

# USING RALLY TABLE TO IMPROVE THE WRITING ABILITY OF THE FIRST GRADE STUDENTS OF SMAN 5 PEKANBARU IN WRITING DESCRIPTIVE TEXT

Yayang Prasedya, Syafri K , Fakhri Ras

[yayangprasedya.yv@gmail.com](mailto:yayangprasedya.yv@gmail.com) [syafrika51@yahoo.co.id](mailto:syafrika51@yahoo.co.id) [fakhriras@yahoo.com](mailto:fakhriras@yahoo.com)

No. Hp: +6281267144630

Student of English Study Program  
Language and Arts Department  
Faculty of Teacher Training and Education  
Riau University

**Abstract:** *This research activity is to find out the contribution of rally table method to improve the writing skill of the first year students of SMAN 5 Pekanbaru. The participants were 39 students. The data was collected by using observations, tests, and field notes. The data was analyzed by quantitative and qualitative. The research finding showed that the implementation of rally table method as the teaching method could improve students' writing ability both at the first cycle and second cycle. The finding also proved that in the pre-test students' average score was only 44 and it improved to 56 in the post-test 1, and finally improved to 76 in the post-test 2. It was also proved that applying the procedures of rally table method in teaching writing could raise students' interest and motivation to learn and share ideas with their groups since the core of rally table method was a collaboration between groups or pairs. In addition, applying rally table as a teaching method in English language teaching and learning could also improve students' ability to writing in English in terms of grammar, vocabulary, mechanic, fluency, and organization. Since Rally Table method has been proven effective in teaching writing a descriptive text, it was suggested that English teachers apply this method in order to improve students' writing skill.*

**Keywords:** *Rally Table, Students' Writing Ability and Descriptive Text*

# PENGUNAAN METODE RALLY TABLE UNTUK MENINGKATKAN KEMAMPUAN MENULIS SISWA KELAS SATU DALAM MENULIS TEKS DESKRIPTIF DI SMAN 5 PEKANBARU

**Yayang Prasedya, Syafri K , Fakhri Ras**

[yayangprasedya.yp@gmail.com](mailto:yayangprasedya.yp@gmail.com) [syafrika51@yahoo.co.id](mailto:syafrika51@yahoo.co.id) [fakhriras@yahoo.com](mailto:fakhriras@yahoo.com)

No. Hp: +6281267144630

Student of English Study Program  
Language and Arts Department  
Faculty of Teacher Training and Education  
Riau University

**Abstrak:** Kegiatan penelitian ini adalah untuk mengetahui kontribusi dari metode rally table untuk meningkatkan kemampuan menulis siswa kelas satu di SMAN 5 Pekanbaru. peserta dari penelitian ini berjumlah 39 orang. Data dikumpulkan engan menggunakan lembaran observasi, tes, dan catatan khusus. data dianalisa secara kuantitatif dan kualitatif. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa penerapan metode rally table sebagai metode mengajar bisa miningkatkan kemampuan menulis siswa di siklus pertama maupun siklus kedua. Hasil penelitian juga menunjukkan bahwa siswa hanya memperoleh nilai 44 pada pretest, lalu meningkat ke 56 pada post test 1 dan akhirnya meningkat menjadi 76 pada post test 2. Ini juga membuktikan bahwa menerapkan prosedur dari metode rally table dalam mengajar menulis bisa meningkatkan ketertarikan siswa dan memotivasi siswa untuk belajar dan berbagi ide dengan kelompok karena inti metode rally table adalah kolaborasi antara kelompok atau pasangan. Sebagai tambahan, menggunakan metode rally table sebagai metode pengajaran bisa meningkatkan kemampuan siswa untuk menulis dalam bahasa Inggris dalam hal grammar, kosa kata, penulisan, kelancaran dan pengaturan. Karena metode rally table terbukti efektif dalam mengajar menulis teks deskriptif, disarankan untuk menerapkan metode ini untuk meningkatkan kemampuan menulis siswa

**Kata kunci:** Rally Table, Kemampuan Menulis Siswa dan Teks Deskriptif

## INTRODUCTION

English is a compulsory subject in school that should be taken by students to develop physics and knowledge. English education is an effort plan to develop student's potency to have intellectual value, self control, and attitude to face the problem in the future. (Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Nasional; 2006)

English is the one of the scariest subject for the majority students. They think that English is not too important to learn because they rarely use English in their daily activities. It makes students lazy to learn and feel bored while learn English in the class. The low ability of grammar, also be a big problem to another student. They think that English just make them busy with rules, grammar, and tenses for every sentence. From all of the skills aspects that have been taught in school, writing is so much a part of daily life that people take it for granted. The average person produces tens of thousands of words a day, although some people like writers or politicians-may produce even more than that. Mansi (2012), says that in the competence based curriculum, the students are expected to be able to communicate. The ability to communicate is the ability to understand and produce discourse of which it can be realized in four language skills, namely listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Among the four language skills taught in schools, writing is the most difficult skill to learn. According to Reid (1994), writing is one of the most self conscious of human activities. It needs writer's ability to express opinions or thought clearly and efficiently. These abilities can be owned only if a learner masters some techniques of writing such as how to obtain ideas about what she/he will write on, how to express them in a sequence of sentences, how to organize them chronologically and coherently, and how to review and then to revise the composition until the writing is well built (Ratnasari, 2004). The student difficulties in writing had effect to the low grade of student ability to show their arguments and knowledge. It influences their reading and vocabulary scores and makes student confused to write in English.

Based on the observation and small survey that had been done by analyzed the data from English teacher at SMAN 5 Pekanbaru, it had been found there were so many problems that the students faced in writing a descriptive text. From writing measurement points, the writer found these following mistakes: firstly, in content aspect, the students still hard to express their ideas in writing. In organization aspect, it is difficult to build their sentences in the right form, in order to complete the text with introduction, body, and conclusion of the text. Then, in syntax or grammar aspect, they lack of the type of language features in descriptive text, also they don't really understand how to use modals, articles, or even the possessive words. In vocabulary aspects, it's difficult to choose the appropriate word that related to their topic and their limited vocabulary. And finally, in terms of mechanic aspect, students are still weak in spelling the word and capitalizations. These problems might occur because the teacher didn't teach them how to make a good descriptive text and provide them with knowledge about how to construct a descriptive text.

The last problem is that the students had big misunderstanding about descriptive text and biography. On their writing, most of them write about the curriculum vitae of the person that they describe than describe the physical, facial features or personality of that person.

Another problem is also related to the way of the teacher's teaching technique. Teaching writing in English is not an easy thing to do. By using many texts teacher can teach students how to make a good writing, whereas the texts have their own function, general structure, and language feature. But, a lot of teacher bounded in limited skill and media, and it makes problem to develop their method to improve student's writing skill. Those problems make some of teachers feel give up and just do the old method that is usually used in classroom. These things can make teacher lazy to renew method and make the subject boring and uninteresting, especially in writing lesson.

The minimum criteria of achievements (MMC) of English subject at SMAN 5 Pekanbaru is 75 while the average score of the test was only 68. 1. The result of the writing test showed that only 14 students or 36,8 % of students could reach the good level on 75, 15 students or 39.4 % could reach the average level on 65-70 , and 9 students or 23.6 % of the students at the poor level while their grade is less than 65.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### *Participants*

The participants of this research were the first year students of SMAN 5 Pekanbaru. For this purpose, class X.9 became the subject of the research. This class consisted of 21 female students and 18 male students so that there were 39 students at all. The reason for chose the first year student as subject of the research was because they were already learned about descriptive text.

### *Instrument and Techniques of Analyzing data*

Two techniques of collecting data were used in this research. The first was language test in form of guided written test in order to get the quantitative data. The written test instruments was asked students to describing the descriptive text in the pre test, post test 1, and post test 2. The second was used observation sheets and field note in order to get the qualitative data. The students were asked to pay attention to the teacher explanation, make group, discussing the picture in rally table, and describing the result of the discussion.

Treatment had given as a way to improve the students' ability to write in English. It had believed that using rally table is an effective way to solve the students' problems in writing. In addition, the lesson plans were made for two cycles, equipped with teaching materials and media, observation sheets and field notes.

The steps of using rally table were drawn as follows; (a) giving explanation about the activity or the way of what students should do in the class, (b)reviewing text or giving example about descriptive text, (c)asking the students to work in group to describe the picture and communicate with other students to get the complete information, (e) asking the students to describe the results of their discussion with their group.

After collecting the data, students' individual score were analyzed by computed using the formula which was adapted from Harris (1974:79). Their average score were being classified to determine their ability level in writing which was also adapted from Harris (1974:79)

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The collaborator analyzed the students' progress during the treatment and also observed both the teacher and the students' activities during the treatment through observation sheets and field notes. Commenting about the teacher's performance in the classroom was also parts of the collaborator's job.

The students had given a post test 1 at the end of cycle 1. The purpose of giving the post-test was to know the ability of the students after being taught by rally table method. If the result of the quantitative and qualitative data in the cycle 1 did not show a significant improvement yet, the writer decided to continue to cycle 2. Consequently, the students got to take post-test 2 at the end of cycle 2.

In addition, the quantitative data of this study was collected through the written tests (Pre-test, Post test 1, Post test 2), and the qualitative data were collected by using the observation sheets and field notes.

The Pre-test was administered before respondents were given a treatment by using rally table method. The number of students who took the tests was 39 students. As assumed before, the average of pre-test score was lower than the minimum passing criteria (75). The total score of the pre-test was 1722 and the mean score was only 44. The level of ability was poor. So that, the treatments were needed to increase students' writing ability.

The result of Pre-test showed that most of students in this class had low ability in writing (writing skill). From 39 students there were 33 students or about 84.61 % reached poor level. There were 5 students or 12.82% reached the poor to average level. Then, 1 students or 2.56% were in average to good level. The last, there was no one could reach good to excellent level.

In cycle 1, the students' ability in writing was still low because most of them were still in below of Minimum Criteria of Achievement (MMC) 75. The total score of the post test 1 was 2196 and the mean score was 56 that ranged in poor to average level. The score of the students was in average to good level (8 students or 20.51%). 30 students (76.92%) were in poor to average level. Then, there were 1 students ( 2.56%) in poor level, and none of the students reached good to excellent level.

Based on students' score in the pre-test and post test 1, there was an improvement. The average score in pre-test was 44 (poor), while the average score in the post test 1 was 56 (poor to average). it means that the students' achievement in writing became better after using rally table method which would improve the writing skill. From the students' test result on cycle I, it could be seen that the students still had problems on five aspects of writing, because the averages were still below of MMC, 75.

The result of cycle 2 showed the total score of post test 2 was 2999 and the mean score was 76. The level of ability was average to good. The level of the students' ability in this cycle was better than in the previous cycle. It was proved that there was 1 students (2.56%) who reached good to excellent level, 38 students (97.43%) who reached average to good level, and there was no student who reached poor to average level. Fortunately, there was none of them who reached the poor level. In other words, the improvement occurs in the post test 2.

Referring to the above cycle II data, the writer and the collaborator/teacher concluded that the improvement of the scores was better because the average score was 76 and it had passed MMC. It means that this method could improve students' writing ability and it did not need to be rearranged the next cycle. This evidence showed that

this research has been success to help students at SMAN 5Pekanbaru to increase the student's writing ability by using rally table method.

## DISCUSSIONS

As shown on the table, it presents the score of the students' writing ability by using rally table technique to see the improvement of student's writing ability in five aspects of writing on base score and score in each cycle. The improvement of students' writing ability from pre test to post test in cycle 1 and cycle 2 can be seen in the table below:

**Improvement of student's speaking ability in each cycle**

Score	Ability level	Pre-test (%)	Cycle 1 (%)	Cycle 2 (%)
80 – 100	Good to Excellent	0%	0%	2.56%
60 - 79	Average to Good	2.56 %	20.51%	97.43%
50 – 59	Poor to Average	12. 82%	76.92%	0%
0 - 49	Poor	84.61%	2. 56%	0%

## CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of the research was to find out whether the teaching writing by using rally table method could improve writing ability. From the research findings, it can be concluded that: First, using rally table as the teaching method could improve students' writing ability both at the first cycle and second cycle. It could be seen from the data that showed in the pre-test where the average score was only 44. It improved to 56 in the post-test 1, and finally improved to 76 in the post-test 2. Second, using rally table method in teaching writing could raise students' interest and motivation to write and share ideas with their partner in groups since the core of rally table is a corporation between groups or pairs.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the conclusions above, the writer would like to propose some recommendations related to the students' ability in writing descriptive text. The recommendations are follows:

1. Teacher should be able to select strategy in teaching writing a descriptive text in order to increase the students' ability in writing.
2. Since Rally Table method has been proven effective in teaching writing a descriptive text, it is suggested that English teachers apply this strategy in order

- to improve students' writing skill. So the students will enjoy the learning process.
3. Teacher should use appropriate method and find the interesting topic to make students more attractive and active.
  4. It is necessary to be active practicing their English in the class and out of class

## REFERENCES

- Beagley, Maria. 2009. *Every Picture Tells A Story*. [www.nasen.org.uk](http://www.nasen.org.uk)
- Brown, H Douglas. 2004. *Language Assessment Principles and Classroom Practices*. Longman. San Fransisco.
- CTE. *Implementing Group Work In The Classroom*. [www.uwaterloo.ca/centre-for-teaching-excellence.com](http://www.uwaterloo.ca/centre-for-teaching-excellence.com) University of Waterloo. Canada.
- DET. 2010. *Action Research In Education*. New South Wales Department Of Education And Training. New South Wales.
- Hadriana. 2008. *Penggunaan Metode Pembelajaran Kooperatif Untuk Meningkatkan Kemampuan Menulis Mahasiswa Program Studi Bahasa Inggris Fkip Universitas Riau*. Universitas Riau. Pekanbaru.
- Helmi, Farid. 2012. *Improving Students' Skill In Writing Recount Text By Using A Personal Letter (A Classroom Action Research With The Tenth Graders Of MASS Proto Pekalongan In The Academic Year Of 2011/ 2012)*. State Institute for Islamic Studies Walisongo. Semarang.
- Harmer, Jeremy. 2007. *How to Teach English*. Pearson Education Limited. Cambridge.
- Harris, David P. 1969. *Testing English as A Second Language*. Georgetown University. Washington DC.
- Hodgson, John. *Approaches to Teaching Writing*. Washington DC.
- Huxham, Chris. 2003. *Action Research As Methodology For Theory Development*. K. McLaughlin, S. Osborne and E. Ferlie. London.
- Kagan, S. 1994. *Cooperative Learning*. San Clemente, California. Kagan Publishing.

- Kagan, S. and Kagan, M. (1998). *Multiple Intelligences: The Complete MI Book*. San Clemente, CA: Kagan.
- Lewin, Kurt. 2006. *Educational Action Research*. Routledge. United Kingdom.
- Megginsin, David. 2014. *The Writing Center/ HyperGrammar*. University of Ottawa. Canada.
- Murie, Craig R. *Effects of Communication on Students Learning*. [www.kaganonline.com](http://www.kaganonline.com). North Dakota.
- Nastain, Ina. 2013. *The Writing Ability in Recount Text Of The Tenth Grade Students of Sma 1 Mejobo Kudus Academic Year 2013/2014 Taught By Using Estafet Writing*. Universitas Muria Kudus. Kudus.
- Nawawi, M. Bagus. 2011. *Improving Students' Writing Skill Of Descriptive Text Through Guided Question*. Syarif Hidayatullah Islamic State University. Jakarta.
- Nunan, David. 1993. *Research Method in Language Learning*. Cambridge.
- Oktariska, Ria. 2014. *The Application Of Information Gap Activities To Improve The Speaking Skill Of The Second Year Students Of SMA Tri Bhakti Pekanbaru*. Universitas Riau. Pekanbaru.
- Sitompul, Hotmaida. 2013. *Manfaat Penerapan Model Pembelajaran Terhadap Keefektifan Kegiatan Pembelajaran*. Universitas Negeri Medan. Medan.
- Slavin, Robert E. 1994. *Co-Operative Learning: What Makes Groupwork Work?*. University of York and Johns Hopkins University.
- Suyatno. 2011. *Using Digging Deeper In To Song Strategy To Improve Ability of The Sixth Grade Students Of MI NURUL IHSAN SIMPANG KANAN ROKAN HILIR in Writing Descriptive Sentences*. University of Riau. Pekanbaru.
- Tryana, Mery. 2011. *Increasing Students Ability in Writing Simple Sentence At The Fifth Grade Of SDS 057 BAGAN BATU By Arranging Scramble Words*. University of Riau. Pekanbaru.