THE INFLUENCE SEQUENCE PICTURE ON INDONESIAN ELT LEARNERS WRITING SKILL

Amiruddin[1], Nur Inayah[2], Syahrun Adzim[3], Andi Mayasari[4], Via Aulinnia[5]

[1, 2, 3, 4, 5] Institut Agama Islam As'adiyah Sengkang, Indonesia

Article Info

ABSTRACT

The goal of this study was to see if using sequence graphics when writing procedural text improves writing skills. As a result, a quasi-experimental approach was used in this study. In both the pre-test and post-test, data on the students' writing abilities were gathered using the interview method. After gathering the data, descriptive analysis was used to examine it. The study included 13 students from IAI As'adiyah Sengkang, Indonesia, who were in their fifth semester of English education. Cluster random sampling was used to gather them. To measure the progress of the sequence picture technique, the researcher conducted a t-test study. The study findings revealed that there was no statistically significant difference between the pretest and posttest. The t-test value (0.11) was found to be greater than the level of significance α (0.05) and degree of freedom (df) = 41. The researcher finds that employing the sequence pictures technique does not significantly improve students' writing skills in procedural text based on the findings and discussion of the study.

Corresponding Author:

Amiruddin,
Institut Agama Islam As'adiyah Sengkang, Indonesia
Email: amiruddinn1@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

From junior high school through university, English is taught as a foreign language in Indonesia (Mistar, 2005; Mattarima & Hamdan, 2011; Alwasilah, 2013). The four abilities of hearing, speaking, reading, and writing are taught in English classes so that students can master them. These four abilities can be divided into two groups: receptive and productive abilities. Receptive skills include listening and reading, whereas productive skills include talking and writing (Golkova & Hubackova, 2014; Miralpeix & Muñoz, 2018). According to Jacobs (2014); Walton (2015); McLeod (2018), humans use language in four ways: reading, writing, speaking and listening. These are frequently classified into two categories. Reading and listening are examples of receptive abilities, which involve extracting meaning from the speech. Speaking and writing are examples of productive skills, which require students to produce language on their own.

Writing is the hardest of the four skills to learn and master, because it is an active or productive skill, and students learning writing must learn how to uncover and express ideas in writing (Sternglass, 2017; Kumala et al., 2017; Andersen et al., 2018). According to Renandya & Widodo (2016), writing is without a doubt the most challenging skill for L2 learners to master. The challenge is not only in creating and organizing ideas but also in converting them into readable prose. In agreement with this concept. Moreover, Weigle (2007); Brown et al. (2014) claimed that "we fully comprehend the difficulty of learning to

write "good" in any language, including our own." In industrialized countries, every educated child learns the fundamentals of writing in his or her native language, but only a small percentage learn to express themselves properly with a logical, well-formed organization that achieves a specific goal. Additionally, Warschauer & Grimes (2008); Taylor (2009) backed up their claim by stating that writing is a challenging endeavor for most people when they are trying to incorporate new ideas and perspectives into their language.

Students are supposed to be able to create a solid text with good content and consistency, but they are unable to do so. Students are at a loss for what to write about. In other words, when requested to produce a text, such as a narrative text, they have a blank mind. As a result, some form of medium is required to bring their thoughts to life. In the teaching-learning process, media plays a significant role (Buckingham, 2007; Asemota, 2015; Syakur, 2020; Loi et al., 2020). By utilizing media, a student may be able to comprehend what a teacher is attempting to convey, and teachers may find it simpler to impart their expertise to their students (Dawes, 2012; Octaberlina & Muslimin, 2020; Siregar et al., 2021). As a result, the assistance or media should be considered.

Moreover, film, television, radio, audio recordings, pictures, projected visuals, written materials, and the like, according to Monaco & Lindroth (2000); Nicolaou et al. (2019), are media of communication. When they are utilized to convey messages with an instructional goal, they are classified as instructional media. Furthermore, he stated that the utility of media as an instructional tool, not only provides the essential tangible experience but is also a major justification for adopting instructional media (Thornton & Houser, 2005; Smaldino et al., 2008; Abrahim et al., 2019). A sequence picture is one of the numerous media.

In this regard, the researcher would like to do research on creating procedural text using sequence visuals as a medium of instruction. The sequences picture appeared to facilitate discourse performance because all respondents created more transitional signals in reaction to them than in response to a single picture (Duong & Ska, 2001; Duong et al., 2005).

Literature Review

Writing is an English language skill that requires students to express and develop their own thoughts in writing (Sadiku, 2015). Furthermore, many students are stumped as to how to start writing a paragraph or how to develop a specific text type (Toba & Noor, 2019; Simanjorang & Pulungan, 2021; Bulqiyah et al., 2021). Moreover, even for specialists, it might be tough to write well. Students must be able to express their ideas in writing as part of their writing skills. It does not pique the students' curiosity. They are unable to write because they lack inspiration and ideas. When kids write something while collecting information such as facts and concepts, they discover something new. They're well aware that as they write, they'll be making important findings.

Students, on the other hand, frequently encounter difficulties when they begin writing (Hyland, 2008; Sadiku, 2015; Fareed et al., 2016). Many students understand that if they can only get started and keep going, they will be able to solve challenges. They use a variety of techniques to keep the writing flowing, especially during the early stages of drafting, when all students revise their initial manuscripts. When students rewrite their work, they have had time to reflect on their draft and may have received feedback from others and are ready to revise. Clouse & Clouse (2013) advises that when revising a piece of writing, we should keep in mind that we are actually rewriting it. Drafts are worked on and reworked by experienced writers multiple times. With each edit, you demonstrate that you are a skilled writer.

It's similar to talking with someone when we write down an idea (the audience). Through written communication, we use our minds to communicate with others. Teachers should, for example, call on different types of communicative criteria, the ideas of product and process, and the function of formal language practice to assess how other abilities are (Donough & Shaw, 2003; Pardiyono, 2007). The importance of pronunciation instruction in the acquisition of greater writing skills cannot be overstated.

Moreover, "errors" in speech are linked to "errors" in writing (Sörqvist et al., 2012; Daigle et al., 2016). There is a close association between verbal and written communication," according to Dallimore et al. (2008); Loureiro et al. (2020), who found this research. It implies that the teacher must incorporate the concepts of product and process into writing exercises when teaching writing abilities. Many new insights about language and learning have been gained through writing.

Furthermore, a procedural text is one in which the author outlines how something is performed by a series of acts or steps (Firkins et al., 2007; Nasution, 2019). Moreover, a procedural text is a text that has four parts: objective, material, method, and reorientation, in which the writer outlines how something is done through a series of activities or stages. The purpose is to explain how something is done. The content focuses on the information required in the case at hand. Some texts may not necessitate the use of materials. The method refers to a set of processes that must be followed in order to attain a specific goal.

Pictures are not merely an element of the approach; they are an integral part of the whole experience since they represent places, objects, and people (Lavrenko et al., 2003; Louie & Sierschynski, 2015; Downs & Stea, 2017). It indicates that visuals can aid learners in comprehending the meaning of a word by representing the meaning of the word. Additionally, visuals will vividly bring the outside world inside the classroom (George, 2002; Bajrami & Ismaili, 2016). As a result, a picture is a great resource because it provides: a shared classroom experience, a requirement for common language forms in the classroom, a range of activities, and a point of interest for students.

Students will be focused and interested in writing utilizing graphics, according to the notion. Students use their imaginations to interpret the image they see (Murray, 2013). As a result, it has the potential to influence students' writing abilities since they compose several words based on the image and their imagination.

According to the preceding description, sequence pictures are one of the media in a study that can be utilized to assist the teacher in conveying material to the students. The purpose of this medium is to encourage student participation in the learning process. It is necessary to make the learning process more appealing so that the student can take the material more easily. In the teaching and learning process, media serves as a bridge between the teacher and the student. Sequence pictures, as one of the media in the learning process, are also designed to improve students' motivation in their studies. If properly placed, sequence pictures are art that is used to draw immovable goods.

2. METHOD

This study used quantitative with experimental methods. The researcher utilized a quasi-experimental method to examine if sequence visuals may improve students' ability to write the procedural language.

The research variables included independent and dependent variables:

1. The sequence photos were the first independent variable. A succession of photographs dealing with a single subject is known as a sequence picture. It could tell a story, depict a scene, disclose a character, or demonstrate how to do something. This picture series consists of 4-5 images.

2. The capacity of students to write procedural text was a dependent variable. Writing is the process of expressing someone's concept or idea through a set of symbols in a readable format.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. The Distribution of Frequency and Percentage Score

The maximum score in the experimental group is 86, and the minimum score is 32, according to data analysis of the students' pre-test of writing ability. Aside from that, the maximum and minimum scores in the post-test are 81 and 40, respectively. The maximum score is 91 and the minimum score is 34 in the control group's pre-test, while the maximum score is 89 and the minimum score is 37 in the post-test.

The outcome of both the experimental and control groups. One student (5.3 percent) received a "very good" rating on the pretest. However, none of the students (0%) received the highest classification on the posttest. One student (5.3%) received a "good" classification on the pretest, while three students (15.8%) received it on the posttest. Then, in the pretest, one student (5.3 percent) received "fair" categorization, and in the posttest, two students (10.5 percent) received it. 2 students (10.5 percent) received the "bad" categorization on the pretest, while 8 students (52.7 percent) received it on the posttest. The last classification, "extremely poor," was received by 9 students (73.6%) in the pretest and 2 students (21.0%) in the posttest. The showed the movement of students' scores in the experimental class.

The students' grades improved in the control group. One student (4.2 percent) receives "very good" on the pretest, while two students (8.3%) receive this rating on the posttest. None of the students (0%) received the "good" categorization in the pretest, and none of the students (0%) received it in the post-test. Then, in the pretest, two students (8.3%) received "fair" categorization, and four students (37.5%) received it in the posttest. Six students (25.0 percent) received the "bad" categorization on the pretest, while five students (45.9%) received it on the post-test. In the pretest, 6 students (62.5%) received the "extremely poor" classification, which decreased to 2 students (8.3%) in the posttest.

2. The Mean Score and Standard Deviation

The mean score and standard deviation of both the control and experimental classes in the pretest and posttest in writing ability were calculated based on the results of data analysis. In the pretest, the mean score for the experimental class was 42.78, with a standard deviation of 15.8. The mean score in the posttest is 51.15, with a standard deviation of 13.7. In the pretest, the mean score for the control group was 43.41, with a standard deviation of 14.1 points. The mean score in the posttest is 57.75, with a standard deviation of 13.2.

3. T-test Value and T-table

For level significance (α) = 0.05 and degree of freedom (df) = 41, based on the results of data analysis. In the pretest, the t-test result was 0.89. The t-test value is higher than the t-table value (0.89 > 0.05), indicating that the t-test value is greater than the t-table value. There is no significant difference in pretest mean scores between the control and experimental groups, according to the results. The t-test

value is 0.11 after the post-test. The difference in mean pretest scores between the control and experimental groups is not significant.

The t-test value in the posttest is 0.11. The t-test value is higher than the t-test value (0.11 > 0.05), indicating that the t-test value is higher than the t-test value. This means that there is no difference in mean post-test scores between the experimental and control groups. It also implies that the null hypothesis (H0) is true and the alternative hypothesis (H1) is false.

The data analysis interpretation related to the students' writing abilities and sequence pictures is shown in the discussion section. This section discusses how the findings are to be interpreted. According to the data acquired through the writing test, the student's ability to write procedural text has not improved. The T-test result of the students' pretest and posttest from five writing components suggested it. These findings contrast slightly with the results of previous studies which found that using serial images could improve students' ability in writing procedural texts (Wiratmajaya et al., 2015; Gendroyono, 2021; Hamzah et al., 2022).

Moreover, the interview results revealed that some students in both the experimental and control classes of IAI As'adiyah Sengkang, Indonesia's fifth-semester English education students lack fundamental English understanding because they were never taught English in elementary school. As a result of the student's answers in the pretest and posttest, he or she is classified as poor.

As a result of the data analysis and discussion, it appears that the pre-test and post-test scores of IAI As'adiyah Sengkang, Indonesia students are not significantly different. As a result, it is concluded that using the sequence pictures technique does not significantly improve students' procedural text-based writing skills.

The achievement of prior investigations are diverse, which has implications for the findings of this study. As a result, more research is needed to show that sequence pictures improve students' procedural text-based writing skills. So that it can be used as a learning tool and is consistent with existing theories.

4. CONCLUSION

The writer finds that the usage of sequence pictures does not considerably increase students' writing skills from IAI As'adiyah Sengkang, Indonesia, based on the results of the data analysis and discussion of the findings. The students' post-test result (51.1) is higher than the mean score of the pre-tests (42.7), and the t-test value is higher than the t-table (0.11 > 0.05). The usage of sequence pictures does not appear to increase students' ability to write procedure text.

As a suggestion, the diversity of previous studies' findings suggests that more research on sequence pictures is needed with a broader scope, so that the findings can be reconciled with the existing theory that sequence pictures can improve students' writing skills, particularly in the field of English language education.

REFERENCES

Abrahim, S., Mir, B. A., Suhara, H., Mohamed, F. A., & Sato, M. (2019). Structural equation modeling and confirmatory factor analysis of social media use and education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *16*(1), 1-25. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0157-y

Alwasilah, C. (2013). Policy on foreign language education in Indonesia. *International Journal of Education*, *7*(1), 1-19. https://www.learntechlib.org/p/208914/

Andersen, S. C., Christensen, M. V., Nielsen, H. S., Thomsen, M. K., Østerbye, T., & Rowe, M. L. (2018). How reading and writing support each other across a school year in primary school children. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *55*, 129-138. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2018.09.005

Asemota, H. E. (2015). The role of media in English language development. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Studies (IJHSSS)*, *2*(3), 311-16.

Bajrami, L., & Ismaili, M. (2016). The role of video materials in EFL classrooms. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *232*, 502-506. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.10.068

Brown, G. T., Glasswell, K., & Harland, D. (2004). Accuracy in the scoring of writing: Studies of reliability and validity using a New Zealand writing assessment system. *Assessing writing*, *9*(2), 105-121. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2004.07.001

Buckingham, D. (2007). Media education goes digital: an introduction. *Learning, Media and technology*, *32*(2), 111-119. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439880701343006

Bulqiyah, S., Mahbub, M., & Nugraheni, D. A. (2021). Investigating Writing Difficulties in Essay Writing: Tertiary Students' Perspectives. *English Language Teaching Educational Journal*, *4*(1), 61-73. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1296404

Clouse, B. F., & Clouse, B. F. (2013). *The student writer*. McGraw-Hill.

Daigle, D., Costerg, A., Plisson, A., Ruberto, N., & Varin, J. (2016). Spelling errors in French-speaking children with dyslexia: Phonology may not provide the best evidence. *Dyslexia*, *22*(2), 137-157. https://doi.org/10.1002/dys.1524

Dallimore, E. J., Hertenstein, J. H., & Platt, M. B. (2008). Using discussion pedagogy to enhance oral and written communication skills. *College Teaching*, *56*(3), 163-172. https://doi.org/10.3200/CTCH.56.3.163-172

Dawes, L. (2012). What stops teachers using new technology?. In *Issues in teaching using ICT* (pp. 61-80). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203185117-5

Donough, J. M., & Shaw, C. (2003). Materials and method in ELT: A Teacher's guide-2nd.

Downs, R. M., & Stea, D. (Eds.). (2017). *Image and environment: Cognitive mapping and spatial behavior*. Transaction Publishers.

Duong, A., Giroux, F., Tardif, A., & Ska, B. (2005). The heterogeneity of picture-supported narratives in Alzheimer's disease. *Brain and language*, *93*(2), 173-184. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bandl.2004.10.007

Duong, A., & Ska, B. (2001). Production of narratives: Picture sequence facilitates organizational but not conceptual processing in less educated subjects. *Brain and cognition*, *46*(1-2), 121-124. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0278-2626(01)80047-6Fareed, M., Ashraf, A., & Bilal, M. (2016). ESL learners' writing skills: Problems, factors and suggestions. *Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, *4*(2), 81-92.

Firkins, A., Forey, G., & Sengupta, S. (2007). Teaching writing to low proficiency EFL students. *ELT journal*, *61*(4), 341-352. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccm052

George, D. (2002). From analysis to design: Visual communication in the teaching of writing. *College composition and communication*, 11-39. https://doi.org/10.2307/1512100

Gendroyono, G. (2021). The Improvement of Students' Ability in Writing Procedure Text Through Picture Series. *Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia*, *2*(6), 993-1023. https://doi.org/10.36418/japendi.v2i6.201

Golkova, D., & Hubackova, S. (2014). Productive skills in second language learning. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *143*, 477-481. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.07.520

Hamzah, H., Amin, F. H., & Nawir, N. (2022). Penggunaan Gambar Berseri Untuk Meningkatkan Kemampuan Menulis Teks Prosedur pada Siswa Kelas IX. 1 MTs. Paitana Kab. Jeneponto Sulawesi Selatan. *JURNAL PEMIKIRAN DAN PENGEMBANGAN PEMBELAJARAN*, *4*(1), 497-505. http://www.ejournal-jp3.com/index.php/Pendidikan/article/view/252

Hyland, K. (2008). Academic clusters: Text patterning in published and postgraduate writing. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *18*(1), 41-62. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2008.00178.x

Jacobs, H. H. (2014). *Active literacy across the curriculum: Strategies for reading, writing, speaking, and listening*. Routledge.

Kumala, B. P., Aimah, S., & Ifadah, M. (2018). An Analysis of Grammatical Errors on Students' Writing. In *English Language and Literature International Conference (ELLiC) Proceedings* (Vol. 2, pp. 144-149). https://jurnal.unimus.ac.id/index.php/ELLIC/article/view/3513

Lavrenko, V., Manmatha, R., & Jeon, J. (2003). A model for learning the semantics of pictures. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, *16*.

Loi, O. P., Tamba, S. B., Pangaribuan, M., & Saragih, E. (2020). Using Flash Expressions Book as Instructional Media to Vocabulary Mastery in Learning English. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris undiksha*, *8*(2), 74-79. http://dx.doi.org/10.23887/jpbi.v8i2.30619

Louie, B., & Sierschynski, J. (2015). Enhancing English learners' language development using wordless picture books. *The Reading Teacher*, *69*(1), 103-111. https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.1376

Loureiro, M., Loureiro, N., & Silva, R. (2020). Differences of gender in oral and written communication apprehension of university students. *Education Sciences*, *10*(12), 379. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci10120379

Mattarima, K., & Hamdan, A. R. (2011). The teaching constraints of English as a foreign language in Indonesia: The context of school based curriculum. *Sosiohumanika*, *4*(2). https://doi.org/10.2121/sosiohumanika.v4i2.452

McLeod, S. (2018). Communication rights: Fundamental human rights for all. *International Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, *20*(1), 3-11. https://doi.org/10.1080/17549507.2018.1428687

Miralpeix, I., & Muñoz, C. (2018). Receptive vocabulary size and its relationship to EFL language skills. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, *56*(1), 1-24. https://doi.org/10.1515/iral-2017-0016

Mistar, J. (2005). Teaching English as a foreign language (TEFL) in Indonesia. *Teaching English to the world: History, curriculum, and practice*, 71-80.

Monaco, J., & Lindroth, D. (2000). *How to read a film: the world of movies, media, and multimedia: language, history, theory*. Oxford University Press, USA.

Murray, G. (2013). Pedagogy of the possible: Imagination, autonomy, and space. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, *3*(3), 377-396. https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=180378

Nasution, A. K. R. (2019). YouTube as a media in English language teaching (ELT) context: teaching procedure text. *Utamax: Journal of Ultimate Research and Trends in Education*, *1*(1), 29-33. https://doi.org/10.31849/utamax.v1i1.2788

Nicolaou, C., Matsiola, M., & Kalliris, G. (2019). Technology-enhanced learning and teaching methodologies through audiovisual media. *Education Sciences*, *9*(3), 196. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci9030196

Octaberlina, L. R., & Muslimin, A. I. (2020). EFL Students Perspective towards Online Learning Barriers and Alternatives Using Moodle/Google Classroom during

COVID-19 Pandemic. *International Journal of Higher Education*, *9*(6), 1-9. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1277897

Pardiyono, P. B. (2007). Teaching Genre Based Writing, Yogyakarta: CV. *Andi Offset*.

Renandya, W. A., & Widodo, H. P. (Eds.). (2016). *English language teaching today: Linking theory and practice* (Vol. 5). Springer.

Sadiku, L. M. (2015). The importance of four skills reading, speaking, writing, listening in a lesson hour. *European Journal of Language and Literature*, *1*(1), 29-31. https://doi.org/10.26417/ejls.v1i1.p29-31

Simanjorang, S., & Pulungan, A. H. (2021). Students'difficulties in writing process of recount text for eight grade of junior high school. *REGISTER: Journal of English Language Teaching of FBS-Unimed*, *10*(3). https://doi.org/10.24114/reg.v10i3.29980

Siregar, A. S. B., Tobing, E. G. L., & Fitri, N. R. (2021). Developing of Teaching Materials: Using Animation Media to Learning English Vocabulary for Early Childhood. *ETDC: Indonesian Journal of Research and Educational Review*, *1*(1), 9-16. https://doi.org/10.51574/ijrer.v1i1.44

Smaldino, S. E., Lowther, D. L., Russell, J. D., & Mims, C. (2008). Instructional technology and media for learning.

Sörqvist, P., Nöstl, A., & Halin, N. (2012). Disruption of writing processes by the semanticity of background speech. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, *53*(2), 97-102. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9450.2011.00936.x

Sternglass, M. S. (2017). *Time to know them: A longitudinal study of writing and learning at the college level*. Routledge.

Syakur, A. (2020). The Effectiveness of English Learning Media through Google Classroom in Higher Education. *Britain International of Linguistics Arts and Education (BIoLAE) Journal*, *2*(1), 475-483. https://doi.org/10.33258/biolae.v2i1.218

Taylor, G. (2009). *A student's writing guide: How to plan and write successful essays*. Cambridge University Press.

Thornton, P., & Houser, C. (2005). Using mobile phones in English education in Japan. *Journal of computer assisted learning*, *21*(3), 217-228. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2729.2005.00129.x

Toba, R., & Noor, W. N. (2019). The current issues of Indonesian EFL students' writing skills: Ability, problem, and reason in writing comparison and contrast essay. *Dinamika Ilmu: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 57-73. https://doi.org/10.21093/di.v19i1.1506

Walton, E. (2015). *The language of inclusive education: Exploring speaking, listening, reading and writing*. Routledge.

Warschauer, M., & Grimes, D. (2008). Automated writing assessment in the classroom. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, *3*(1), 22-36. https://doi.org/10.1080/15544800701771580

Weigle, S. C. (2007). Teaching writing teachers about assessment. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *16*(3), 194-209. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.07.004

Wiratmajaya, I. G. N. A., Artika, I. W., & Darmayanti, I. A. M. (2015). Penggunaan Gambar Berseri Untuk Meningkatkan Kemampuan Menulis Teks Prosedur Kompleks pada Siswa Kelas X Akuntansi A SMK Negeri 1 Singaraja. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia Undiksha*, *3*(1). http://dx.doi.org/10.23887/jjpbs.v3i1.6257