

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF USING SCRAMBLED SENTENCES IN TEACHING WRITING RECOUNT TEXT

M.Muklas¹, Nurbayanah²

STKIP of Nurul Huda Sukaraja OKU Timur Sumatera Selatan

mmuklas@stkipnurulhuda.ac.id

Abstract

The objective of this research was to know whether or not there is significant different between students who are taught by using Scramble Sentences and the students who are taught by using Conventional Technique in teaching writing recount text to the eighth grade students of SMP Negeri 1 Buay Madang Timur. This research was quantitative research, using experimental method and true experimental design. Then, the population of the research were 208 students from six classes. And the sample of the study were 72 students, consist of two groups, namely experimental group (VIII.C) consist of 36 students and control group (VIII.D) consist of 36 students which chosen by cluster random sampling. In this research, the researcher used written test as an instrument for the collecting the data. The data obtained from Independent t-test analysis by using SPSS 20, between the result of posttest in experimental group and control group. Based on the calculation by using Independent t-test in SPSS 20, the writer found that $t_{obtained}$ was higher than t_{table} ($4.174 > 1.994$) at the significant level $\alpha=0.05$ in two tailed testing. It meant that there was any significant differences between experimental group and control group. So, the null hypothesis (H_0) was rejected and alternative hypothesis (H_a) was accepted. It can be concluded that Scramble Sentences was significantly effective in teaching writing recount text to the eighth grade students of SMP Negeri 1 Buay Madang Timur.

Keywords: Effectiveness, Teaching, Writing, Scrambled Sentences

1. INTRODUCTION

Based on the writer's observation and interviewed with English teacher at SMP Negeri 1 Buay Madang Timur, the researcher found some problems in the students' writing ability, such as the students did not know how to start writing, they could not generate their ideas, probably they understood what they would be done but they could not generate it into written form, they could not make a good sentence, they were still confused when they were asked to organize words into a good sentence or organize sentences into a good paragraph.

Meanwhile, the problems occurred because of some factors. First, the students had less motivation in learning English writing, they prefer to talk each other or do other activities. Second, the students were lack in mastering vocabulary. The lack of vocabularies could be seen when the teacher asked them to make a sentence or paragraph and they did not understand the meaning of their sentence or paragraph. The last, it came from the material that did not interesting for the students. The teachers usually only gave the topic and asked the students to write based on the topic. It made the students monotone, so that they felt boring with the material and lazy to do it.

From the problems above, the researcher interested to investigate the technique of teaching writing, especially Scrambled Sentences whether it can improve the students' writing ability. According to Manka (1996:38), there are two ways to improve students' writing. First, the students are asked to develop a topic into a text or make a thesis statement and develop it into a text. Second, the students are asked to rearrange scrambled sentences into a good text.

Larsen–Freeman (2000:133) said that Scrambled Sentences are part of communicative language teaching technique and it is usually used by the teacher in classroom. The students are given a passage (a text) in which the sentences are in a scrambled order. They are told to unscramble the sentences so that the sentences are restored to their original order. Ordering scrambled sentences shows words organization in a sentence or sentence organization in a text that is coherent and cohesive.

In addition, Elisa (2014:4) defines that scrambled sentences are random sentences in a text. Scrambled sentence is an excellent device for building concepts about blocks of text. As students arrange words into sentences, their awareness of sentences structure improves. They begin to take cues from capitalization and punctuation, identify subjects and predicates, put modifiers with nouns or verbs, build prepositional phrases, use conjunctions to provide cohesive ties. Students enjoy scrambled sentences. Ordering scrambled sentences shows words organization in a sentence or sentence organization in a text that is coherent and cohesive. Manka (1996: 38) states that organization of logical order is actually an activity of writing in which the writer are arranging words in a sentence or arranging jumbled sentences into meaningful text. This activity is done to convey a coherent and cohesive meaning of the text.

Based on the explanation above, the researcher was interested to conduct research entitled "The Effectiveness of Scrambled Sentences in Teaching Writing Recount Text to the Eighth Grade Students of SMP Negeri 1 Buay Madang Timur".

2. TEORITICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. The Concept of Writing

2.2. The Definition of Writing

Writing is one of four language skills that must be learned by the students because through writing students are able to express their idea, thought and feeling in writing symbol. The ideas on that paper from the students are the result of what they feel. This statement is supported by Siahaan (2007:2) who stated that it is the skill of writer to communicate information about idea, thought, feeling, and opinion to a reader or group of reader in written form.

In addition, Hyland (2009:191) states that writing is fundamental to modern societies and of overarching significance in all our lives: central to our personal experiences, life chances and social identities. For some people, writing is a product, an artefact of activity which can be studied independently of users by counting features and inferring rules. Writing skill deals with the ability to arrange the graphic system such as letter, words, and sentences of certain language being used in written communication in order that the reader can understand the message or the information. This also means that writing is used for communicating one's idea in written forms to the readers.

Furthermore, Meyers (2005:2) says that writing is a way to produce language, which you do naturally when you speak. Writing is communicating with others in a verbal way. Writing is also an action—a process of discovering and organizing your ideas, putting them on a paper and reshaping and revising them. Thus, writing is basically the process of expressing ideas and thoughts of the writer using knowledge of structure and vocabulary to combine the writer's ideas as a means of communication. It has a complex process that are begun by finding the main idea, find the supporting details and then constructing them into an essay.

From the definitions above, the writer could conclude that writing is a way to produce language that comes from our thought in the written form. It has a function to communicate the writers' ideas to their reader. So, writing is a tool to communication in language. By using writing, we can share our idea, feeling or anything that exist in our mind. It is influenced both by the personal attitudes and social experiences that the writer brings to writing. Writing is also an ability to make a form of words that have a higher value.

3. METHOD OF THE RESEARCH

In this research, the researcher used experimental method and chose true experimental design. In true experimental design, there were two groups which consisted of two classes used as the sample in this design, they were as the experimental group and control group. Two groups was given the same materials of the same topics, the population of this research was 208 and sample was 72 consist of experiment 36 students and control group 36 students.

4. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Result

In this chapter, the findings of this research were presented in term scores: (1) the result of pre-test and post-test score in the experimental group, (2) the result of pre-test and post-test score in the control group, (3) statistical analysis; a) the test of normality and homogeneity, and b) independent t-test.

4.1.1. The Result of Pre-test and Post-test Score in the Experimental Group

The data of the frequency of the students' score for pre-test and post-test of experimental group can be seen in Table 1s/d 3.

Table 1: Frequency of the Pre-test Score in the Experimental Group

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	40,00	1	2,8	2,8
	42,00	1	2,8	5,6
	47,00	4	11,1	16,7
	49,50	2	5,6	22,2
	51,00	1	2,8	25,0
	52,00	3	8,3	33,3
	53,00	1	2,8	36,1
	57,50	2	5,6	41,7
	58,00	3	8,3	50,0
	61,00	1	2,8	52,8

62,00	3	8,3	8,3	61,1
63,00	2	5,6	5,6	66,7
63,50	1	2,8	2,8	69,4
66,50	1	2,8	2,8	72,2
67,00	2	5,6	5,6	77,8
68,00	1	2,8	2,8	80,6
69,00	1	2,8	2,8	83,3
70,00	1	2,8	2,8	86,1
71,50	2	5,6	5,6	91,7
73,00	1	2,8	2,8	94,4
73,50	1	2,8	2,8	97,2
74,00	1	2,8	2,8	100,0
Total	36	100,0	100,0	

Table 2: The Distribution Score of Pre-test in the Experimental Group

Score Interval	Level of Competency	Score	
		Frequency	Percentage (%)
91-100	Excellent	0	0 %
81-90	Very Good	0	0 %
71-80	Good	5	13.89%
61-70	Moderate	13	36.11 %
51-60	Enough	10	27.78 %
41-50	Low	7	19.44 %
0-40	Poor	1	2.78%
Total		36	100 %

On the table distribution above, it was obtained that was no student (0%) who got excellent and very good level of competency, but there were 5 students (13.89%) who got good level of competency, 13 students (36.11%) who got moderate level of competency, 10 students (27.78%) who got enough level of competency, 7 students (19.44%) who got low level of competency and the last 1 student (2.78%) who got poor level of competency.

In addition, the following table is the the frequency of the students' score for posttest of experimental group.

Table3:Frequency of the Post-test Score in the Experimental Group

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
60,00	1	2,8	2,8	2,8
63,50	1	2,8	2,8	5,6
64,00	1	2,8	2,8	8,3
64,50	1	2,8	2,8	11,1
65,50	1	2,8	2,8	13,9
68,00	1	2,8	2,8	16,7
69,00	1	2,8	2,8	19,4
70,00	4	11,1	11,1	30,6
73,00	3	8,3	8,3	38,9

73,50	1	2,8	2,8	41,7
74,00	3	8,3	8,3	50,0
74,50	1	2,8	2,8	52,8
75,00	1	2,8	2,8	55,6
76,00	1	2,8	2,8	58,3
78,00	1	2,8	2,8	61,1
78,50	1	2,8	2,8	63,9
79,00	1	2,8	2,8	66,7
80,00	1	2,8	2,8	69,4
81,00	1	2,8	2,8	72,2
81,50	1	2,8	2,8	75,0
84,00	2	5,6	5,6	80,6
85,00	2	5,6	5,6	86,1
86,00	3	8,3	8,3	94,4
86,50	2	5,6	5,6	100,0
Total	36	100,0	100,0	

Based on Table 10 and Chart 2, mode of the post-test score in experimental group was 70, median was 74.25, the lowest score of was 60 and the highest score was 86,5, and mean of the score was 75.60 with standard deviation was 7.55. Next, the writer interpreted the students' score into distribution table as presented in Table.4.

Table 4: The Distribution Score of Post-test in the Experimental Group

Score Interval	Level of Competency	Frequency	Score Percentage (%)
91-100	Excellent	0	0 %
81-90	Very Good	11	30.55 %
71-80	Good	14	38.89 %
61-70	Moderate	10	27.78 %
51-60	Enough	1	2.78 %
41-50	Low	0	0 %
0-40	Poor	0	0 %
Total		36	100 %

From the Table 11, it was gotten that there were 11 students (30,55%) who got very good level of competency, there were 14 students (38.89%) who got good level of competency, there were 10 students (27.78%) who got moderate level of competency, and the last there were 1 students (2.78%) who got enough level of competency. For the level of competency of excellent, low, and poor were not students got it.

In addition, the following table is the descriptive statistics of pre-test and post-test in the experimental group that used to get information about number of sample, range, minimum score, maximum score, sum, mean, standard deviation (SD), variance, skewness and kurtosis. It can be seen in Table 5.

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics of Pre-test and Post-test in the Experimental Group

N	Range	Mini mum	Maxi mum	Su m	Mean	Std. Devia tion	Varia nce	Skewness	Kurtosis
---	-------	----------	----------	------	------	-----------------	-----------	----------	----------

	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
Pretest Score Experimental Group	36	34,0	40	74	212,5,5	59,04	1,587	9,523	90,691	-,164	,393	-,998	,768
Posttest Score Experimental Group	36	26,5	60	86,5	272,1,5	75,6	1,259	7,558	57,1276	-,118	,393	-,934	,768
Valid N (listwise)	36												

4.1.2. The Result of Pre-test and Post-test Score in the Control Group

The data of the frequency of the students' score for pretest and posttest of control group can be seen in Table 6s/d 8.

Table 6: Frequency of the Pre-test Score in the Control Group

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	40,00	2	2,8	5,6
	42,00	2	2,8	5,6
	45,50	1	2,8	2,8
	47,50	1	2,8	2,8
	49,50	3	2,8	8,3
	50,00	1	2,8	2,8
	51,00	1	2,8	2,8
	52,00	1	11,1	2,8
	53,50	1	8,3	2,8
	54,00	1	2,8	2,8
	54,50	1	8,3	2,8
	55,00	2	2,8	5,6
	57,00	2	2,8	5,6
	57,50	1	2,8	2,8
Valid	58,00	1	2,8	2,8
	61,00	2	2,8	5,6
	62,00	1	2,8	2,8
	62,50	1	2,8	2,8
	63,00	1	2,8	2,8
	63,50	1	2,8	2,8
	64,50	2	5,6	5,6
	65,50	2	5,6	5,6
	66,00	1	8,3	2,8
	66,50	1	5,6	2,8
	67,00	1	2,8	2,8
	71,50	1	2,8	2,8
	72,50	1	2,8	2,8
Total		36	100,0	100,0

Table .7: The DistributionScore of Pre-testin the ControlGroup

Score Interval	Level of Competency	Frequency	Score Percentage (%)
91-100	Excellent	0	0%
81-90	Very Good	0	0%
71-80	Good	2	5.56 %
61-70	Moderate	13	36.11 %
51-60	Enough	11	30.55 %
41-50	Low	8	22.22 %
0-40	Poor	2	5.56 %
Total		36	100%

Based on the result of descriptive statistic above, it was found that criteria of pre-test in the control group, there wasn't students (0%) were in an excellent and very good level of competency, 2 students (14.28%) were in a good level of competency, 13 students (36.11%) were in a moderate level of competency, 11 students (48.57%) were in an enough level of competency, 8 students (48.57%) were in a low level of competency and there was only 2 students (2.86%) were in a poor level of competency.

Furthermore, the following table is the the frequency of the students' score for posttest of experimental group.

Table 8: Frequency of Post-test Score in the Control Group

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
53,00	1	2,8	2,8	2,8
55,00	3	8,3	8,3	11,1
58,00	1	2,8	2,8	13,9
60,00	4	11,1	11,1	25,0
60,50	1	2,8	2,8	27,8
63,00	5	13,9	13,9	41,7
64,00	1	2,8	2,8	44,4
65,50	1	2,8	2,8	47,2
68,00	3	8,3	8,3	55,6
68,50	1	2,8	2,8	58,3
69,50	1	2,8	2,8	61,1
70,00	3	8,3	8,3	69,4
70,50	1	2,8	2,8	72,2
71,00	1	2,8	2,8	75,0
73,50	3	8,3	8,3	83,3
80,00	1	2,8	2,8	86,1
82,00	2	5,6	5,6	91,7
83,50	2	5,6	5,6	97,2
85,00	1	2,8	2,8	100,0
Total	36	100,0	100,0	

Table 9: The Distribution Score of Post-testin Control Group

Score Interval	Level of Competency	Frequency	Score Percentage (%)
91-100	Excellent	0	0 %
81-90	Very Good	5	13.89 %
71-80	Good	5	13.89 %

61-70	Moderate	16	44.44 %
51-60	Enough	10	27.78 %
41-50	Low	0	0 %
0-40	Poor	0	0 %
Total		36	100 %

From the Table 16, it was gotten that there was 5 student (13.89%) who got very good level of competency, there was 5 student (13.89%) who got good level of competency, there were 16 students (44.44%) who got moderate level of competency, and the last there were 10 students (27.78%) who got enough level of competency. For the level of competency of excellent, and poor were not students got it.

Moreover, the following table is the descriptive statistics of pretest and posttest in the experimental group that used to get information about number of sample, range, minimum score, maximum score, sum, mean, standard deviation (SD), variance, skewness and kurtosis. It can be seen in Table 9.

Table 10: Descriptive Statistics of Pre-test and Post-test in the Control Group

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness	Kurtosis			
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic			
						Std. Error			Std. Error	Std. Error			
Pretest_Score_Control_Group	36	32,50	40	72,5	2036,5	56,57	1,464	8,79	77,25	-,230	,393	-,748	,768
Posttest_Score_Control_Group	36	32,00	53	85	2431	67,53	1,466	8,79	77,41	,437	,393	-,538	,768
Valid N (listwise)	36												

Based on the table 12 and 17, the mean score of the experimental group was 75.60 and the mean score of the control group was 67.53. And the value of sig (2-tailed)= 0.000 less than the value significance level (0.05).

Finally, the writer concluded that hypothesis alternative (Ha) of this study was accepted and (H0) of this study was rejected. It meant that there was any significant differences in teaching writing by using Scrambled Sentences and Conventional Technique in the experimental group and control group.

4.2 DISCUSSION

Based on the findings above, it could be interpreted that teaching writing recount text by using scrambled sentences enabled them to get better score. It meant that scrambled sentences was effective to improve students' writing ability. It could be seen from average score in post-test of experimental group was 75.60 and average score in posttest of control group was 67.53. The t-obtained was 4.174 and the critical value in the t-table was 1.994.

Whereas, it could be seen based on the statistical analysis by using independent t-test, it found that $\text{sig} = 0.000$. It is less than critical value $= 0.05$. In other word, the Null Hypothesis was rejected and Alternative Hypothesis (H_a) was accepted. It meant that there was a significant difference between students who were taught by using scrambled sentences and students who were taught by using conventional technique.

5. CONCLUSION

Based on the data analysis described by the previous chapter, the researcher concluded that was effective to used Scrambled sentences in teaching writing recount text to the eighth grade students of SMP Negeri 1 Buay Madang Timur. It was proved by the students' average score in the post-test of experimental group was 75.60, it was higher than the students' average score in the pre-test of experimental group was 59.04, it was also proved by the students' average score in the post-test of control group was 67.53, it was higher than the students' average score in the pre-test of control group was 56.56.

Then, it was found that the result of the Independent Sample t-test of the post-test score in the Experimental and Control group gave the value of t-obtained was 4.174 and the value of Sig (2-tailed) was 0.000. It meant that the value of t-obtained was higher than t-table = 1.994 with df was $(n-2) = (72-2) = 70$, and value of Sig (2-tailed) was less than the value of Significance level ($\alpha = 0.05$). So, the Null Hypothesis was rejected and Alternative Hypothesis (H_a) was accepted. It can be concluded there was a significant difference between students who were taught by using scrambled sentences and students who were taught by using conventional technique.

REFERENCES

- Arikunto, S. (2010). *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Brown, H. Douglas. (2001). *Teaching by principles: and interactive approach to language pedagogy*. Addison Wesley Longman.
- Chicaiza, A. O. M. (2009:97). The Incidence of Some Practical Activities on Writing Skill Improvement for Children Attending the 6th Year of Basic Education at "Hernando Taques School during the Second Term, School Year 2008-2009": Army Politechnic School.
- Departemen Pendidikan Nasional. (2006). *Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris*. Jakarta: Depdiknas.
- Derewianka, Beverly. (1990). *Exploring How Text Work*. New South Wales: Primary Teaching English Association.
- Duigu, G. (2002). *Essay writing for English Tests*. Academic English Press:Australia.
- Elisa. (2014:4). *An Analysis of the Second Year Students' Ability of SMA N 1 Suliki in Rearranging Scrambled Sentences into a Good Hortatory Exposition*

Text.[Http://ejournal.bunghatta.ac.id/index.php?journal=JFKIP&page=article&op=view&path%5B%5D=2516](http://ejournal.bunghatta.ac.id/index.php?journal=JFKIP&page=article&op=view&path%5B%5D=2516). Retrieved on sunday, Jan 4th, 2016.

- Frank, M. (1990: 43). *Writing as Thinking: A Guided Process Approach*. EnglewoodCliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Fraenkel, R. J. and Wallen, E. N. (2006). *How to design and Evaluate Research in Education. Seventh Edition*. New York: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- Heaton, J.B. (1990). *Writing English Language Tests*. Longman Group: United States of Amerika.
- Hill, Susan. (2008). *Developing Early Literacy; Assessment and Teaching*. Australia: Eleanor Curtain Publishing.
- Hornby, A.S. (2000). *Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary of Current English*. New York: Oxford university press.
- Hyland, Ken. (2009). *Researching Writing*. Hongkong: City University.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000:133). *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. Second Edition. Oxford University Press.
- Manka, Ntonifor H. (1996:38). *Teaching Organizational Writing. English Teaching Form*. Washington: Growell Hill Inc.
- Nation. (1989:79). *Language Teaching Techniques*. New Zealand: Victoria University of Wellington.
- Novianti. (2011). *The Use of Scrambled Sentences Practice In Improving Students' Writing Ability to Produce Recount Text at The Second Grade Of SMP N 2 Pugung Tanggamus (A Classroom Action Research)*.<http://digilib.unila.ac.id/14072/6/CHAPTER%20II.pdf>. Retrieved on Sunday, Jan 3th, 2016.
- Oshima., and Hogue. (1991). *Writing Academic English*. San Francisco: Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.
- yers, Allan. (2005). *Gateways to Academic Writing; Effective Sentences, Paragraphs, and Essays*. New York: Longman.