Literature (online), 10, 1, <http://ejournal.stainpamekasan.ac.id>. Access Febuary 2020.
- Wilson. (2013: 44). In Ferismanda. 2016. *Strengths and Weaknesses of Brainwriting Strategies Steps of Brainwriting Strategies in Short Story Writing Learning*. Thesis. Yogyakarta: Fakultas Bahasa dan Negeri- Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta.
- Yulianti¹, Nuraeni², Parmawati³. 2019. *Improving Students' Writing Skill Using Brainswriting Strategy*. Project (online), 2, 5. <https://www.researchgate.net>. Access Febuary 2020.