

Improving Student's Writing Procedure Text through Student Facilitator and Explaining Learning Model

Hamriany¹, Nurhayati², Asriani Abbas³

¹²³Hasanuddin University, Indonesia

Abstract: In this research, the researcher tended to analyze the improving students writing procedure text by using student's facilitator and explaining learning model. Instrument of this research were questionnaires, observations and document. the data analysis was analyzed by using quantitatively and qualitatively. The results shows that the students' facilitator and explaining learning model can be seen that it can increase the students' productive skill especially in writing procedure text in learning and teaching process. The implications of research conducted by researchers related to the impact of research results on learning process. The development of an authentic as productive skill in based-learning can facilitate teacher performance in assessment to increase students' ability to understand the content read text.

Keywords: Procedure Text, Learning Model, Language Teaching

1. Introduction

Teachers must respond to the current multidimensional era by acting more creatively, productively, and innovatively. The most important aspect is the ability to solve various problems encountered by themselves and their learning participants (students) in their professional work. This is because the dynamics of education are becoming more complex, resulting in more challenges and problems that must be faced and resolved.

Various sources have provided a wealth of information and guidance regarding the best teacher or educator. Perfection in terms of ability, demeanor, method, and so on. According to Arends & Kilcher (2010), the ideal teacher must have extensive knowledge and insight, because how can maximum results in educating and teaching be achieved. A teacher should not force their students to learn, but should instead provide motivation or emotional stimulation. A teacher's role is crucial in encouraging his students to be active and creative. In addition, an ideal teacher is not only capable of instructing and inviting his students to participate in one area, but is also more complex in other positive areas. A teacher, for example, may try to develop students' cognitive aspects while also developing affective and psychomotor aspects, in order to produce higher-quality results.

Based on the concept of the ideal teacher, it is hoped that teachers will better understand their status and position as teachers, so that they will be better able to overcome the problems they and their students face. The most common and frequently discussed issue among teachers is the success of learning. Several factors indicate a problem with the success of this learning, including the fact that teachers have not been able to achieve minimum mastery standards, either partially or in groups, and students' motivation or interest in Indonesian is low, particularly in certain materials.

This is in line with Harmer (2004)'s assertion in his book *How to Teach Writing* that by selecting and employing a learning model appropriate to the characteristics of the subject matter being taught to students, the process and achievement of the expected goals will be successful. According to Patel & Praveen (2008), when a teacher succeeds in selecting and using the right learning model or in accordance with the learning needs of students in class, at least five things occur: (1) the learning process runs smoothly; (2) students easily understand learning material or content; (3) students are active in various learning situations; (4) the expected outcomes or learning outcomes are achieved; and (5) the emergence of good interest in learning from students.

The teacher has used various models, but the implementation does not meet the quality standards of the learning model that should be, for example, the learning steps are not provided, the model is not relevant to the subject matter, student learning characteristics, and learning activities. It is not surprising that the results index and student learning motivation are low, particularly in procedural text writing. Early student learning outcomes and motivation were measured, and the average learning mastery index and student cognitive learning motivation index were only 17.4% and 25.93%, respectively (preliminary documentation data). These findings demonstrate that student learning outcomes and motivation remain at or below the collective minimum standard of mastery. On other hand, it is necessary to make efforts to select and apply new models that are consistent with the subject matter characteristics, student learning characteristics, and learning activities characteristics, one of the learning models that is considered appropriate to apply.

This is something that many teachers overlook. The learning model is used without any prior analysis or learning of the problems and learning needs that underpin the model's selection. The sequence is what the teacher's understanding of the applied learning model itself is lacking. As a result, the learning model is used solely for formality purposes. This is what researchers discovered after conducting observations at SMP Negeri 7 Cenrana, Maros Regency, South Sulawesi Province.

The provided teaching and learning for the teachers and their students, they need to find the appropriate ways to make the learning process can be running well. However, finding out the best method in teaching and learning process can be categorized difficult things. Through in this research, it is expected that the teacher and students can produce learning and teaching method as a ideal media in improving students' writing procedure text. Moreover, this research result will provide the students improvement in making procedure text.

2. Research Methods

This research used a qualitative method with a CAR (Abbas et al., 2022; Yulianti et al., 2022). Classroom action research was used to measure the students' writing procedure text (Idris et al., 2020; Rochiati, 2005). This research took the population and sample VII B SMP Negeri 7 Cenrana, Maros Regency, South Sulawesi Province. The Subjects totaled 29 people with ranging of 20 women and 9 men. In this research, questionnaires, observations and document were used as instrument. Questionnaires was used to obtain data on student motivation. The questionnaire was developed by researchers with reference to the theory and indicators of learning motivation. Questionnaire using the Likert scale options. Questionnaires were given before and after the classroom conducted. Observations were made during the process of implementing the action. The things revealed during the observation are as follows: when the teacher begins to open the lesson, then presents the subject matter, the researcher observes student behavior. The last is document, it was used to intend as a step to obtain quantitative data. Documentation data can be in the form of learning support documents that were previously applied by subject teachers or in the form of ability report data obtained from student learning outcomes reports. The data analysis was categorized as quantitative and qualitative approach (Zena et al., 2022).

3. Findings and Discussion

A. Findings

The implementation research process is in two cycles, each cycle consisting of four stages, namely: 1) planning, 2) implementing actions, 3) observation and interpretation, and 4) analysis and reflection. Before the results of the research are presented, this chapter first describes the initial conditions (pre-action) of students.

Based on the data revealed, the researcher categorized the findings as follows Table 3.1.

Table 3.1 Comparison of Pre-action Results, Cycles I and II

Score	Action		Percentage		Status
	Post	Cycle I	Post	Cycle II	
0-24	-	-	-	-	Unpassed
25-44	4	-	13,79	-	Unpassed
46-64	12	11	41,38	17,24	Unpassed
65-84	12	15	41,38	48,28	Passed
85-100	1	3	3,45	34,48	Passed

In the actions, cycle I, and cycle II there were no students who scored 0-24. In the pre-action for the score range of 25-44, 4 people were still obtained, while in the first cycle there were none, as well as in the second cycle. For a score of 46-64, in the pre-action obtained 12 people and in the first cycle only 11 people while in the second cycle only 5 students. Score 65-84, in pre-action obtained 12 students while in the first cycle obtained 15 students and the second cycle 14 students. Furthermore, for a score of 85-100, in the pre-action there was only one person, while in cycle I there were three students and cycle II obtained 10 students. The lowest score in the pre-action was 40 while in the first cycle it was 50, and in the second cycle it was 60. The highest score in the pre-action was 85 while in the first cycle it was 90, as well as in the second cycle. The average score of this pre-action questionnaire was 61.72, with the percentage of student motivation being 44.83%. While in the first cycle is 68.45% with the percentage of student learning motivation is 62.07%. Whereas in cycle II, the average value was 80.17% with the percentage of student learning motivation being 82.75%.

Table 3.2 Comparison of Post-action Results and Cycle I and II

Score	Action		Percentage		Status
	Post	Cycle I	Post	Cycle II	
0-24	-	-	-	-	Unpassed
25-44	4	-	13,79	-	Unpassed
46-64	12	11	41,38	37,93	Unpassed
65-84	12	15	41,38	51,72	Passed
85-100	1	3	3,45	10,34	Passed

In the post-action for the range of values 25-44, 4 people were still obtained, while in cycle I there were none. For scores of 46-64, 12 people were obtained in post-action and in cycle I only 11 people. Value 65-84, in the post-action obtained 12 students while in cycle I obtained 15 students. Furthermore, for grades 85-100, there was only one person in the post-action, while in cycle I there were three students. the lowest score in the post-action was 40 while in the first cycle it was 50. The highest score in the post-action was 85 while in the first cycle it was 90. The average score in this learning was 61.72, with a completeness percentage of 44.83%. Whereas in cycle I it was 68.45% with a passing percentage of 62.07%.

B. Discussion

This research was conducted at SMP Negeri 7 Cenrana, Maros Regency, South Sulawesi Province. The subjects of this study were 29 grade VII students of SMP Negeri 7 Cenrana. This study aimed to improve students' ability to understand the subject matter by utilizing the Student Facilitator and Explaining Model. The type of research used is classroom action research designed with two cycles. The second cycle consists of four processes, namely planning, action implementation, observation and interpretation, analysis and reflection.

The results of the study proved that there was a significant increase in the pre-action results, cycle I and cycle II. This increase is not only in terms of student learning achievement in this case the ability and creativity of students, but also the attitude of students in the learning process and the method or learning method applied by the teacher who is getting better.

As for the acquisition of pre-action skills scores, 16 students were still incomplete, still obtaining a score of less than 65. There were 4 students who received a score of 40, six students also received a value of 50, six students received a value of 60. Furthermore, there were four students who scored 65 and there were three students who scored 75. Furthermore, five students scored 80 and one student scored 85. There were 13 students who completed learning in the initial survey. The detailed scores of students who completed were four students who scored 65, three students scored 75, and five students scored 80 and one student scored 85. Thus, the lowest score in this pre-action learning was 40 for four students. The highest learning value is 85 which was achieved by one student. The average score in this pre-action learning was 61.72, with the proportion of completeness being 44.83%.

The scores obtained by students by applying the Student Facilitator and Explaining Mode in cycle II were as follows: five students were declared disqualified by obtaining a score of 60. Meanwhile, for a value of 65 and above, 24 students were obtained. Seven students got a score of 70, four students got a score of 75, three got a score of 80, four students got a score of 85 and six students got a score of 90. The lowest score in cycle II was 65 while the highest score was 90. The average score -the average in cycle II was 80.17% with a passing percentage of 82.75%. The results in cycle II showed a better difference than the results in the pre-action test and cycle I.

Based on the data findings above, it can be concluded that the researcher found out the results of the cycle II is higher than cycle I. it means that the student facilitator and explaining learning model who implemented by the teacher can be categorized successful. It is in line with Elihami et al., (2021), they mentioned that Students become fond of learning and collaboration between students is also formed in group activities so as to foster a positive attitude towards students in their social interactions. In addition, Putra et al., (2021) stated that SFAE learning has an effect on increasing student representative abilities, so it is hoped that educational institutions can use this learning in the learning process. It means that the learning model can be given an effect for the students to achieve the learning materials in learning and teaching process (Oktaviani, 2019; Setiawan, 2017; Harahap, 2017). However, Sukma et al., (2022) found that Classroom learning becomes more efficient and interesting because the available reading texts are close student environment. It means that teaching materials local wisdom can add to students' insight into the diversity of their regions so that students' curiosity will increase. On other hand, Yusnan et al., (2022) mentioned that the two cycles used in this research shows that the score of cycle I is lower that cycle II. It means that the learning activity improved student performance.

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of this study it can be concluded that Student Facilitator and Explaining learning model affects the ability of students' comprehensive representations. It can improve students' representation ability is better than conventional learning models. The high, medium, and low social skills affect the improvement of students' representation skills. Productive representation skills of students with high social are better than

students with moderate and low social Skills. In addition, there is no interaction between the learning model and the social skills category on the improvement of students' representation ability.

5. References

1. Abbas, Asriani, Kaharuddin, Hasyim, Muhammad. 2022. The Organization of Personal Pronouns in Sentence Structure Construction of Makassarese Language. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 13, (1), pp. 161-171.
2. Arends, R. & Kilcher, A. 2010. *Teaching for Student Learning*. New York: Routledge.
3. Elihami, E., Musdalifah, M., & Hasan, H. 2021. Increasing the Higher of Think through Moodle Application: The Effects of Learning Procees in the Higher Education System. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 1783 (1), 012054.
4. Harahap, D. A. 2017. *The Effect of Background Knowledge on The Students' Achievement in Speaking Through Student Facilitator and Explaining Method* (Doctoral dissertation).
5. Idris, Andi, Muhammad, Syafri, Juddah, Abu, Bakar, Nurhamdah. 2020. Comparing between Total Physical Response and Silent Way Method to Develop Students' Speaking Ability. *LETS: Journal of Linguistics and English Teaching Studies*, 1(2), 107-114.
6. Ilma Sarah Zena, Ikhwan M. Said, Asriani Abbas. 2022. Analysis of Neologism Process in Menfess of @convomf Autobase Account on Twitter. *Asian. Jour. Social. Scie. Mgmt. Tech*, 4(6): 214-220.
7. Oktaviani, R. 2019. *The Effect of Student Facilitator and Explaining Learning Model Assisted by Audio Visual Media on the Students' Speaking Achievement* (Doctoral dissertation).
8. Patel, M. F. & Praveen M. J. 2008. *English Language Teaching*. Bangalore: Sunrise Publishers and Distributors.
9. Putra, F. G., Meriyati, V I Safitri, W Nursa'idah, D. Putri, N Mistasari, M Isnaini, Santi Widyawati and Rizki Wahyu Yunian Putra. 2021. The influence of student facilitator and explaining (SFAE) learning model viewed from social skills in improving students' mathematical representation ability. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 1796 (1), 012074).
10. Rochiati, W. 2005. *Metode penelitian tindakan kelas*. Remaja Rosdakarya.
11. Setiawan, A. 2017. *The Collaboration of Spontaneous Group Discussion (SGD) and Student Facilitator and Explaining (SFE) to Enhance Students' Conversation Ability* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Muhammadiyah Semarang).
12. Sukma, Asriani Abbas, Nurhayati, Kaharuddin, & Asma Gheisari. 2022. Development of Authentic Assessment in Local Wisdom-Based Reading Learning. *Education Research International*, 1(1), 1-11.
13. Yulianti, Sri, Arafah, Burhanuddin, Rofikah, Ummu, Idris, Andi, Muhammad, Syafri, Samsur, Nurfaizah, & Arafah, Azhariah, Nur, Burhanuddin. 2022. Conversational Implicatures on Saturday Night Live Talk Show. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 13(1), 189-197.
14. Yusnan, M., Karim, Iye, R., Abbas, A., & Sumiaty. 2022. Demonstration Methods to Improve Intensive Reading Skills in 3rd-Grade Students. *International Journal of Learning Reformation in Elementary Education*, 1(02), 61-69.

INFO

Corresponding Author: **Hamriany, Hasanuddin University, Indonesia.**

How to cite this article: **Hamriany, Nurhayati, Asriani Abbas, Improving Student's Writing Procedure Text through Student Facilitator and Explaining Learning Model, Asian. Jour. Social. Scie. Mgmt. Tech.2022; 5(1): 99-103.**