TEACHING WRITING THROUGH KWL (KNOW, WANT, AND LEARN) TECHNIQUE AT THE SECOND YEAR OF MAN 1 BANDAR LAMPUNG

Herlina, Hery Yufrizal, Basturi Hasan
Email: myownspace@yahoo.com
Institution :University of Lampung

Abstract: The objectives of the research were to investigate how KWL Technique can improve students writing hortatory exposition text in class XI IPS 4 of MAN 1 Bandar Lampung and to find out whether KWL Technique is effective to teach writing hortatory exposition text under which writing elements applied. The research was conducted at MAN 1 Bandar Lampung. The population of this research was the students of class XI IPS 4 at that school. This research used one group time series design. It took six meetings with test on each meeting. This applied three topics i.e. computer, internet, and facebook. The indicator of the research dealt with the increase of students' mean and students' number who passed KKM. Besides, the instrument used in collecting the data was writing tests.

The result of the tests indicated that KWL Technique is effective to teach writing hortatory exposition text under which writing elements applied. It could be seen that the increases of mean of topic I, II, and III were 15.42, 14.91, and 16.48. Meanwhile, the increase percentages of students' number who passed *KKM* were 61.97%, 43.90%, and 53.66%. It showed that the increase of students' ability in writing hortatory exposition text was good. In addition, KWL Technique improves students' writing of hortatory exposition text by three elements of writing namely content, vocabulary and language use.

Keywords: *Hortatory Exposition Text, KWL Technique, and Writing Ability*

MENGAJAR MENULIS MELALUI TEKNIK KWL (KNOW, WANT, AND LEARN) PADA KELAS DUA MAN 1 BANDAR LAMPUNG

Herlina, Hery Yufrizal, Basturi Hasan
Email: myownspace@yahoo.com
Institution :University of Lampung

Abstrak: Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk meneliti bagaimana Teknik KWL dapat meningkatkan tulisan siswa dalam bentuk *Hortatory Exposition Text* di kelas XI IPS 4 MAN 1 Bandar Lampung dan apakah Teknik KWL efektif untuk mengajar menulis *Hortatory Exposition Text* berdasarkan pada komponen-komponen menulis yang diterapkan. Penelitian ini dilaksanakan di MAN 1 Bandar Lampung. Populasi dari penelitian ini adalah siswa-siswa Kelas XI IPS 4 di sekolah tersebut. Penelitian ini menggunakan desain penelitian *one group time series*. Ini dilakukan dalam enam kali pertemuan dengan diikuti tes pada setiap pertemuan. Tes-tes yang diadakan menerapkan tiga topik yaitu komputer, internet, dan facebook. Indikator dari penelitian ini berkaitan dengan peningkatan nilai rata-rata siswa dan jumlah siswa yang lulus KKM. Selain itu, alat yang digunakan untuk mengumpulkan data berupa tes menulis.

Hasil dari tes-tes tersebut mengindikasikan bahwa Teknik KWL efektif untuk mengajar menulis *Hortatory Exposition Text* berdasarkan pada komponen-komponen menulis yang diterapkan. Tampak bahwa peningkatan nilai rata-rata pada topik I, II, dan III adalah 15.42, 14.91, dan 16.48. Sedangkan, peningkatan persentase jumlah siswa yang lulus KKM adalah 61.97%, 43.90%, dan 53.66%. Hal ini menunjukkan bahwa peningkatan kemampuan siswa dalam menulis *Hortatory Exposition Text* adalah baik. Selain itu, cara Teknik KWL meningkatkan tulisan *Hortatory Exposition Text* siswa dominan pada peningkatan tiga komponen menulis yaitu isi, kosa kata, dan penggunaan bahasa.

Kata Kunci: *Hortatory Exposition Text, Kemampuan Menulis, dan Teknik KWL*

INTRODUCTION

Writing skills are complex and sometimes difficult to teach, requiring mastery not only of grammatical and rhetorical devices but also of conceptual and judgemental elements (Heaton, 1991: 135). According to Jacob in Reid (1993:236-237) there are five elements should be considered in writing namely content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. There are five purposes of writing in the classroom suggested by Cohen (1990:103) i.e. to have the learner *imitate* some model of writing by, for example, copying a series of sentences; to *train* the learner in the use and manipulation of linguistic and rhetorical forms; to *reinforce* some material that has already been learned, e.g. the students are asked to write a summary of an article they had read; to improve the learner's writing *fluency*; and to create *authentic communication*.

The students of senior high school are required to have ability in writing paragraph in type of hortatory exposition text. According to Reid (1993:29) paragraph is a series of sentences about one idea called the topic. This is supported by Coffey (1987:2) who points out that a paragraph is a group of sentences that clearly and concisely expresses one basic idea. Besides, hortatory exposition text is a text which persuades the reader or listener that something should or should not be the case (Sudarwati, 2007:204). This type of text requires arguments on the case discussed. The difficulty often appears when the students lack of arguments. Relying only on their background knowledge makes their arguments limited.

Heaton (1991:138) suggests the solution for the problems. He says that it is needed to provide the necessary stimulus and information required for writing, a

good topic for a composition determines the register and style to be used in the writing task by presenting the students with a specific situation and context in which to write. Therefore, the students need to be given alternative strategy which provides the necessary stimulus and information required so that they could compose their paragraph easily.

KWL Technique provides the solution to the writing problems suggested by Heaton above. It, which includes elaboration, may be an essential pre-writing strategy as it encourages learners to activate their background knowledge and apply it to the writing task at hand (Melanie Bloom in Hurd, 2008:109), by creating a chart with three categories (Casey, 2003:41). They are "K (what I know)", "W (what I want to know)", and "L (what I learned)" (Lipson, 2003:10). Bright (2007:48) states that it can be a great way to begin researching a topic. Bloom in Hurd (2008:109) explains the procedure of using KWL Technique. In the 'K' step, independent language learners write down everything that they know already about the topic of their writing and/or the writing style. In the 'W' step, learners write questions based on their background knowledge about what they still need to find out about the topic and/or the genre before they begin writing. This step helps guide their research process by creating clear objectives. Finally, in the 'L' step, learners note what they learned from their research on the topic and/or style. In conclusion, KWL Technique provided the students the solutions by its steps in writing.

RESEARCH METHOD

In conducting this research, one-group time series design has been applied. the formula of this research can be cited as follows :

$$\textbf{T1 T2 T3 X T4 T5 T6}$$

(Setiyadi, 2007:137)

T1, T2, T3   : The tests before treatments.

X   : The treatment

T4, T5, T6   : The tests after the treatments.

The population of this research is the second grade of MAN 1 Bandar Lampung in 2011-2012 academic year. The sample was only one class i.e. Class of XI IPS 4 which consists of 41 students. The instruments of the research are six writing tests i.e. three tests before treatments and three tests after treatments. There are three topics for the tests namely computer, internet and facebook. Computer belongs to topic for Test 1 and Test 4; internet is topic on Test 2 and Test 5; and facebook includes topic in Test 3 and Test 6. It takes 45 minutes for each test. Some points considered in the instruments of this research are validity, reliability and scoring system suggested by Jacob.

In analyzing the data, the researcher used the data of mean, standard deviation, minimum and maximum score which were gotten from the students' scores calculated. Those data are used to measure students' attainment and to get the description of students' ability in writing hortatory exposition text under which writing elements applied.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

As stated before, there are six teaching and learning processes with tests which were categorized into three topics. They were computer, internet, and facebook. The writer would like to discuss the research findings based on the topics.

1. Computer

On this topic, there were Test 1 and Test 4 whom results were evaluated by two raters. Here was the result of the students' tests on each test done based on the components of writing i.e. content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanic.

Table 1.
The Results of Test 1 and Test 4 Based on Components of Writing

No	Test	Writing Components					Total Score
		C	O	V	L	M	
1	Test 1	16.9	10.8	11	12.1	2.9	53.6
2	Test 4	21	13.6	14.8	16.5	3.1	69

From the table above, the students' ability in writing hortatory exposition text on Test 1 was low. The entire scores of writing components based on the Jacob's scoring system tended on the bottom range in the score interval of fair to poor level. In the other hand, although Test 4 has the similar level, fair to poor, the scores reached the top range on sore interval in this level. Then, here was the result of mean, standard deviation, minimum and maximum score.

Table 2. The Results of Test 1 and Test 4 Based on Standard Deviation, Minimum and Maximum Score

No	Test	Mean	Standard Deviation	Score	
				Min	Max
1	Test 1	53.6	7.72	41	76
2	Test 4	69	10.43	41	84

It was found that on Test 1 the students who got score upper than the mean was 51.22% (21 students) whereas the students who got score lower that the mean was 48.78%(20 students). In the other hand, on Test 4 the students who got score upper than the mean was 58.54% (24 students) whereas the students who got score lower that the mean was 41.47% (17 students).

Relating to the standard minimum score (*KKM*) which required score 65 the standard minimum score for writing, it showed that mean of Test 4 passed *KKM*. On this test, 12 students got score less than 65 (29.27%) and 29 (70.73%) other achieved score more than 65. The following was the graph which showed the explanation above.

Graph 1. The Distribution on the Students' Scores on Test 1 and Test 4 Based on *KKM*

Test 1

Test 4

The figure showed us that there were 37 students (90.24%) whose scores were lower than 65 and 5 students (8.76%) whose scores were higher than 65. Here, we could see the increase of students' number who passed *KKM* reached 60.97%.

This proved that there was a speeding up on students' ability in writing hortatory exposition text.

2. Internet

The topic internet related to Test 2 and Test 5. Here was the result of score based on five component of writing content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanic.

Table 3. The Results of Test 2 and Test 5 Based on Components of Writing

No	Test	Writing Components					Total Score
		C	O	V	L	M	
1	Test 2	17.5	11.2	11.5	12.8	3	56.1
2	Test 5	21.3	13.4	15.5	17.3	3.5	71

From the table above, we could see that Test 2 showed the students' ability was still on fair to poor level whereas Test 5 showed the students' ability passed this level although it did not reach upper level (good to average) yet except vocabulary did.

Beside the score based on the components of writing above, here was the result of standard deviation, minimum and maximum score of Test 2 and Test 5.

Table 4 The Results of Test 2 and Test 5 Based on Standard Deviation, Minimum and Maximum Score

No	Test	Mean	Standard Deviation	Score	
				Min	Max
1	Test 2	56.1	9.91	42	81.5
2	Test 5	71	9.98	55.5	87.5

On this Test 2, by the mean 56.10, the students who got score upper than the mean were 17 (41.46%) and the students who got score lower than the mean were 24

(58.53%). In the other hand, the Test 5 showed 20 students passed the mean 71 and 21 students were lower.

Relating to *KKM*, it showed that mean of Test 5 passed *KKM*. The distribution of the students' scores on Test 5 could be seen in the following graph.

Graph 2. The Distribution on the Students' Scores on Test 2 and Test 5 Based on *KKM*

75...24...   ■   31...68...   ■ < 65

The figure show **Test 2** listribution of the stude **Test 5** after treatments. It could be seen that on Test 5 there were 13 students (31.71%) whose scores were lower than 65 and 28 students (68.29%) whose scores were higher than 65. In the other hand, on Test 2 we could see that 75.61% students got scores less than 65. It means 31 students did not pass the score 65. Then, the number of the students who passed score 65 is 10 or 24.39% of the entire students. Here, we could see that the increase of students' number who passed KKM reached 43.90%. It meant that there was an acceleration increase of students' ability in writing hortatory exposition text.

3. Facebook

The topic facebook was chosen for Test 3 and Test 6. Here was the result of score based on five components of writing i.e. content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanic.

Table 5. The Results of Test 3 and Test 6 Based on Components of Writing

No	Test	Writing Components					Total Score
		C	O	V	L	M	
1	Test 3	18.2	11.8	11.5	13.4	3	57.8
2	Test 6	22.2	14	16.3	18.3	3.5	74.3

The table above showed that the score of Test 3 demonstrated that the result of students' writing ability was on the fair to poor level whereas the level of Test 6 was good to average.

Beside the score based on the components of writing above, the results of standard deviation, minimum and maximum score of these tests are following.

Table 6. The Results of Test 3 and Test 6 Based on Standard Deviation, Minimum and Maximum Score

No	Test	Mean	Standard Deviation	Score	
				Min	Max
1	Test 3	57.8	12.50	34	82.5
2	Test 6	74.3	7.73	58	87.5

On this Test 3, by the mean 57.8, the students who got score upper than the mean were 20 (48.79%) and the students who got score lower than the mean were 21 (51.22%). In the other hand, the Test 6 showed 56.09% students passed the mean 74.3 and 43.90% students were lower.

Relating to *KKM*, it showed that mean of Test 5 passed *KKM*. On this test, the students whose scores were less than 65 were 6 (14.63%) and the students whose scores were more than 65 were 35 (85.37%). This could be drawn as the following graph

Graph 3. The Distribution on the Students' Scores on Test 3 and Test 6 Based on *KKM*

68...31... ■   14...85... ■ < 65

Test 3   **Test 6**

On the other hand, on Test 3, the students whose scores were less than 65 were 28 (31.17%) and the students whose scores were more than 65 were 13 (68.29%). From the result above, we could conclude that the increase of students who passed *KKM* on this topic was 53.66%. This number shows the good improvement of average students' ability in writing hortatory exposition.

IV. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Referring to the research question and research findings, conclusion can be cited like followings:

1. KWL (Know, Want, and Learn) Technique can improve students' ability in writing hortatory exposition text. It is indicated by the increase of students' scores among the tests done. The hypothesis testing shows that there are improvement on students' mean and the increase of students' number who passes *KKM*. The increases of mean for each topic are 15.42, 14.91, and 16.48. Meanwhile, the increase of students' number percentages who passes *KKM* is 61.97%, 43.90%, and 53.66%. It shows that the increase of students' ability in writing hortatory exposition text is good.

2. On this research, students' writings are evaluated based on the five components of writing. They are content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanic. From the result of students' score, it is found that among the five elements of writing, KWL Technique works better on three elements. They are content, vocabulary, and language use. The other two elements, organization and mechanic, still needed improvement. These are the descriptions of the way each element of writing improved.

a. In content component, KWL Technique is able to increase students' writing because the students are led to elaborate their prior and current knowledge so that their writing can be more developed.. So, by using this technique, the students' knowledge about a topic is wider so that it will be more substantive and relevant to assign topic.

b. In term of organization component, KWL Technique is slightly able to enhance students' writing well. The problem may arise from the time allocation to discuss about the organization of hortatory exposition text is not enough. Most students still did not have adequate understanding about the parts of hortatory exposition text; which one is thesis, argumentation, and recommendation.

c. For vocabulary component, KWL Technique is able to improve students' writing because this technique invites the students to read the material. This task may help the students to solidify their initial learning of the vocabulary.

d. In case of language use component, KWL Technique is able to increase students' writing because by this technique the students are allowed to imitate some model of writing by copying a series of sentences from the passage into L column in KWL Chart. This gives them a sense how to write the language and helps them become familiar with certain grammatical and stylistic form.

e. Moreover, mechanics component, KWL Technique is slightly able to increase students' writing well because this technique invites the students to be independent learner. If the students do not have good background knowledge about the mechanic component of writing and they do not pay

attention to the mechanic on the passage given, their writings will not have really good improvement in this component.

This technique, as elucidated above, works better on three elements of writing namely content, vocabulary and language use. However, the other two components of writing do not develop well. They are organization and mechanic. Then, the suggestions for the development of these two elements are referred to the following.

1. Organization

   The result shows that the increase of organization score is not good enough. For this problem, the writer suggests the teacher to explain and discuss deeply about the organization of hortatory exposition text with his students before applying this technique. He may show the example of hortatory exposition text available on text book and invite the students to pay attention to this text. Then, they discuss the parts of hortatory exposition text; which one is thesis statement, argumentation, and recommendation. He may also explain the function and characteristic of each part. Finally, he may check students understanding about the organization of this text by questioning. After these steps are done, the teacher may invite the students to compose their writings by applying this technique as pre writing activity.

2. Mechanics

   Capitalization, punctuation, and spelling were not appropriately achieved by the technique. It is suggested that for the first problem, relating to capitalization and punctuation, it is suggested to the teacher to remind and explain to the students how to use capital letter and punctuation by, for example, explaining

and discussing in the same with discussion about organization of the text. Then, he must also remind the students to use the capital letter and punctuation correctly in their writings before the students compose their texts. Secondly, for the problem relating to misspelling words, it is advocated that the teacher asks the students to bring the dictionary. He may invite the students to open their dictionary while they find doubt in spelling a word.

REFERENCES

Bright, Robin. 2007. *Write through the Grades: Teaching Writing in Secondary Schools*. Alberta: Portage & Main Press.

Casey, Jean Marie. 2000. *Creating the Early Literacy Classroom: Activities for Using Technology to Empower Elementary Students*. Libraries Unlimited: Westport.

Coffey, Margaret Pogemiller. 1987. *Communication through Writing*. New Jersey: Prentice Hal Regents.

Cohen, Andrew D. 1990. Language Learning. New York: Newbury House Publishers.

Heaton, J.B. 1991. *Writing English Language Tests*. New York: Longman Inc.

Hurd, Stella and Tim Lewis. 2008. *Language Learning Strategies in Independent Setting*. Toronto: Multilingual Matters.

Lipson, Majorie Y et al (Karen K. Wixson). 2003. *Assessment and Instruction of Reading and Writing difficulty: An Interactive Approach*. Michigan: Allyn and Bacon.

Reid, Joy M. 1993. *Teaching ESL Writing*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents.

Setiyadi, Ag. Bambang. 2006. *Metode Penelitian untuk Pengajaran Bahasa Asing Pendekatan Kuantitatif dan Kualitatif*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.

Sudarwati, Th. M and Eudia Grace. 2007. *Look Ahead Book 2: An English Course for Senior High School Students Year XI Science and Social Study Program.* Jakarta: Erlangga.