A Study on the Ability of the First Year Students of SMAN 10 Pekanbaru in Writing Recount Text

Khairunnisa Serenita, Syafri K, Erni
Email: cerenith.serenita@gmail.com, email: syafrik@yahoo.com, email: erni.rosda@yahoo.co.id
No. Hp: 085278366004
Student of English Language Education Department
Faculty of Teacher's Training and Education
Riau University

Abstract: This descriptive research was aimed to find out the ability of the first year students of SMAN 10 Pekanbaru in writing recount text .The participants were 34 students. The data was collected by using writing tests. The students were given four topics and they were asked to choose only one. The research finding indicated that the students were capable in writing recount text although they still had difficulty in writing recount text based on the topic given. The result of test showed the average score of students writing ability was 60.27. It showed that the students were in average to good level and it means that the writing recount text based on the topic given was not too difficult for the students.

Keywords: Recount Text, Writing Ability

A Study on the Ability of the First Year Students of SMAN 10 Pekanbaru in Writing Recount Text

Khairunnisa Serenita, Syafri K, Erni

Email: cerenith.serenita@gmail.com, email: syafrik@yahoo.com, email: erni.rosda@yahoo.co.id

No. Hp: 085278366004

Student of English Language Education Department

Faculty of Teacher's Training and Education

Riau University

Abstrak: Penelitian deskriptif ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui kemampuan siswa kelas satu SMAN 10 Pekanbaru didalam menulis teks recount. Para peseta ada 34 siswa. Pengumpulan data dilakukan dengan menggunakan tes terulis. Siswa diberi empat topic dan mereka disuruh memilih hanya satu topik. Hasil penelitian menjunjukan bahwa siswa mampu menulis teks recount meskipun masih terdapat kesulitan dalam menulis teks recount berdasarkan topik yang diberikan. Hasil penelitian menunjukan nilai rata rata kemampuan siswa 60.27. Hasil ini menunjukkan bahwa siswa berada dalam level cukup sampai bagus dan dengan hasil ini berarti menulis teks recount berdasarkan topic yang diberikan tidak terlalu sulit.

Kata kunci: Teks Recount, Kemampuan menulis Siswa

INTRODUCTION

Writing is one of the language skills that is important to be mastered. In writing skills we find many conventions of rules that have to be followed in order to achieve the standard of writing skill. Therefore students can provide themselves to practice in writing which is reinforcing the language that the students have learned.

According to Langan (2000:13) writing is not an automatic process: we will not get something for nothing and we should not expect to. Writing needs a process and practice to make the students familiar with all parts of writing and accustomed to express their ideas, thoughts and experiences in the written form.

According to Hairson (1986:2) writing is the major tool for learning. When we write something we practice to express ideas demonstrating our knowledge about writing. A writer has to be able to develop his or her ideas and how the ideas are related to one another. In writing we stimulate our thoughts process by the act of writing. Writing helps us to explore what we know.

Writing as a productive skill is not easy. There are many aspects which should be considered in writing such as, developing ideas, grammatical devices, choice of words, writing strategy and so on. As a productive skill, writing has to be practiced in order to be a good writer. The purpose of writing is the expression of ideas, the conveying of the message to the reader. Writing as a subject makes learners to be in active learner rather than passive receivers of information because when we write, we train our mind, our energy, and our knowledge and form them into a good writing that can be read by all people.

Genre has been emphasized in the process of learning English. Based on the curriculum there are 12 genres taught in the senior high school. Recount is one of the kinds of text learnt by first year students of senior high school.

In syllabus SMAN 10 Pekanbaru, students are asked to write recount text based on experience/event that happened with considering the language feature, generic structure, social function of recount text. It shows that students have practiced it in school. But in real life, when learning recount text, students are more focus on reading skill than writing skill. This problem happens because writing is more difficult to teach.

Based on the researcher informal interview with the English teacher at SMAN 10 Pekanbaru, the students still had problem to produce recount text in written language. Actually the teacher had given the explanation about recount text and when teaching and learning process it has been repeated by the teacher to write recount text correctly. And although they had been studied recount text from Junior high school, the students had difficulties in writing recount text.

On learning process, teacher had created many strategies to teach the recount text subject. Teacher often give students authentic material such as picture or short video to make students comprehend about this material. Ideally students capable and comprehend in writing in form recount text, but in contrast some students still get low score in their exercise.

Writing a good recount text must involve many aspects that should be concerned by the writer; there are grammar, vocabulary, mechanics, fluency and organization. Especially in organization, the students must organize the text organization and language feature uses in recount text in order to create a good recount text. This phenomena makes the writer wants to know the difficulties that the students faced when they write recount text and they ability in writing recount text.

Based on the background above, the writer is interested to conduct a research which entitled: A Study on the Ability of the First Year Students of SMAN 10 Pekanbaru in Writing Recount Text

METHODOLOGY

Participants

The participants of this research were the firts year students of SMAN 10 Pekanbaru. Arikunto (2005:94) states that if the number of population is more than 100, the sample used should be 10-15% and 20-25%. In this research, the writer will take 20% of the population; the number of student is 34 persons.

In choosing sample, the writer use random cluster sampling. The writer will use seven small papers which six papers written 'zero' and 'sample'. Writer will ask each chairman of the class to choose one paper. A chairman that has paper with 'sample' will be the sample of the research.

Instrumentation and Analysis

The research instrument of the test is writing test. The students were asked to write a recount text by giving them topics to choose. The students choose only one topic. The topic is familiar or known by the students. The students have to write a clear and simple sentences to express their ideas and concern with grammar, vocabulary, mechanics, fluency, and form of organization.

The students' written test must consist of general classification and description. The text must be at least 100 words. The time provided for doing the test is 90 minutes. After writing tests were collected, they were evaluated by three raters who have Sarjana Degree of English.

To analyze the level of students' writing ability, the writer uses the following formula:

$$Score = G+V+M+O+F$$

Hughes (1989:94)

Where, S = students' score
G = students' ability in grammar
V = students' ability in vocabulary
M = students' ability in mechanic
O = students' ability in form organization
F = students' ability in fluency

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This research was conducted to find out how good are the first year students of SMAN10 Pekanbaru in writing recount text. Azher et al (2004:11) Says that the test in the form of essay needs two or more raters; therefore this test was scored by three raters, they are Mrs. Agustimarni, S. Pd (English teacher in SMAN 10 Pekanbaru), Mr. M. Rusli, S.Pd. (English teacher in SMAN pekanbaru), Mrs. Hj. Misrawati, S.Pd (English

teacher of SMPN 21 Pekanbaru). The writer calculated not only the scores of the whole writing composition, but also the scores if each aspects of writing evaluated: grammar, vocabulary, mechanic, fluency, and organization.

1. **The Student's Writing Ability According To Rater 1**

The score of students' writing ability in general according to rater 1 is presented as followed:

Table. 4 The Students' Writing Ability According to Rater 1

No	Score	Level of ability	Frequency	Percentage
1	80 – 100	Good to excellent	5	14.71%
2	60 – 79	Average to good	13	38.24%
3	50 – 59	Poor to average	6	17.65%
4	0 – 49	Poor	10	29.41%
Total			34	100%

Table 4 shows the students' writing ability score based on rater 1 is as follows: 5 students (14.71%) are in good to excellent category, 13 students (38.24%) are in average to good, 6 students (17.65%) are in poor to average category, and 10 students (29.41%) are in poor category. In conclusion, the students' writing ability of the first year students at SMAN 10 Pekanbaru, to rater 1 is average to good level.

2. **Students' Writing Ability According to Rater 2**

The score of students' writing ability in general according to rater 2 is presented as followed:

Table 5. The Students' Writing Ability According to Rater 2

No	Score	Level of ability	Frequency	Percentage
1	80 – 100	Good to excellent	5	14.71%
2	60 – 79	Average to good	12	35.29%
3	50 – 59	Poor to average	7	20.29%
4	0 – 49	Poor	10	29.41%
Total			34	100%

Table 5 shows the students' writing ability score based on rater 2 is as follows: 5 students (14.71%) are in good to excellent category, 12 students (35.29%) are in average to good, 7 students (20.59%) are in poor to average category, and 10 students (29.41%) are in poor category. In conclusion, the students' writing ability of the first year students at SMAN 10 Pekanbaru according to rater 2 is average to good level.

3. Students' Writing Ability According to Rater 3

The score of students' writing ability in general according to rater 3 is presented as followed:

Table 6. The Students' Writing Ability According to Rater 3

No	Score	Level of ability	Frequency	Percentage
1	80 – 100	Good to excellent	5	14.71%
2	60 – 79	Average to good	12	35.29%
3	50 – 59	Poor to average	9	26.47%
4	0 – 49	Poor	8	23.35%
Total			34	100%

Table 6 shows the students' writing ability score based on rater 3 is as follows: 5 students (14.71%) are in good to excellent category, 12 students (35.29%) are in average to good, 9 students (26.47%) are in poor to average category, and 8 students (23.53%) are in poor category. In conclusion, the students' speaking ability of the second year students at SMAN 10 Pekanbaru to rater 3 is average to good level.

4. The Students' Writing Ability According to the Three Raters

The score of students' speaking ability in general in terms of writing aspect according to the three raters can be seen as followed:

a. The student's score in term of grammar aspect

Table 7. The Students' score in Grammar Aspect

No	Level of ability	Range score	Rater 1		Rater 2		Rater 3		Based on three raters	
			F	%	F	%	F	%	f	%
1	Good to excellent	80-100	4	11.76	5	14.71	6	14.71	1	2.94
2	Average to good	60-79	9	26.47	8	23.53	7	20.59	10	29.41
3	Poor to average	50-59	13	38.24	11	32.35	14	41.18	8	23.53
4	Poor	0-49	8	23.53	10	29.41	7	20.59	15	44.12
			34	100	34	100	34	100	34	100

There are 34 students who took writing test. Based in rater 1, on grammar aspect, there are 4 student or 11,76% in good to excellent level; 9 students or 26.47% in average to good level; 13 students or 38.24% in poor to average level; 8 students or 23.53% in poor level. Based on rater 2, there is 5 student or 14.71% in good to excellent level; 8 students or 23.53% in average to good level; 11 students or 32.35% in poor to average level; 10 students or 29.41% in poor level. Based on rater 3, there are 6 students or 17.65% in good to excellent level; 7 students or 20.59% are in average to good level; 14 students or 41.18% are in poor to average level and 7 students or 20.59% are in poor level. Moreover based on three raters, there is 1 student or 2.94 in good to excellent level; 10 students or 29.41 % are in average to good level; 8 students or 23.53% are in

poor to average level and 15 students or 44.12% are in poor level. In conclusion, the students' writing ability in terms of grammar of the first year students at SMAN 10 Pekanbaru according to three raters is poor level.

b. The Students' Score on the Vocabulary Aspect

        The score of students' writing ability in general in terms of vocabulary aspect according to the three rater can be seen as followed:

Table 8.   The students' score on the vocabulary aspect

No	Level of ability	Range score	Rater 1		Rater 2		Rater 3		Based on three raters	
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Good to excellent	80-100	2	5.88	2	5.88	2	5.88	-	-
2	Average to good	60-79	9	26.47	7	20.59	7	20.59	9	26.47
3	Poor to average	50-59	18	52.94	19	55.88	19	55.88	14	41.18
4	Poor	0-49	5	14.71	6	17.65	6	17.65	11	32.35
			34	100	34	100	34	100	34	100

In table 8, it can be seen that based in rater 1, on grammar aspect, there are 2 student or 5.88% in good to excellent level; 9 students or 26.47% in average to good level; 18 students or 52.94% in poor to average level; 5 students or 14.716% in poor level. According to rater 2, there is 2 student or 5.88% in good to excellent level; 7 students or 20.59% in average to good level; 19 students or 55.88% in poor to average level; 6 students or 17.56% in poor level. According to rater 3, there are 2 students or 5.88% in good to excellent level; 7 students or 20.59% are in average to good level; 19 students or 55.88% are in poor to average level and 6 students or 17.56% are in poor level. While based on three raters, there is no student in good to excellent level; 9 students or 26.47 % are in average to good level; 14 students or 41.18% are in poor to average level and 11 students or 32.35% poor level. In conclusion, the students' writing ability in terms of vocabulary of the first year students at SMAN 10 Pekanbaru according to three raters is poor to average level.

c. The Students' Ability in Terms of Mechanic

        The score of students' writing ability in general in terms of mechanic aspect according to the three raters can be seen as followed :

Table 9. The Students' Score in Term of Mechanic

no	Level of ability	Range score	Rater 1		Rater 2		Rater 3		Based on three raters	
			F	%	F	%	F	%	f	%
1	Good to excellent	80-100	1	2.94	2	55.88	1	2.94	0	0
2	Average to good	60-79	8	23.53	9	26.47	9	26.47	7	20.59
3	Poor to average	50-59	19	55.88	16	47.06	18	52.94	20	58.82
4	Poor	0-49	6	17.65	7	20.59	6	17.65	7	20.59
			34	100	34	100	34	100	34	100

From table 9, we can see based on rater 1, on grammar aspect, there is 1 student or 2.94% in good to excellent level; 8 students or 23.53% in average to good level; 19 students or 55.88% in poor to average level; 6 students or 17.56% in poor level. Based on rater 2, there is 2 student or 5.88% in good to excellent level; 9 students or 26.47% in average to good level; 16 students or 47.06% in poor to average level; 7 students or 20.59% in poor level. Based on rater 3, there is 1 student or 2.94% in good to excellent level; 9 students or 26.47% are in average to good level; 18 students or 52.94% are in poor to average level and 17 students or 17.65% are in poor level. While based on three raters, there is no student in good to excellent level; 7 students or 20.59 % are in average to good level; 20 students or 58.82% are in poor to average level and 7 students or 20.59% are in poor level. In conclusion, the students' writing ability in terms of mechanic of the first year students at SMAN 10 Pekanbaru according to three raters is poor to average level.

d. **The Students' Ability in Term of Fluency**

The score of students' speaking ability in general in terms of fluency aspect according to the three rater can be seen as followed :

Table 10.The Students' Score in Term of Fluency

No	Level of ability	Range score	Rater 1		Rater 2		Rater 3		Based on three raters	
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Good to excellent	80-100	1	2.94	-	-	1	2.94	-	-
2	Average to good	60-79	8	23.53	11	32.35	15	14.71	7	20.59
3	Poor to average	50-59	12	35.29	11	32.35	16	47.06	11	32.35
4	Poor	0-49	13	38.24	12	35,29	12	35.29	16	47.06
			34	100	34	100	3412	100	34	100

Table 10 says based on rater 1, on fluency aspect, there are 1 student or 2.94% in good to excellent level; 8 students or 23.35% in average to good level; 12 students or 35.29% in poor to average level; 13 students or 38.24% in poor level. Based on rater 2, there is no student in good to excellent level; 11 students or 32.35% in average to good

level; 11 students or 32.35% in poor to average level; 12 students or 35.29% in poor level. Based on rater 3, there is 1 student or 2.94% in good to excellent level; 5 students or14.71% are in average to good level; 16 students or 47.06% are in poor to average level and 12 students or 35.29% are in poor level. Moreover based on three raters, there is no student in good to excellent level; 7 students or 20.59 % are in average to good level; 11 students or 32.35% are in poor to average level and 16 students or 47.06% are in poor level. In conclusion, the students' writing ability in terms of fluency of the first year students at SMAN 10 Pekanbaru according to three raters is poor level.

e. The Students' Ability in Terms of Organization

The score of students' speaking ability in general in terms of organization aspect according to the three raters can be seen as followed :

Table 11.   The Students' Score in Term of Organization

No	Level of ability	Range score	Rater 1		Rater 2		Rater 3		Based on three raters	
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Good to excellent	80-100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	Average to good	60-79	7	20.59	7	20.59	7	20.59	7	20.59
3	Poor to average	50-59	11	35.29	11	35.29	11	35.29	9	26.47
4	Poor	0-49	15	44.12	15	44.12	15	44.12	18	52.94
			34	100	34	100	34	100	34	100

From table 11, it can be seen that based in rater 1, on organization aspect, there is no in good to excellent level; 7 students or 20.59% in average to good level; 11 students or 35.29% in poor to average level; 15 students or 44.12% in poor level. Based on rater 2, there is no student in good to excellent level; 7 students or 20.59% in average to good level; 11 students or 35.29% in poor to average level; 15 students or 44.12% in poor level. Based on rater 3, there is no student in good to excellent level; 7 students or 20.59% are in average to good level; 11 students or 35.29% are in poor to average level and 15 students or 44.12% are in poor level. Moreover based on three raters, there is no student in good to excellent level; 7 students or 20.59 % are in average to good level; 9 students or 26.47% are in poor to average level and 18 students or 52.94% in poor level. In conclusion, the students' writing ability in terms of organization of the first year students at SMAN 10 Pekanbaru according to three raters is poor level.

The Result of Students' Writing Ability in writing Recount Text

The score of students' writing ability in general according to the three raters can be seen as followed:

Table 12.   The Students' Writing Ability in Writing Recount Text

No	Score	Level of ability	Frequency	Percentage
1	80 – 100	Good to excellent	4	11.76%
2	60 – 79	Average to good	11	32.35%
3	50 – 59	Poor to average	9	26.47%
4	0 – 49	Poor	10	29.41%
Total			34	100%

By looking at the table above we can see the students' writing ability score according to the three raters as follows: 4 students or 11.65% are in good to excellent category, 10 students or 32.35% are in average to good, 9 students or 26.47% are in poor to average category, and 10 students or 29.41%. It seems that some of the students reach average to good level.

Finally the writer calculates all the students' score which were obtained to find out the mean score of the test. The result of the computation of mean score shows that students' ability in writing recount text falls into 60.27. Based on the result, students' ability in writing recount text can be categorized as average to good.

DISCUSSIONS

As shown on the table, the researcher presents the score of the students' speaking ability by applying information gap activities technique to see the improvement ofstudent's speaking ability in five aspects of speaking on base score and score in each cycle. The improvement of students' speaking 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%	7.1%
60 - 79	Average to Good	3.5 %	96.4%	92.8%
50 – 59	Poor to Average	17.8%	3.5%	0%
0 - 49	Poor	78.5%	0%	0%

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the result of the research, some conclusions can be drawn in this chapter. The first year students' average writing score of SMAN 10 Pekanbaru according to three raters in terms of Grammar is 52.78 (Poor to average). In terms of vocabulary, the students' average score is 52.94 (Poor to average). In terms of mechanic, the students' average score is 52.12 (Poor to average). In terms of fluency, the students' average is 47.22 (Poor). In terms of organization the mean score is 44.12 (Poor).

From the five aspects of writing (grammar, vocabulary, mechanic, fluency, and organization), the students' score in terms of vocabulary is highest among the other aspect. The students' score of vocabulary aspect is 52.94. It means they still found

difficulty in vocabulary. The lowest among the other aspect is organization. The students' score in organization is 44.12. It means students found difficulty in organizing or progress the idea and the ability of the students in organization is poor.

In conclusion, the first year students' writing ability of SMAN 10 Pekanbaru is average to good level.

REFERENCES

Arikunto, S. P. (2006). *Dasar Dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan.* Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

B.Y, C. (2011). *Teaching English by Using Various Text Types.* Malang: State University of Malang.

Derewianka, B. (2001). *Exploring How Text Work.* Australia: National Library.

Gay, L. R., & Airasian, P. (2000). *Educational Research Competes for Analysis and Application, Sixth Edition.* New Jersey: Merral Publishing Company.

Gerot, L., & Wignel, P. (1995). *Making Sense of Functional Grammar.* Sidney: Antipodean Educational Enterprise.

Gibbons, P. (1993). *Learning to Learn in Second Language.* United States of America: Bookserve Pty Ltd.

Grace, E. (2005). *An Overview on Systematic Functional Grammar.* Semarang: Semarang University Press.

Hairston, M. (1986). *Contemporary Composition, short edition.* Boston: University of Texas at Austin.

Halliday, M. A., & Hasan, R. (1984). *Language Context and Text: Aspect of Language in Social-Semiotic Perspective.* Hongkong: Oxford University Press.

Haloho, R. B. (2011). *A Study on The Ability of the Second Year Students of SMAN 2 Tapung in Writing Report Text.* Pekanbaru: University of Riau.

Hammonds, J., Burns, A., Joice, H., Brosnan, D., & Gerot, L. (1992). *English for Social Purpose.* Sidney: Marquarie University.

Harris, P. D. (1974). *Testing English as A Second Languange.* Hill Publishing Company.

Hartono, R. (2005). *Genre of Text.* Semarang: Semarang University Press.

Hatch, E., & Farhady, H. (1982). *Research Design and Statistic for Applied Linguistic.* London: New Burry House Publisher, Inc.

Heaton, J. B. (1974). *Writing English Test.* London: Modern English Publication.

Helmi, F. (2012). *Improving Students' Skill in Writing Recount Text by Using a Personal Letter.* Semarang: Walisongo Islamic University.

Hornby, A. (1995). *Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary.* New York: Oxford
University Press,.

Hughes, A. (1993). *Teting for Language Teachers.* New York: Cambridge University
Press.

Jacobs, M. G. (2000). *English in Focus.* Singapore: Pearson Education Ptc. Ltd.

Langan, J. (2000). *College Academic Writing.* Singapore: the Mc Graw Company Inc.

Martinez, & Martine. (1986). *The Holt Work Book.* British: College Publishing.

Nunan, D. (1981). *Language Testing Methodology.* UK: Prentice Hail International.