

Improving Writing Skills in Second-Year Students of SMA Negeri 12 Bulukumba Using Problem-Based Illustration Strategy: An Experimental Study

Hasri*

Master Program of English Language Education, Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar, Makassar, Indonesia

ABSTRAK

This research applied pre-experimental method. This thesis discusses Developing the Writing Ability of the Second Year Students of SMA Negeri 12 Bulukumba through the Use of Problem Based Illustration Strategy (An Experimental Research). The population was the second year students of SMA Negeri 12 Bulukumba. This research used one group pre-test and post-test design. The sample of this research was the second year students of SMA Negeri 12 Bulukumba and used cluster random sampling technique. Instrument of the research was writing test. The writing test consisted of pre-test and post-test is used to see the students writing ability after giving treatment. The result of this research is gotten by comparing the pre-test and post-test score, then analyzed it by using t-test formula and finally shows $t\text{-test} = 17.63$ than this value is measured into t-table with the level of significance (α) 0.05, degree of freedom (df) = 19, and finally it was found the value of t-table shows = 2.093. Based on the result, researcher concludes there is significance development in writing ability of the students after giving treatment.

Keywords:

Problem Based Illustration Strategy, Writing Ability, Experimental Research

1. INTRODUCTION

Writing is an aid of both written communication and self-expression. Writing is one of the language skills that require mastery of grammar, proper use of vocabulary, and the preparation of sentences Logically and systematically. Sugiyono (2021:56) states that writing is a written communication process that involves the delivery of ideas, information, and thinking in a clear and effective way. In writing, it is important to use good grammar and an easy structure understood by the reader. In addition, writing also requires structuring logic thinking so that the message is conveyed in a structured manner without confusing the reader.

Hapsari (2020:33) says that writing is not just compose sentences, but it is also a creative process that involves the elements of the system language, word selection, and proper writing style. He also emphasized that Writing must be developed consistently because it involves various aspects of Cognitive and technical. According to Hapsari, the effectiveness of writing depends on the author's ability to connect ideas coherently and pass a clear message to the reader. Furthermore, Raimes in Nurzaitun (1996:2) says that writing helps the students learn two languages. Firstly, reinforce the grammatical structure, idioms and vocabulary. Secondly, when the students write also have two chances to be adventures with the language to go beyond what just learned to say to take risk. Thirdly, they become involved with the new language.

Writing is important and practical skill. The writer skill is thought as the most difficult one among the four language skill. Heaton (1988:138) says that the writing skill are complex and difficult to teach requiring mastery not only of grammatical and rhetorical devices but also of conceptual and judgment elements.

Among all the language skills, writing is the most difficult because people demand the accuracy in the skill. As Harmer (1991:53) says that points out that writing skill is expected to be correct. From the point's view of language teaching, therefore, there is often far greater pressure for written accuracy than there is for accuracy in speaking.

*Corresponding Author: Hasri: asrihaz@gmail.com

Two factors affect the difficulty of writing namely: the lack of knowledge of how to express ideas in the form of writing, and the lack of background knowledge about what to present to the readers. The first is related to the writing process and the second are related to the idea. Both are important to consider in teaching writing especially to the Secondly High School students.

One method that can entice the students to develop their writing by using problem-based illustration which shown certain situation that will be easier for the students to grasp ideas and formulate sentences. Besides, they will also describe about the pictures in such a way, they are expected to learn writing more easily and meaningfully since they are presented with the picture of certain event in the world.

Using illustration is one of the best ways to prove the worth of the students. There is a good deal of truth in the idea that pictures say things that words cannot. However, the reverse is also true and the researcher can draw pictures with our words, and paint them, as well. So that the reader can understand our ideas. Illustration and example are among the best devices to help explain things. Illustration does not have to be true, the researcher can make them up. Illustration is an example used to example used to explain (Brock and Howard: 1978:2).

2. METHOD

This study used a pre-experimental design with a pre-test and post-test in one group without a control group. This design was used to examine the effect of problem-based illustration on students' ability to write recount texts. The research design was O1 X O2, where O1 was the pre-test, X was the treatment using problem-based illustration, and O2 was the post-test.

The independent variable was the use of problem-based illustration, while the dependent variable was students' achievement in writing recount texts. The writing assessment covered content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. The population of this research was the second-year students of SMA Negeri 12 Bulukumba, consisting of 60 students in three classes. The sample was selected through cluster random sampling, and one class with 20 students was chosen.

The objective of this research was to determine whether problem-based illustration could improve students' ability to write recount texts. The significance of the study is expected to provide useful information for English teachers in teaching writing and to help students improve their writing skills. The scope of the research is limited to the application of problem-based illustration in teaching recount text writing to second-year students.

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

RESULT

The results of this researcher deal with the scoring classification of the students' pretest and posttest, hypothesis testing of the paired sample containing mean score, standard deviation and the test of significance. These findings are described as follows. Scoring classification of the students' pretest and posttest

The raw scores of the students' writing ability obtained through tabulating the five components of writing, they are: content, organization, vocabulary, grammar and mechanics. The students' score pretest and posttest as seen in table 1

Table 1. Rate percentage and frequency of the students' score in content

No	Classification	Range	Pretest		Posttest	
			F	%	F	%
1	Excellent	27-30	0	0	3	15%
2	Good to vey good	22-26	3	15%	12	60%
3	Poor to Fair	17-21	11	55%	5	25%
4	Very poor	16-13	6	30%	0	0%
	Total		20	100	20	100%

The table 1 indicates that, Before the lesson (pretest), most students were in the “Poor to Fair” category (55%), and some were “Very Poor” (30%). Only a small number (15%) were in the “Good to Very Good”, and none reached the “Excellent” level. After the lesson (posttest), there was a clear improvement. Most students (60%) moved up to the “Good to Very Good” category, and 15% even reached the “Excellent” level. Only 25% remained in the “Poor to Fair” category, and no one stayed in the “Very Poor”.

Table 2. Rate percentage and frequency of students' score in organization

No	Classification	Range	Pretest		Posttest	
			F	%	F	%
1	Excellent	18-20	0	0	5	25%
2	Good to vey good	14-17	8	40%	9	45%
3	Poor to Fair	10-13	9	45%	3	15%
4	Very poor	7-9	3	15%	3	15%
	Total		20	100	20	100%

Table 2 indicates that Before the treatment, no students were in the Excellent category. Most students were in the Poor to Fair category, while 40% were in the Good to Very Good category and 15% were in the Very Poor category. After the treatment, the results improved. Five students reached the Excellent category, the Good to Very Good category increased to 45%, and the Poor to Fair category decreased to 15%. The Very Poor category stayed the same at 15%. Overall, the posttest results show that the students' organizational ability improved after the treatment.

Table 3. Rate percentage and frequency of students' score in vocabulary

No	Classification	Range	Pretest		Posttest	
			F	%	F	%
1	Excellent	18-20	0	0	8	40%
2	Good to vey good	14-17	9	45%	9	45%
3	Poor to Fair	10-13	8	40%	3	15%
4	Very poor	7-9	3	15%	0	0%
	Total		20	100	20	100%

Tabel 3 indicates that the organization component of writing, the pretest results showed that no students achieved an *Excellent* score (18-20), but 8 students (40%) scored in the *Good to Very Good* range (14-17). A total of 9 students (45%) scored in the *Poor to Fair* range (10-13), and 3 students (15%) scored in the *Very Poor* range (7-9).

After the treatment in the posttest, there was a significant improvement in the distribution of scores. Five students (25%) achieved an *Excellent* score, with scores ranging from 18-20. The *Good to Very Good* category also saw an increase, with 9 students (45%) earning this score. Only 3 students (15%) remained in the *Poor to Fair* category, and another 3 students (15%) were still in the *Very Poor* category.

The improvement in the posttest scores indicates significant development in students' ability to organize their writing after the implementation of the problem-based illustration strategy.

Table 4. Rate percentage and frequency of students' score in grammar

No	Classification	Range	Pretest		Posttest	
			F	%	F	%
1	Excellent	18-20	0	0	9	45%
2	Good to vey good	14-17	6	30%	11	55%
3	Poor to Fair	10-13	11	55%	0	0%
4	Very poor	7-9	3	15%	0	0%
	Total		20	100	20	100%

The table 4 presents the distribution of student scores in the **Grammar** component, comparing the pretest and posttest results. In the pretest, no students achieved an *Excellent* score (18-20), indicating that none of the students performed at the highest level for grammar. However, 6 students (30%) scored in the *Good to Very Good* range (14-17), while 11 students (55%) scored in the *Poor to Fair* range (10-13). Additionally, 3 students (15%) scored in the *Very Poor* range (7-9). In the posttest, there was a notable improvement in grammar scores. Nine students (45%) achieved an *Excellent* score, demonstrating significant progress in their grammar proficiency. The number of students in the *Good to Very Good* range also increased, with 11 students (55%) scoring in this category. Interestingly, there were no students in the *Poor to Fair* or *Very Poor* categories in the posttest, reflecting a complete elimination of lower scores. This shift in the results suggests that the intervention, likely the problem-based illustration strategy, had a positive impact on students' grammar skills, leading to a significant improvement in their writing accuracy. The absence of students in the *Poor to Fair* and *Very Poor* categories in the posttest demonstrates the effectiveness of the teaching method in improving grammar proficiency

Table 5. Rate percentage and frequency of students' score in mechanics

No	Classification	Range	Pretest		Posttest	
			F	%	F	%
1	Excellent	18-20	3	15%	14	70%
2	Good to vey good	14-17	14	70%	6	30%
3	Poor to Fair	10-13	3	15%	0	0%
4	Very poor	7-9	0	0%	0	0%
	Total		20	100	20	100%

The table 5 indicates that, in pretest, 3 (15%) students got excellent score, 14 (70%) students got good to very good, 3 (15%) students poor to fair score and none of them get very poor score. In the posttest, 14 (70%) students got excellent score, 6 (30%) students got good to very good score, and none of them got fair to poor and very poor score.

1. The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of the Students' Pretest and Posttest

After calculating the result of the students' pretest and posttest, the mean score is presented in following table

Table 6. Mean score and standard deviation of the students' pretest and posttest

Type of Test	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Pre-test	6.165	1.491
Post-test	7.875	1.146

The table 6 shows the statistical summary of the students' score and standard deviation both in pretest and posttest. The mean score of the students' pretest and posttest was different, where the mean score of the students' posttest was higher than the mean score of the students' pretest. So, it means that problem based illustration can developing the students' writing in recount text. Then based on the table above also shows the standard deviation of the students' pretest and posttest was different too. The standard deviation of the students' pretest was 1.491 where as the standard deviation of the students' posttest was 1.146. It reveals that the result of the students' pretest has move varied scores than students' posttest

2. Test of Significance

In order to know whether or not the mean score is different from two variable (pretest and posttest) of the level significance (0.05) with degree of freedom (df) = N - 1, where N = the total of the students' (20). The following table shows the result of the t-test calculation

Table 7. Test of Significance

Posttest and Pretest	t-test	t-table
$X_2 - X_1$	17.63	2.093

The table 7 above indicates that the value of t-test is greater than the value of t-table. It shows that there is a significant difference between the result of the students' pretest and posttest.

Hypothesis Testing

The result of statistical analysis at the level significance (α) 0.05 with degree of freedom (df) = N - 1 = 20 - 1 = 19 indicated that there was a significant difference between the mean score of the pretest and posttest, where the mean score of the posttest was higher than pretest. In addition, the t-test value which is $17.63 > 2.093$.

Seeing the result above, it is concluded that the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected, while alternative hypothesis (H1) is accepted. It means there is a significant difference between the writing development of the students' through problem based illustration and those who are not.

DISCUSSION

The description of data collected writing test as explained in the previous section shows that the students' ability in writing develop. It is supported by the frequency and rate percentage of the students' pretest and posttest from the five components of writing. In the component of content, in the pretest, 3

(15%) students got very good to good score, and most of the students are in fair to poor and very poor range. While in the posttest, the data shows, 3 (15%) students got excellent to very good score range. In the component of organization, in the pretest, 8 (40%) students got very good to good score, and most of the students are in fair to poor and very poor range. While in the posttest, the data shows, 5(25%) got excellent to very good score range. In the component of vocabulary, in the pretest, 9 (45%) students got very good to good score, and most of the students are in fair to poor and very poor range. While in the posttest, the data shows, 8 (40%) students got excellent to very good score, and most of the students are in fair to poor and none of them got very poor score. In the component of grammar, in the pretest, 6 (30%) students got very good to good score, and most of the students are in fair to poor and very poor range. While in the posttest, the data shows, 9 (45%) students got excellent to very good score, and none of them got fair to poor and very poor score. In the component of mechanics, in the pretest, 3 (15%) students got excellent to very good score, most of the students are in very good to good score, and none of them got very poor range.

The mean score of the students' pretest is 6.165 classified as poor score and posttest is 7.875 classified into good score. It shows that the mean score of the students' posttest is greater than pretest. The standard deviation of the students' pretest is 1.491 and posttest is 1.146.

The value of the t-test is greater than t-table ($17.63 > 2.093$). Based on the t-test, the researcher finds that there is a significant difference between the result of pretest and posttest. In other words, the students' ability in writing develops after giving treatment.

This improvement is consistent with recent studies on problem-based learning (PBL). Research suggests that PBL enhances students' critical thinking, problem-solving, and writing skills. For instance, Alghamdy (2023) found that PBL significantly improved EFL learners' paragraph writing and grammar skills. Similarly, Chen et al. (2024) demonstrated that combining collaborative learning and task-based learning teaching significantly enhances vocational students' analytical reading and writing skills.

The mean score of the students' posttest (7.875) is greater than the pretest (6.165), indicating a significant improvement in writing ability. The t-test result ($17.63 > 2.093$) also confirms a significant difference between the pretest and posttest scores. These findings support the conclusion that problem-based illustration is an effective approach to improving students' writing abilities. From the discussion above, it can be concluded that the second year students of SMA Negeri 12 Bulukumba have good ability in writing particularly in writing through illustration. Finally, the researcher concludes that the use of problem based illustration can help the students increase their writing ability

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the results and discussion of the research, it can be concluded that the students' writing ability through problem based illustration can develop the writing ability of the second year students of SMA Negeri 12 Bulukumba. It is proved by the t-test value is 17.63 which is greater than t-table 2.093. Means that the hypothesis is accepted, the strategy problem based illustration developing students' writing ability and very helpful to active the students' to describe their own picture based on their imagination.

5. REFERENCES

- Adelstein. M.E Pival. 1980. *The Writing Commitment*. 2nd Education. New York: Harcaut Brace Jovanovic.
- Alghamdy, R. Z. (2023). Efficacy of Problem-Based Learning Strategy to Enhance EFL Learners' Paragraph Writing and Grammar Skills. *Arab World English Journal*, 14 (1):43-58. DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol14no1.3>
- Arikunto, suharsini. 1997. *Prosedur penelitian*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta
- Asiah, N., Ardian, E., & Amri, S. (2020). *A Study on The Students' Factor Difficulty in Writing Narrative Text at Viii Grade of Mts Sabilal Muhtadin Tembilahan*. *J-Shelves of Indragiri (Jsi)*, 1(2), 84–97. <https://doi.org/10.32520/jsi.v1i2.1057>
- Brock and Howard. 1978. *Writing for a Reason*. United States of America: John Wiley and Sons. Inc
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *John W. Creswell-Research Design_ Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Method Approaches-SAGE Publications (2013).pdf* (p. 273)
- Depdikbud. 1986. *Garis-Garis Besar Program Pengajaran Bahasa Inggris*. Jakarta: Depdikbud.
- Dumains, L. wullur. 1988. *Writing in English*. Jakarta: depdikbud.
- Elizabeth abd friend. 1990. *The Writer's Rhetoric and Handbook*. Second edition. New York: Merril Public Company.
- Gagne, E. 1985. *The Cognitive Psychology of School Learning*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company.
- Hariston. Maxine. 1986. *Contempory Composition*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Harmer. 1991. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. New York: Longman.
- Heaton, J.E 1988. *Writing English Language Laboratory Language Tests*. Longman Handbooks for Language Teachers (UK) Ltd.
- Jacobs, Holly L. 1981. *Testing ESL Composotion: A practical approach*. Rowley, Massachusset: Newbury. House Publisher. Inc.
- James M. Mc. Crimon 1976. *Writing with a Purpose* (6th edition). USA: Florida State University. Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Joseph P. Daghter. 1976. *Writing*. USA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Kartini. 1995. *The Students' SAbility To Compose Narrative Essay Using Story Picture at English Department of FPBS IKIP Ujung Pandang*. Thesis FBS S1 FPBS IKIP Ujung Pandang.
- Lamusu, A. S. (2022). *Improving Students' Competence in Writing Descriptive Text by Using Realia Media*. *Journal La Edusci*, 3(1), 18–22. <https://doi.org/10.37899/Journallaedusci.V3i1.611>
- Lesnusa. Wate Irawan. 1998. *Teaching Write to the First Year Students at the SMU Negeri 1 Parigi by Using Pictures*. Thesis FBS S1 UNM Makassar.
- Lubis, R. F. (2014). *Writing Narrative Text*. *English Education*, 02(01), 61–76.
- Meyer, Alan. 1992. *Writing with Confidence*. New York: Harper Collins. Publish.
- Muhyiddin. 1985. *Improving Writing Ability Through Arrange Paragraph*. Thesis FPBS IKIP Ujung Pandang.
- Nurzaitun.1996. *The Ability to Write an English Composition Through Parallel Writing Technique. A Case Study on Third Grade Students of SMU 8 Ujung Pandang*. Thesis FBS UNM Makassar.
- Rizal, M. (2023). *Learning Writing Skill During Covid-19 Pandemic Through E-Learning in Indonesian English Classroom*. *Educasia: Jurnal Pendidikan, Pengajaran, Dan Pembelajaran*, 8(1), 73–84. <https://doi.org/10.21462/Educasia.V8i1.151>
- Saputro, I. E. (2023). *Applying Realia for Teaching Writing Skill At First Grade Students Of Papua Senior High School*. 1(5), 1135–1140. <https://doi.org/10.5281/Zenodo.8175320>
- Saraka, 1988. *From Paragraph to Essay*. Jakarta: Depdikbud.
- Sears, S. 2002. *Teaching English A Foreign Language*. American: Ministry of National Education.
- Sugiyono. 2021. *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: Penerbit Alfabeta.
- Sumarni. 2005. *Developing the Students' Ability to Write Short Paragraphs Through Childhood Experience*. Thesis FBS UNM Makassar.
- Taylor, Gorden. 1993. *The Students' Writing Guide for the Arts and Social Sciences*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Umar, Azis P. 2002. *Developing the Writing Ability of the Third Year Students of SLTPN 11 Makassar through Guided Paragraph*. Thesis FBS UNM Makassar.
- Winn, W. 2013. *The Psychology of Illustration (Volume 1)*, new York: Spring-Verlag, 152-198.