# **EDUVELOP**

# Journal of English Education and Development

Volume 1, No. 2, March 2018

ISSN 2597-713X (print) ISSN 2597-7148 (online)

# Using Chronological Order Method to Improve Writing Ability of the Third Year Students of SMA Negeri I Pangsid Kabupaten Sidenreng Rappang

#### **RONI**

### Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Kesehatan Muhammadiyah Sidrap

Address. Jl. Syarif Al Qadri., Pangkajene Sidrap Regency,
South Sulawesi,Indonesia
Telp. +6282333555989 E-mail: sarullah.roni@yahoo.com

**Abstract:** The objective of the research was to find out whether or not using chronological order was able to improve writing ability of the students of SMA Negeri 1 Pangkajene Sidrap. This study employed pre-experiment method, using the third year students of SMA Negeri 1 Pangsid kabupaten Sidenreng Rappang in Academic year 2011/2012. Total number of population was 192 students on six classes one of them were taken as sample by using cluster random sampling technique; class IPA 1 consisting 32 students. The instrument used in this research was to chronological order. The research used an experimental design one class was given pre-test, treatment and post-test design. The population was the third students of SMA Negeri 1 Pangsid kabupaten Sidenreng Rappang in academic year 2011/2012. The sample of this research was third year of SMA Negeri 1 Pangsid Kabupaten Sidenreng Rappang there were 32 students. The technique of sampling was cluster random sampling, and the data was analyzed into percentage, mean score analyzes and the of the research shows that teaching writing by using chronological order can increase the writing ability of the third year students of SMA Negeri 1 Pangsid Kabupaten Sidenreng Rappang in which the result of t-test ( 5.743) is higher than t-table (2.042) with df( N-1) = 32-1=31 in the level of significance (0.05) = 2.042. It means that using chronological order method in teaching writing is able to improve writing ability of the third year students of SMA Negeri 1 Pangsid Kabupaten Sidenreng Rappang.

Keyword: Teaching Writing, Chronological Order, Writing performance

#### 1. Introduction

67

**EDUVELOP** 

Vol. 1 No. 2 March 2018

Journal of English Education and Development Universitas Sulawesi Barat English become important tools in the word. The evidence is that in every part of international relationship, it is the only one language which is used to the delegation all over the word. Moreover, those we could not communicate in English will get behind or out of date country or person. So by being able to used English, we can easily associate with foreigners, and it will be easy to build friendship among societies of various nations. In our country, English has been thought since elementary school. Event it has become one of the subjects that is examined to the students in national examination since junior high school. So, it is plays important role to decide whether the students pass or fail in examination. Moreover, those who want to get post graduate education should get the maximum TOEFL score, So that English as a very important subject for the students to develop and the students are expected to have good ability in English. In learning foreign language especially English, there are four language skill which should be mastered by the students. They listening, reading. speaking and writingpractice. A few adjustments will be added during the exercise as needed, and a mistake response will be used.

Some students, particularly those who have been brought up in teacher-based learning environments have difficulty with the after math of making mistakes (Brown, 1994) and are therefore reluctant to do the exercise for fear or failure. To eliminate the focus on the error, to maintain the rhythm of the exercise, and to keep the students engaged in the activity, it can be helpful to have a specific action that is done by all students in the event a mistake is made. For example, the teacher teaches the entire group of students an "error", "activity" such as turning around and clapping three times before beginning the exercise again or putting hands out, heads down and calling out a nonsense syllable such as "moo" can create this change of focus.

Writing is one of the four skills that must be mastered because it is way to communicate one another, although it is form writing. Writing is ability to express idea, feeling and experience, but most student find some difficult in writing form. An anonymous stated that the one of the biggest problem in students writing is that students writers often fail to prove their points. They fail because they do not support their points with concrete detail. Writing chronological order that students can improve their writing. Some roles need attention as grammatical sentence, punctuation, and mechanic. We often make mistakes in writing. They occurs because there are many kinds of writing, writing a letter that is referent from writing a composition; they have roles that are different from each other, letter composition are the park of writing. Writing is very exciting with writing we can enjoy some story book, newspaper, magazine, on still other. Although some techniques and approaches have been applied in teaching writing. The using of chronological order method as a prewriting technique is never used by teacher. Therefore. the researcher

68

introduces chronological order as one method in teaching writing. The researcher assumes that teaching writing trough chronological order method is good to improve writing ability of the students.

#### 2. Review Of Related Literature

Awaluddin in his research of the students SMP Negeri 1 Duampanua Kabupaten Pinrang found that using spider web technique able to improve writing ability. It was proved by improvement of the students mean score were the mean score in pre-test is 46,34 while the post-test score is 79,4.

Syawal in his research of students Madrasah Aliyah Negeri (MAN) 1 Baraka found that using cronological order method as a source material in teaching writing can stimulate the students to do writing well.

Syahril in his research of SMP N 9 Parepare found that the using unforgettable experiences motivated the students to write stories in writing form. When they tell their unforgettable story through time of accordance, they will meet emotional, cognitive and psychological demands

# 3. Writing Concept

Writing is one the four skills in language activity. With writing we can express our opinion or our feeling. There are some definitions of writing mentioned by some experts:

a. Byrne stated that writing is clearly much more than the production of

- graphic symbol as speech is more than the production of sound.
- b. Henry Guntur, writing is a language skills who use for communications indirect, and is not face to face with people another.

According an Hogue, good writing more than just using correct grammar. It is also means thinking, planning, checking, and revising. From the definition above, we can say that writing is the production of graphic symbols that have to be arranged according to the certain compensation, ideas, feeling and opinions to be read not only by the writer but also by another.

## A. Writing process

Pre-writing. Writing, particularly academic writing, it is no easy. It takes study and practice to developed this skill. For both native speaker and new leaner of English, it is in fortune to note that writing is a process, not a "produce" this means that piece of writing, weather it is compotation for your English class or a Hemingway short story, is never complete; the is, it is ways possible to review and revise, and review and revise again.

In the palling stage, your organized the ideas you generated brainstorming. The most efficient way to do this is to make and outline.

Writing and revising draftt. This stage in the writing process after brainstorming and outline, this to write and revise several

69

drags until you have produced a final copy to hand in.

## **B.** The Component of Writing

There are theree significance component of writing, namely content, organization, vocabulary, language, use and mechanics.

- Content. There are four things that can be measured in connecting with content, the composition should contain one central purpose only, should have unity, and community, and should be adequately developed.
- 2) Organization. The purpose of organizing material and writing evolves coherence. Order of important, general of specific to general, chronological order and special order of pattern, When writing, the learner should arrange the writing chronologically. They should present their ideas based on the order of which happened from the beginning to the end.
- 3) Vocabulary. The effective used of word will always result good writing both specific and technical writing, the dictionary is very considerable. Vocabulary IS one component of writing. To express ideas we always deal with vocabulary.
- 4) Chronological order Concept. Chronological order is one of the easiest methods of organization to master writing. Chronological order, therefore, is a way of organizing the ideas in a paragraph. The objective of generalization is learners better remember conclusion about form and

function, they make by themselves; and the objective of the application is to use or apply a structure item learned in the previous stage to communicate information or massages. Chronological paragraph organized order in chronologically, events and details are arranged in the order in which they occurred, usually moving from the first and earliest to the last or latest. Not paragraph arranged chronologically tell stories. Some give directions or explained a process; others summarize historical events, and still other report on the steps or action taken by an individual or organization.

In learning and teaching process, teacher must master some certain techniques. A variety of techniques will at least partially ensure that a maximum of students will be "reach", The techniques also determine when the process of transferring knowledge is effective and efficient or not. The technique, which will be used, must be suitable with the material will be taught in order to get good result.

In this research the writer used the chronological order method in teaching English structure. Chronological order is used for something as simple as a recipe and for something as complex as a history book. In academic writing, chronological order has many uses. One of the primary ways you might use it is to write a historical narrative about the subject of a term paper. For example, you might review the history of labor unions before you discuss the current situation.

70

This step is the specialization of this teaching method. For the language, which has just been taught, will be used soon as a tool of communication for giving and taking information or message among the students in the classroom. However, chronological order is not just used for historical narratives; it is also used in business, science, and engineering to explain processes and procedure. For example, chronological order would be used to explain how to make a cake. Such paragraphs are called "how to" or "process" paragraphs.

#### 4. Method

This chapter covers the deascription of the method, variables, and the operational definition of items, population, sample and technique of sampling, instrument of the research, data collecting procedure and technique of data analysis.

In this research, the researcher applied pre experiment method by using one class pretest and post-test. The design is presented as follows:

$$E = 0_1 \quad X \quad 0_2$$

Where:

E = Experimental Class

 $O_1$ = The result of the students pre- test

X = The treatment by using Chronological order method

 $O_2$ = The result of the students post- test

There are two variables involved in this research namely independent variable and dependent variable. Independent variable is teaching writing through chronological order and dependent variable is the student writing ability of the eleventh year students of SMA Negeri 1 Pangsid Kabupaten Sidenreng Rappang.

### Operational Definition of Variable

Chronological order is one of the easiest methods of organization to master writing. Chronological order, therefore, is a way of organizing the ideas in a paragraph. The objective of generalization is learners better remember conclusion about form and function, they make by themselves; and the objective of the application is to use or apply a structure item learned in the previous stage to communicate information or massages. And the researcher used cluster random sampling technique to take the sample of the research from the number of population; the researcher took Class IPA 1 as a sample in this research

# 5. Procedure of Collecting Data

The procedure in collecting data was divided in to three stages they are:

- a. Pre Test. Before doing treatment, the researcher administered a pre-test by writing and assay.
- b. Treatment. The treatment would be conducted four times in this research. In this treatment, the researcher would apply many techniques in delivering material such as game, stimulating of writing to in teaching the students. The procedure is giving prewriting activities in form chronological

**EDUVELOP** 

71

Journal of English Education and Development Universitas Sulawesi Barat

Vol. 1 No. 2 March 2018

order of the narration. After that the researcher would apply the second step that is the main activities by explaining the chronological order and then the researcher gave them material of writing. Time allocation for each meeting is 2 x 45 minutes. That is being played through chronological order. The last steps would be the post-writing activities by giving review and feed beck to the students.

3. Post Test. This activity intended to find the ability of the students in writing after giving treatment, and the writing achievement in learning process of the students.

# 6. Technique of Data Analysis

a. Scoring the students answer pre-tests and post-tests. The students score are obtained by dividing the correct answer. with the total score maximum of test and multiplying them with a hundred per cent (100%)

$$= \frac{\text{Students correct answer}}{\text{score maximum}} X100\%$$

### b. Writing Scoring

No.	Classification	Score
1.	Very good	86 – 100
2.	Good	71 – 85
3.	Fair	56 – 70
4.	Poor	41 – 55
5.	Very Poor	≤ 40

Scoring each of the five writing components using the following scoring system

Classif ication	Score level	Criteria
-----------------	-------------	----------

So-27 Excellent to very good: knowledge, substantive through development of topic, relevant to assigned topic.  Good to average: some knowledge of subject, adequate range, limited development of topic, most relevant to topic, but lacks detail. Fair to poor: limited knowledge of subject, little substance, inadequate development of topic. Very poor: doesn't show knowledge of subject, non-substantive, not pertinent, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: fluent expression, ideas clearly stated/supported, succinct, well organized, logical sequencing, cohesive.  Good to average: somewhat choppy.  13-10 Loosely organized but main ideas stand out. Limited support, logical but incomplete sequencing. Fair to poor: non fluent, ideas confused or disconnected, lacks logical sequencing and development.  Very poor: doesn't communicate, not organized, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: sophisticated range, effective word/idiom  17-14 choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register.  Good to average: defective word/idiom form, choice, usage, meaning			
through development of topic, relevant to assigned topic. Good to average: some knowledge of subject, adequate range, limited development of topic, most relevant to topic, but lacks detail. Fair to poor: limited knowledge of subject, little substance, inadequate development of topic. Very poor: doesn't show knowledge of subject, non-substantive, not pertinent, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: fluent expression, ideas clearly stated/supported, succinct, well organized, logical sequencing, cohesive. Good to average: somewhat choppy. 13-10 Loosely organized but main ideas stand out. Limited support, logical but incomplete sequencing. Fair to poor: non fluent, ideas confused or disconnected, lacks logical sequencing and development. Very poor: doesn't communicate, not organized, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: sophisticated range, effective word/idiom choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register. Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,		30-27	Excellent to very good:
through development of topic, relevant to assigned topic. Good to average: some knowledge of subject, adequate range, limited development of topic, most relevant to topic, but lacks detail. Fair to poor: limited knowledge of subject, little substance, inadequate development of topic. Very poor: doesn't show knowledge of subject, non-substantive, not pertinent, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: fluent expression, ideas clearly stated/supported, succinct, well organized, logical sequencing, cohesive. Good to average: somewhat choppy. 13-10 Loosely organized but main ideas stand out. Limited support, logical but incomplete sequencing. Fair to poor: non fluent, ideas confused or disconnected, lacks logical sequencing and development. Very poor: doesn't communicate, not organized, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: sophisticated range, effective word/idiom choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register. Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,			knowledge substantive
topic, relevant to assigned topic. Good to average: some knowledge of subject, adequate range, limited development of topic, most relevant to topic, but lacks detail. Fair to poor: limited knowledge of subject, little substance, inadequate development of topic. Very poor: doesn't show knowledge of subject, non-substantive, not pertinent, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18			_
assigned topic. Good to average: some knowledge of subject, adequate range, limited development of topic, most relevant to topic, but lacks detail. Fair to poor: limited knowledge of subject, little substance, inadequate development of topic. Very poor: doesn't show knowledge of subject, non-substantive, not pertinent, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18			
Good to average: some knowledge of subject, adequate range, limited development of topic, most relevant to topic, but lacks detail.  Fair to poor: limited knowledge of subject, little substance, inadequate development of topic.  Very poor: doesn't show knowledge of subject, non-substantive, not pertinent, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18		26-22	topic, relevant to
Conte nt			assigned topic.
Conte nt			Good to average: some
21-17 adequate range, limited development of topic, most relevant to topic, but lacks detail. Fair to poor: limited knowledge of subject, little substance, inadequate development of topic. Very poor: doesn't show knowledge of subject, non-substantive, not pertinent, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: fluent expression, ideas clearly stated/supported, succinct, well organized, logical sequencing, cohesive.  Good to average: somewhat choppy.  13-10 Loosely organized but main ideas stand out. Limited support, logical sequencing. Fair to poor: non fluent, ideas confused or disconnected, lacks logical sequencing and development.  Very poor: doesn't communicate, not organized, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: sophisticated range, effective word/idiom  17-14 choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register.  Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,			_
Conte nt  Conte		01 17	
Conte nt    16-13   most relevant to topic, but lacks detail.   Fair to poor: limited knowledge of subject, little substance, inadequate development of topic.   Very poor: doesn't show knowledge of subject, non-substantive, not pertinent, or not enough to evaluate.		21-17	
Conte nt    16-13   but lacks detail.   Fair to poor: limited   knowledge of   subject, little   substance,   inadequate   development   of topic.   Very poor: doesn't show   knowledge of subject,   non-substantive,   not   pertinent,   or not enough   to evaluate.			
Conte nt  Fair to poor: limited knowledge of subject, little substance, inadequate development of topic.  Very poor: doesn't show knowledge of subject, non-substantive, not pertinent, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: fluent expression, ideas clearly stated/supported, succinct, well organized, logical sequencing, cohesive.  Good to average: somewhat choppy.  13-10 Loosely organized but main ideas stand out. Limited support, logical but incomplete sequencing.  Fair to poor: non fluent, ideas confused or disconnected, lacks logical sequencing and development.  Very poor: doesn't communicate, not organized, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: sophisticated range, effective word/idiom  17-14 choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register.  Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,			most relevant to topic,
Conte nt limited knowledge of subject, little substance, inadequate development of topic.  Very poor: doesn't show knowledge of subject, non-substantive, not pertinent, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: fluent expression, ideas clearly stated/supported, succinct, well organized, logical sequencing, cohesive.  Good to average: somewhat choppy.  13-10 Loosely organized but main ideas stand out. Limited support, logical but incomplete sequencing.  Fair to poor: non fluent, ideas confused or disconnected, lacks logical sequencing and development.  Very poor: doesn't communicate, not organized, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: sophisticated range, effective word/idiom  17-14 choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register.  Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,		16-13	but lacks detail.
Conte nt limited knowledge of subject, little substance, inadequate development of topic.  Very poor: doesn't show knowledge of subject, non-substantive, not pertinent, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: fluent expression, ideas clearly stated/supported, succinct, well organized, logical sequencing, cohesive.  Good to average: somewhat choppy.  13-10 Loosely organized but main ideas stand out. Limited support, logical but incomplete sequencing.  Fair to poor: non fluent, ideas confused or disconnected, lacks logical sequencing and development.  Very poor: doesn't communicate, not organized, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: sophisticated range, effective word/idiom  17-14 choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register.  Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,			Fair to poor:
ht knowledge of subject, little substance, inadequate development of topic.  Very poor: doesn't show knowledge of subject, non-substantive, not pertinent, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: fluent expression, ideas clearly stated/supported, succinct, well organized, logical sequencing, cohesive.  Good to average: somewhat choppy.  Loosely organized but main ideas stand out. Limited support, logical but incomplete sequencing.  Fair to poor: non fluent, ideas confused or disconnected, lacks logical sequencing and development.  Very poor: doesn't communicate, not organized, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: sophisticated range, effective word/idiom  17-14 choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register.  Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,	Conte		*
subject, little substance, inadequate development of topic. Very poor: doesn't show knowledge of subject, non-substantive, not pertinent, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: fluent expression, ideas clearly stated/supported, succinct, well organized, logical sequencing, cohesive. Good to average: somewhat choppy. 13-10 Loosely organized but main ideas stand out. Limited support, logical but incomplete sequencing. Fair to poor: non fluent, ideas confused or disconnected, lacks logical sequencing and development. Very poor: doesn't communicate, not organized, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: sophisticated range, effective word/idiom 17-14 choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register. Good to average: doesn't communicate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,	nt		
substance, inadequate development of topic.  Very poor: doesn't show knowledge of subject, non-substantive, not pertinent, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: fluent expression, ideas clearly stated/supported, succinct, well organized, logical sequencing, cohesive.  Good to average: somewhat choppy.  13-10 Loosely organized but main ideas stand out. Limited support, logical but incomplete sequencing.  Fair to poor: non fluent, ideas confused or disconnected, lacks logical sequencing and development.  Very poor: doesn't communicate, not organized, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: sophisticated range, effective word/idiom  17-14 choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register.  Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,			knowledge of
inadequate development of topic. Very poor: doesn't show knowledge of subject, non-substantive, not pertinent, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: fluent expression, ideas clearly stated/supported, succinct, well organized, logical sequencing, cohesive. Good to average: somewhat choppy.  Loosely organized but main ideas stand out. Limited support, logical but incomplete sequencing. Fair to poor: non fluent, ideas confused or disconnected, lacks logical sequencing and development. Very poor: doesn't communicate, not organized, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: sophisticated range, effective word/idiom 17-14 choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register. Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,			subject, little
development of topic.  Very poor: doesn't show knowledge of subject, non-substantive, not pertinent, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: fluent expression, ideas clearly stated/supported, succinct, well organized, logical sequencing, cohesive. Good to average: somewhat choppy.  Loosely organized but main ideas stand out. Limited support, logical but incomplete sequencing. Fair to poor: non fluent, ideas confused or disconnected, lacks logical sequencing and development. Very poor: doesn't communicate, not organized, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: sophisticated range, effective word/idiom 17-14 choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register. Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,			substance,
development of topic.  Very poor: doesn't show knowledge of subject, non-substantive, not pertinent, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: fluent expression, ideas clearly stated/supported, succinct, well organized, logical sequencing, cohesive. Good to average: somewhat choppy.  Loosely organized but main ideas stand out. Limited support, logical but incomplete sequencing. Fair to poor: non fluent, ideas confused or disconnected, lacks logical sequencing and development. Very poor: doesn't communicate, not organized, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: sophisticated range, effective word/idiom 17-14 choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register. Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,			inadequate
Organi zation  Organi			•
Very poor: doesn't show knowledge of subject, non-substantive, not pertinent, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: fluent expression, ideas clearly stated/supported, succinct, well organized, logical sequencing, cohesive.  Good to average: somewhat choppy.  13-10 Loosely organized but main ideas stand out. Limited support, logical but incomplete sequencing.  Fair to poor: non fluent, ideas confused or disconnected, lacks logical sequencing and development.  Very poor: doesn't communicate, not organized, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: sophisticated range, effective word/idiom  17-14 choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register.  Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,			*
knowledge of subject, non-substantive, not pertinent, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: fluent expression, ideas clearly stated/supported, succinct, well organized, logical sequencing, cohesive.  Good to average: somewhat choppy.  Loosely organized but main ideas stand out. Limited support, logical but incomplete sequencing.  Fair to poor: non fluent, ideas confused or disconnected, lacks logical sequencing and development.  Very poor: doesn't communicate, not organized, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: sophisticated range, effective word/idiom  17-14 choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register.  Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,			*
non-substantive, not pertinent, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18			Very poor: doesn't show
non-substantive, not pertinent, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18			knowledge of subject.
Dertinent, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: fluent expression, ideas clearly stated/supported, succinct, well organized, logical sequencing, cohesive.  Good to average: somewhat choppy.  13-10 Loosely organized but main ideas stand out. Limited support, logical but incomplete sequencing.  Fair to poor: non fluent, ideas confused or disconnected, lacks logical sequencing and development.  Very poor: doesn't communicate, not organized, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: sophisticated range, effective word/idiom  17-14 choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register.  Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,			•
to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: fluent expression, ideas clearly stated/supported, succinct, well organized, logical sequencing, cohesive.  Good to average: somewhat choppy.  Loosely organized but main ideas stand out. Limited support, logical but incomplete sequencing.  Fair to poor: non fluent, ideas confused or disconnected, lacks logical sequencing and development.  Very poor: doesn't communicate, not organized, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: sophisticated range, effective word/idiom  17-14 choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register.  Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,			· ·
20-18 Excellent to very good: fluent expression, ideas clearly stated/supported, succinct, well organized, logical sequencing, cohesive.  Good to average: somewhat choppy.  Loosely organized but main ideas stand out. Limited support, logical but incomplete sequencing.  Fair to poor: non fluent, ideas confused or disconnected, lacks logical sequencing and development.  Very poor: doesn't communicate, not organized, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: sophisticated range, effective word/idiom choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register.  Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,			
fluent expression, ideas clearly stated/supported, succinct, well organized, logical sequencing, cohesive.  Good to average: somewhat choppy.  13-10 Loosely organized but main ideas stand out. Limited support, logical but incomplete sequencing.  Fair to poor: non fluent, ideas confused or disconnected, lacks logical sequencing and development.  Very poor: doesn't communicate, not organized, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: sophisticated range, effective word/idiom  17-14 choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register.  Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,			to evaluate.
fluent expression, ideas clearly stated/supported, succinct, well organized, logical sequencing, cohesive.  Good to average: somewhat choppy.  13-10 Loosely organized but main ideas stand out. Limited support, logical but incomplete sequencing.  Fair to poor: non fluent, ideas confused or disconnected, lacks logical sequencing and development.  Very poor: doesn't communicate, not organized, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: sophisticated range, effective word/idiom  17-14 choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register.  Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,		20-18	Excellent to very good:
Clearly stated/supported, succinct, well organized, logical sequencing, cohesive. Good to average: somewhat choppy. Loosely organized but main ideas stand out. Limited support, logical but incomplete sequencing. Fair to poor: non fluent, ideas confused or disconnected, lacks logical sequencing and development. Very poor: doesn't communicate, not organized, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: sophisticated range, effective word/idiom to choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register. Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,			
Succinct, well organized, logical sequencing, cohesive.  Good to average: somewhat choppy.  Loosely organized but main ideas stand out. Limited support, logical but incomplete sequencing.  Fair to poor: non fluent, ideas confused or disconnected, lacks logical sequencing and development.  Very poor: doesn't communicate, not organized, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: sophisticated range, effective word/idiom choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register.  Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,			*
Organi zation  Fair to poor: non fluent, ideas confused or disconnected, lacks logical sequencing and development.  Very poor: doesn't communicate, not organized, or not enough to evaluate.  Excellent to very good: sophisticated range, effective word/idiom choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register.  Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,			,
Organi zation  Fair to poor: non fluent, ideas confused or disconnected, lacks logical sequencing and development.  Very poor: doesn't communicate, not organized, or not enough to evaluate.  Excellent to very good: sophisticated range, effective word/idiom choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register.  Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,			· ·
Organi zation  Fair to poor: non fluent, ideas confused or disconnected, lacks logical sequencing and development.  Very poor: doesn't communicate, not organized, or not enough to evaluate.  Excellent to very good: sophisticated range, effective word/idiom choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register.  Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,		17-14	logical sequencing,
Somewhat choppy. Loosely organized but main ideas stand out. Limited support, logical but incomplete sequencing. Fair to poor: non fluent, ideas confused or disconnected, lacks logical sequencing and development. Very poor: doesn't communicate, not organized, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: sophisticated range, effective word/idiom choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register. Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,			cohesive.
Somewhat choppy. Loosely organized but main ideas stand out. Limited support, logical but incomplete sequencing. Fair to poor: non fluent, ideas confused or disconnected, lacks logical sequencing and development. Very poor: doesn't communicate, not organized, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: sophisticated range, effective word/idiom choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register. Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,			Good to average:
Organi zation  Fair to poor: non fluent, ideas confused or disconnected, lacks logical sequencing and development.  Very poor: doesn't communicate, not organized, or not enough to evaluate.  Excellent to very good: sophisticated range, effective word/idiom choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register.  Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,			
Organi zation  Fair to poor: non fluent, ideas confused or disconnected, lacks logical sequencing and development.  Very poor: doesn't communicate, not organized, or not enough to evaluate.  Excellent to very good: sophisticated range, effective word/idiom choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register.  Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,		12.10	
Organi zation  Organi zation  Organi zation  Dorgani zation  Organi zation  Organi zation  Dorgani zation  Limited support, logical but incomplete sequencing. Fair to poor: non fluent, ideas confused or disconnected, lacks logical sequencing and development. Very poor: doesn't communicate, not organized, or not enough to evaluate.  Dorganized, or not enough to evaluate.  Excellent to very good: sophisticated range, effective word/idiom choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register. Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,		13-10	, ,
Organi zation  Organi zation  Description  Organi zation  Description  Organi zation  Description  Description  Description  Description  Description  Description  Description  Description  Description  Fair to poor: non fluent, ideas confused or disconnected, lacks logical sequencing and development.  Very poor: doesn't communicate, not organized, or not enough to evaluate.  Description  Des			main ideas stand out.
Organi zation  Organi zation  Description  Organi zation  Description  Organi zation  Description  Description  Description  Description  Description  Description  Description  Description  Description  Fair to poor: non fluent, ideas confused or disconnected, lacks logical sequencing and development.  Very poor: doesn't communicate, not organized, or not enough to evaluate.  Description  Des			Limited support, logical
Organi zation    Sequencing   Fair to poor: non fluent, ideas confused or disconnected, lacks logical sequencing and development.   Very poor: doesn't communicate, not organized, or not enough to evaluate.    20-18   Excellent to very good: sophisticated range, effective word/idiom choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register.   Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,		9-7	
Organi zation  Fair to poor: non fluent, ideas confused or disconnected, lacks logical sequencing and development.  Very poor: doesn't communicate, not organized, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18  Excellent to very good: sophisticated range, effective word/idiom choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register.  Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,		, ,	*
zation  Fair to poor: non fluent, ideas confused or disconnected, lacks logical sequencing and development.  Very poor: doesn't communicate, not organized, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: sophisticated range, effective word/idiom choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register.  Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,	Organi		1 0
deas confused or disconnected, lacks logical sequencing and development.  Very poor: doesn't communicate, not organized, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: sophisticated range, effective word/idiom choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register.  Vocab ulary Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,	_		Fair to poor: non fluent,
logical sequencing and development.  Very poor: doesn't communicate, not organized, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: sophisticated range, effective word/idiom choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register.  Vocab ulary Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,	Zation		ideas confused or
development.  Very poor: doesn't communicate, not organized, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: sophisticated range, effective word/idiom choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register.  Vocab ulary Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,			disconnected, lacks
development.  Very poor: doesn't communicate, not organized, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: sophisticated range, effective word/idiom choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register.  Vocab ulary Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,			,
Very poor: doesn't communicate, not organized, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: sophisticated range, effective word/idiom choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register.  Vocab appropriate register. Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,			
communicate, not organized, or not enough to evaluate.  20-18 Excellent to very good: sophisticated range, effective word/idiom choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register.  Vocab appropriate register. Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,			*
Vocab ulary  13-10  organized, or not enough to evaluate.  Excellent to very good: sophisticated range, effective word/idiom choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register. Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,			, .
Vocab ulary  to evaluate.  Excellent to very good: sophisticated range, effective word/idiom choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register. Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,			communicate, not
Vocab ulary  to evaluate.  Excellent to very good: sophisticated range, effective word/idiom choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register. Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,			organized, or not enough
Vocab ulary  20-18  Excellent to very good: sophisticated range, effective word/idiom choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register. Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,			
Vocab ulary  13-10  sophisticated range, effective word/idiom choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register.  Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,		20-18	
Vocab ulary  13-10  effective word/idiom choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register.  Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,		20-10	
Vocab ulary  17-14  choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register. Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,			
Vocab ulary  13-10  form mastery, appropriate register. Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,			
Vocab ulary  13-10  form mastery, appropriate register. Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,		17-14	choice and usage, word
Vocab ulary  13-10  appropriate register.  Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,			
ulary  13-10  Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,	Vocah		
13-10 adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form,			
occasional errors of word/idiom form,	ulary		
word/idiom form,		13-10	adequate range,
word/idiom form,			occasional errors of
5-7 choice, usage, meaning		0.7	· ·
		7-1	choice, usage, meaning

72

		not confused or obscured.
		Fair to poor: limited
		range, frequent errors of
		word/idiom form,
		choice, usage, meaning
		confused or obscured.
		Very poor: essentially
		translation, little
		knowledge of English
		vocabulary, idioms,
		word form, or not
		enough to evaluate.
	25-22	Excellent to very good:
	25-22	effective complex
		construction, few errors
	21 10	of agreement, tense,
	21-18	number, word
		order/function, articles,
		pronouns, preposition.
		Good to average:
		effective but
		simple/complex
	17-11	construction, minor
		problems in complex
		constructions, several
		errors of agreement,
		tense, number, word,
		order/function, articles,
	10-5	pronouns, preposition,
		but meaning seldom
Langu		obscured.
age		Fair to poor: major
use		problem in
		simple/complex
		constructions: frequent
		errors of negation,
		agreement, tense,
		number, word/function,
		articles, pronouns,
		propositions and/ or
		fragments, deletion,
		meaning confused or
		obscured.
		Very poor: virtually no
		mastery of sentence
		constructions rules.
		Dominated by errors,
		doesn't communicate, or
		not enough to evaluate.
	5	Excellent to very good:
		demonstrates mastery
M- 1		conventions. Few errors
Mecha		of spelling, punctuation,
nics	4	capitalization,
		paragraphing.
		-

	Good to average:
3	occasional errors of
	spelling, punctuation,
	capitalization,
	paragraphing but
2	meaning not obscured.
	Fair to poor: frequent
	errors of spelling,
	punctuation,
	capitalization,
	paragraphing, poor
	handwriting, meaning
	confused or obscured.
	Very poor: no mastery of
	conventions, dominated
	by errors of spelling,
	punctuation,
	capitalization,
	paragraphing,
	handwriting illegible, or
	not enough to evaluate.

#### 8. Discussion

Based on findings that presented on data analysis technique at table, we could see that result of pre-test and post-test were so different. In the pre-test none students got very good and good score. Classification the students score in this test were most of the students classified as fair 6 (18.75%); 25 (78.125%) students classified as poor and 1 (3.125%) students classified as very poor. In the post-test, most of the students' score classified as good score. 4 (12.5%); very good, 27 (84.375%) students classified as good; 1 (3.125%) students classified as fair and none students classified as poor and very poor. Based on classification students' score at pre-test and post-test above, we could make conclusion that the students' score have improved from pre-test to post-test. We could see their improved on the good score and very poor score. Post-test there were 27 (84. 375%) good score And for very poor score at pretest, there were 1 (3.125%) of students classified at it and at post-test none students got this score. On pre-test, most of the students score classified into poor 25 (78.125%) and on

73

#### **EDUVELOP**

Journal of English Education and Development
Universitas Sulawesi Barat

the post-test most of the students score classified into good score 27(84.375%). Those mean that the students' score was improved and it supported that there were four students got very good score in post - test. The statements above was supported by the findings on the difference mean score between pre-test and post-test, in which the students' mean score in pre-test (50.9) increased in post-test (80), and score standard deviation in pre-test was (6.22). While, in the post-test score standard deviation was (5.27). It means that even though, the mean score of post-test was higher than the mean score of pre-test, but the deviation of pre-test was better than deviation of post-test. The findings on pre-test and post-test were strengthened by the result of computation of ttest value; it was 5.743. If it was compared to twhich N = 32 or the total table value. respondents were 32 students with the degree of freedom (df) = N - 1 = 32 - 1 = 31 in the level of significance 0.05 (2.042), the t-test value was higher than t-table value. It means that the alternative hypothesis (H<sub>1</sub>) was accepted, and null hypothesis (H<sub>0</sub>) was rejected, or it can be concluded that there was a significant different between the students ability in writing before and after the use chronological order.

#### 9. Conclusion

Beside on the findings and the discussion presented in the previous chapter, the researcher conclude this research that focus on the student's ability in writing through chronological order can stimulate, developed and improve the writing ability in chronological order of the third year students of SMA Negeri 1 Pangsid Kabupaten Sidenreng Rappang. It is supported by the data, in which the mean score of the students in pre-test (50.9) has been improved in the post-test, in which the students

mean score is (80). In applying the t-test formula the researcher found that the t-test (5.743) it is higher than the value of the t-table (2.042).

#### References

- Anwar, dkk. 2009, Pedoman Penelitian Karya
  Ilmiah dan Laporan Kegiatan
  Praktik Pengalaman Lapangan
  Mahasiswa. Edisi
  Revisi.STAIN Parepare
- Awaluddin, 2009. Improving Writing Skill of
  the Second Year Students of
  SMPN 1 Duampanua
  Kabupaten Pinrang By Using
  Spider Web. Unpublished
  Thesis, Parepare: UMPAR
- Bryne, 1984. *Teaching Writing Skill*. London. Oxford University Press.
- Crimmon, Mc. 1984. Writing with a Purpose. New Jersey. Hougton Miffin Company.
- Dirjen Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah, 2005.

  Peraturan Direktorat

  Jenderal Pendidikan Dasar

  dan Menengah Tentang

  Penilaian Perkembangan Anak

  Didik.
- Dumais, 1988. Writing and English. Depdikbud Dierjen Pendidikan Tinggi Proyek Pengembangan Lembaga Pendidikan Tenaga Kependidikan. Jakarta
- Gay, L.R. 1981. Educational Research

  Competencies for Analysis and
  Application. Bell and Howell
  Company.
- Heaton, J. B. 1988. Writing English Language
  Tests (New York: Longman
  Handbook for Language
  Teachers). p.145-146

74

# **EDUVELOP**

Journal of English Education and Development
Universitas Sulawesi Barat

- Homby. A.S. 1995. Oxford Learners'

  Dictionary.Now York: Oxford
  University Press. Unwin
  Brothers Ltd.
- Oshima, Alice. 1998. Writing Academic English. Longman.
- Oshima, Alice. 1999. Writing Academic English. Longman.
- Rahma, Sitti. 2005. Improving the Students Ability to Write Descriptive

- Pragraph Through Direct Observation. Unpublished Thesis, Parepare: UMPAR
- Syahril. 2006. Improving Narative Writing
  Ability of the Second Semester
  of Muhammadiyah University
  of Parepare Through Telling
  Unforgettable Story.
  Unpublished thesis UMPAR