



Teaching the First Grade Cadet's Writing of MTPD by Using Reporting Activities at the Inland Water and Ferries Transport Polytechnic of Palembang

Hari Arkani¹, Oktrianti Diani¹, Desti Yuvita Sari¹, Aulia Ika Atika¹, Sepriadi Sepriadi²

¹Inland Water and Ferries Transport Polytechnic of Palembang, Palembang, Indonesia

²Indonesia Open University, Jakarta, Indonesia

Email: hariarkani@gmail.com

Abstract. The title of this thesis is “*Teaching the First Grade Cadets’ Writing of MTPD Through Reporting Activities at the Inland Water and Ferries Transport Polytechnic of Palembang.*” The main research question was: “Is teaching the first grade cadets’ writing of MTPD through reporting activities effective at the Inland Water and Ferries Transport Polytechnic of Palembang?”

This study applied a pre-experimental design. The population consisted of first grade cadets at the institution, with a sample of 40 cadets selected from a total of 65. Data collection was done through a written test using reporting activities. The data were analyzed using the results of pre-tests and post-tests, applying the matched t-test formula.

The average score was 56.3 on the pre-test and 75.4 on the post-test. The t-test findings, which showed that the t-obtained value (13.356) was higher than the t-table value (1.684), proved the method's efficacy. Consequently, the null hypothesis (Ho) was disproved and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) accepted. This suggests that using reporting exercises to teach first-grade cadets how to write MTPD was successful.

Keywords: *First Grade Cadet, Writing, Reporting Activities*

1 BACKGROUND

Based on the principles of the Merdeka Curriculum, English is recognized as a vital tool for both oral and written communication. Communication encompasses the understanding and expression of information, thoughts, feelings, as well as the advancement of knowledge, technology, and culture. Communication skills entail the

ability to comprehend and produce both oral and written texts, which are essential in mastering the four language skills: reading, speaking, listening, and writing. The objective of English language education in Indonesia under the Merdeka Curriculum is to foster proficiency in all four language skills. It is acknowledged that each skill is interconnected, whereby practicing one skill facilitates the development of others. However, it is important to note that proficiency in one skill does not guarantee mastery in others. For instance, while writing practice contributes to language development, it is not interchangeable with listening, reading, or speaking practice. The teaching of English writing skills should be approached with creativity to align with the communicative approach-based curriculum. This entails designing innovative teaching methods and activities that promote active engagement and effective communication in written English.

To address the difficulties students face in developing ideas and organizing their writing, the writer intends to conduct experimental research using reporting activities as a writing strategy. According to Rober (1994), the primary purpose of reporting activities for students, parents, and educational institutions is to support children's learning. This implies that reporting activities can serve as an effective tool in helping students learn and improve their language skills.

2 METHOD

Method is a way of doing something. In this proposal, the writer used the pre-experimental method. Frankel and Wallen (1990:236) say that “pre-experimental design, a single group is measured observed both before and after exposure to treatment”.

This design has the following diagram:

$$O_1 X O_2$$

Where:

O_1 = Pre-test

X = Treatment

O_2 = Post-test

In doing this investigation, the writer will take some steps. They are as follows:

1. Examining relevant literature
2. Providing a definition of the issue
3. drafting the research design and creating an experimental strategy;
4. Carrying out the experiment
5. Gathering and evaluating the data
6. Coming to a conclusion, making recommendations, and summarizing the findings.

2.1 Technique for Collecting Data

To evaluate the cadets' essays, the writer used a writing scoring scale adapted from Weigle (2002). This rubric assesses five key aspects of writing: content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. In this study, two raters were involved in analyzing the data—one was a lecturer from the campus, and the other was the writer. Each cadet received individual scores for each aspect of writing, with overall scores ranging from 34 to 100. These scores were then converted using a grading system, as outlined in Table 1.

- 86-100 : Excellent
- 71-85 : Good
- 56-70 : Average
- 41-55 : Poor
- <40 : Failed (Arikunto, 1996: 27)

TABLE 1
THE WRITING SCORING SCALE

Elements	Score	Criteria
Content	30-27	Excellent to Very Good substantial information gained during thesis preparation that is pertinent to the given issue
	26-22	Good to Average: somewhat broad scope, limited

	21-17 16-13	thesis development, considerable subject knowledge, and a thesis that is largely pertinent to the issue but lacking in detail Fair to Poor: insufficient topic growth, minimal substance, and limited subject knowledge Very Poor: lacks subject expertise and is objective
Organization	20-18 17-14 13-10 9-7	Excellent to Very Good: coherent, logically sequenced, concise, well-organized, ideas that are well articulated and supported, and fluid expression Good to Average: a little choppy, not well structured, but the major ideas are clear, with little evidence and logical but incomplete sequencing. Fair to Poor lacks logical progression and sequencing, ideas are disjointed or unclear, and Very Poor: lacks organization, communication, or sufficient evaluation
Vocabulary	20- 18 17-14 13-10 9-7	Excellent to Very Good: appropriate register, word form mastery, sophisticated range, and efficient word/idiom selection and usage Good to Average: sufficient range, sporadic mistakes in word or idiom form, selection, but meaning is unobscured Fair to Poor: restricted vocabulary, frequent mistakes in word or idiom choice, usage, and meaning that is unclear or muddled Very Poor: basically a translation with insufficient understanding of English idioms, vocabulary, and word structure, or insufficient to assess
Language Use	25- 22 21- 18 17-11	Excellent to Very Good: well-executed complicated structures, few mistakes in number, tense, agreement, word order/function, articles, pronouns, and prepositions Good to Average: many errors in agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, and prepositions, but meaning is rarely muddled; simple but effective constructions; slight issues in complicated constructs Fair to Poor: significant issues with simple or com-

	10- 5	plex constructions, frequent mistakes with negation, agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions and/or fragments, run-ons, deletions, and unclear or muddled meaning Very Poor: almost no command of sentence structure principles, rife with mistakes, ineffective at communicating, or insufficient to assess
Mechanics	5	Excellent to Very Good: show command of conventions, with few spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and paragraphing mistakes
	4	Good to Average: sporadic spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and paragraphing mistakes that do not obscure the meaning
	3	Fair to Poor: capitalization, punctuation, spelling, and paragraphing mistakes are common, but the meaning is clear.
	2	Very Poor: lack of convention knowledge, primarily due to spelling, grammar, capitalization, paragraphing, handwriting that is unreadable, or insufficient to assess

The writer would complete the next step in order to analyze the data that was collected from the test. The test results were first categorized by the author into pre-test and post-test categories. The author would next apply the matching t-test. To determine how well the students could compose narrative paragraphs, the author employed a paired t-test. The following is the method the author employed to analyze the data, which matches the t-test formula:

$$T = \frac{\overline{X_1} - \overline{X_2}}{\overline{SD}}$$

Where:

T : the t-obtained

$\overline{SD}$: Standard Error of Differences between Two Means.

$\overline{X_1}$: The Students' Average score in the Post-test.

$\overline{X_2}$: The Students Average score in the Pre-test

The formula standard deviation (SD) Based on Farhady. 1982:116

$$\overline{SD} = \frac{SD}{\sqrt{n}}$$

Where:

SD : Standard Deviation of the Differences

n : Number of pairs

D : The difference between the pre-test and post-test

Where the formula of SD is

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{\sum D^2 - \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)(\sum D)^2}{n - 1}}$$

3 RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The writer discovered that the matching t-test result was 13.356 based on the pre-test and posttest results. The critical value from the table was 1.684 with degrees of freedom (df) = 40 and a significance level of 0.05. The alternative hypothesis was accepted and the null hypothesis was rejected since the t-obtained value was greater than the t-table value. This demonstrates that teaching writing to first-grade MTPD students at the Inland Water and Ferries Transport Polytechnic of Palembang through reporting activities was successful. Below is a more thorough description of the results.

3.1 The average scores of students’ pretest

Before introducing the reporting activities, a pretest was administered to assess the students' initial ability in writing a narrative paragraph. In this pretest, students were asked to write a narrative paragraph in their own style. From the results, it became evident that most students had not yet mastered how to write or structure a proper composition. The data were assessed by two raters—Judge 1, a campus lecturer, and Judge 2, the writer—using criteria that included content, organization, vocabu-

lary, language use, and mechanics. After scoring and ranking, the writer found that the average pretest score was 56.3, and the reliability of the pretest was calculated at 0.75. This average was obtained by dividing the total pretest score (2254) by the number of students (40). The highest individual score was 91, achieved by one student, while the lowest score was 37.5, also earned by one student.

3.2 The average scores of students' posttest

Following the administration of the pretest and evaluation of the students' writing abilities, the author gave each student specific attention through focused educational exercises. This entailed employing reporting exercises as an educational strategy to teach writing. Following the prescribed number of therapy sessions, a posttest was administered to assess the students' writing development, specifically in the area of crafting narrative paragraphs. Using the reporting exercise, students were required to compose a story on the subject of "My Daily Activities" for the posttest. approach. Two raters, Judge 1 (a college professor) and Judge 2 (the writer), evaluated the responses on five criteria: organization, vocabulary, language use, mechanics, and topic. The reliability score was 0.8 and the average posttest score was 75.4 after the results were ranked. By dividing the overall posttest score (3017) by the total number of students (40), this average was determined. One student had the maximum score of 95.5, while another student received the lowest score of 60.5.

3.3 Analysis of the Research

Based on the analysis of the students' pretest and posttest scores, and the outcomes of the experiment, the writer concluded that implementing reporting activities was an effective method for teaching paragraph writing to first grade MTPD cadets at the Inland Water and Ferries Transport Polytechnic of Palembang. During the treatment, the writer guided students by first explaining the concept of a narrative paragraph, reviewing the use of the simple past tense, and discussing the basic elements of a narrative. Students were then instructed to create a reporting activity table before

beginning their writing. Once they understood the process, the students were asked to write about their activities by hand.

The following three elements contributed to the student's posttest results being higher than their pretest scores:

1. Students were assisted in expressing their thoughts or narrating a connected tale in the form of a narrative paragraph through reporting activities.
2. Students have the opportunity to practice writing narrative paragraphs through reporting activities.
3. By providing the key words for the reporting tasks, the students were able to construct sentences using the right phrases.

4 CONCLUSION

The writer concluded that the use of reporting activities greatly supported students in learning and practicing narrative paragraph writing. This method proved to be an effective approach to teaching narrative writing. It was evident that students who were introduced to reporting activities before engaging in the main writing tasks showed greater improvement. In other words, reporting activities enhanced students' writing abilities. Therefore, it can be concluded that teaching MTPD writing to first grade cadets at the Inland Water and Ferries Transport Polytechnic of Palembang through reporting activities is an effective strategy.

References

1. Arikunto, Suharsimi. 2006. *Prosedur Penelitian*. Jakarta: Rinaka Cipta.
2. Fraenkle, Jack R, and Norman E. Wallen. 1990. *How to Design and Evaluate Research*. United States of America: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
4. Vallete, Rebeca M. 1987. *Modern Language Tests: A Hand Book* 2nd Ed. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc.

5. Weigle, C. Sara. 2002. *Assessing Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

