



## STUDENTS' WRITING NARRATIVE TEXT ABILITY BY USING LOCAL WISDOM BASED LEARNING MODEL

Gabby Maureen Pricilia

[maureenaisyah20@gmail.com](mailto:maureenaisyah20@gmail.com)

Institut Pendidikan Tapanuli Selatan, Indonesia

Habib Rahmansyah

Institut Pendidikan Tapanuli Selatan, Indonesia

[habib.echo6@gmail.com](mailto:habib.echo6@gmail.com)

### Abstract

This study aim to determine the effect of using local wisdom based learning model on students' writing narrative text ability at the fourth semester students of English Education Program in Institut Pendidikan Tapanuli Selatan. The research type is quantitative with experimental method. The researcher collected the data by using composition writing test. The sample was taken by using total sampling technique, it was 25 students. The data were then analyzed by using descriptive and inferential analysis, it was t-test formula by Arikunto. The results of the research are the mean score of students' writing ability before using local wisdom based learning model was 53.54 which categorized bad, then after using local wisdom based learning model was 82.50 which categorized good. The hypothesis testing showed that t-test was higher than t-table, it means that the hypothesis is accepted. The finding of research reveals that there is a significant effect of local wisdom based learning model on students' writing narrative text ability at the fourth semester students of English Education Program in Institut Pendidikan Tapanuli Selatan.

**Keywords: writing narrative text, local wisdom, learning model**

### Background

In the English language curriculum at a high level, students are expected to be able to communicate in English both oral and written. Writing is one of the competencies which communicates ideas, information, and also feelings. Students are expected to be able to write in English. This competencies must be owned by students in order to compete in the current of globalization.

Unfortunately, many students consider that writing in English is the most difficult skill. This also happened in Institut Pendidikan Tapanuli Selatan in writing course (Writing II) which showed that students' writing narrative text was still relatively low. This can be seen from the list of students' writing scores which the average score was 50, it was predicated "D".

There are many factors which caused problems in writing narrative text, such as the lack of students' knowledge, lack of interest, and the inappropriate teaching models used by the lecturer. Lecturer has an important role in the success of learning. Lecturer often still uses conventional learning models, the learning process is focused on lecturer (lecturer centered), not students centered. It makes students are not involved actively in learning process so, they are bored and not interested.

Hence the lecturer must be able to use the appropriate learning model to teach writing competence. One of the learning models offered to overcome writing difficulties is a local wisdom-



based learning model. Local wisdom is an effort to cultivate local values in areas where students live. This model will make students are interested and like writing activities because it is close to their daily lives. So that students will get closer and love their local culture. Local wisdom-based learning models used are 1) local wisdom-based learning models through *Dalihan na tolu*, 2) traditional game, 3) writing narrative text, namely folktale.

Considering the harsh current of globalization, a conscious effort is needed to nurture the generation from a shift in the values of local culture by foreign cultures which will certainly have an impact on the generation's character. Character education is a vital need to create human beings who have the integrity of moral values that make a person has a personality to respect, cooperate, and care about local culture.

## ***The Nature of Writing***

Writing is a complex activity which needs ability in arranging words and sentences grammatically and meaningfully to be understood by the readers. It involves multiple processes where a writer does not only need to learn the mechanism of writing but also need to develop the idea by activating cognitive process and working memory. It is clear that writing is a complex activity which needs effort.

As Kellog (2007) said that writing is indeed one of the most effortful activities that humans can implement. Effortful activity means, the writer needs effort to be able to express ideas in written presentation.

Then, Graham (2006) stated that writing allows people to communicate, to learn, to express themselves artistically and creatively, to persuade readers and in education to demonstrate knowledge. It means that through writing people communicate, persuade, learn, express and share knowledge to other people.

The social function of narrative text is to entertain the readers. According to Linda Gerot and Peter Wignell (1994: 204) narrative text is a text which has social function to amuse and entertain the readers. Then Meyers (2005) said that narrative text is the most powerful ways to communicate. It means that by writing narrative text, the author can communicate to other people well.

Narrative text has three generic structures, they are orientation, complication, and resolution. Orientation is an introduction of participants involved in the text. Complication is a group of problems which happens when a crisis rises. Resolution is when the crisis resolved, it can be better or even worse. Reorientation is an optional structure which convey the writer's opinion or conclusion.

Writing narrative text has some aspects which assessed according to Hartfield in Nurgiyantoro, ( 2010: 307-308). They are:

- 1) content: information intensive, substantive and relevant to the problem
- 2) organization: smooth expression, ideas expressed clearly, well organized, logical and cohesive order
- 3) vocabulary: the use of sophisticated word potential, the right choice of words and mastering word formation
- 4) language mastery: complex but effective construction, use of linguistic forms, and
- 5) mechanics; master spelling and writing rules.



## *Local Wisdom*

Sibarani (2012) said that local knowledge can be seen from the two senses. First, the local knowledge is wisdom or original knowledge of a society which is originated from the noble values of cultural tradition to set the order of a society.

Second, local wisdom is the local cultural values that can be used to set the order of a society wisely and prudently. In this case, local knowledge is seen as a cultural value that is used to regulate social life. Local knowledge and local wisdom can be utilized to improve the welfare and create peace in society. Practically, indigenous knowledge and local knowledge is the real truth as it really is beneficial to human life.

## **METHOD**

### **Participants**

This research is categorized as quantitative research to find the effect of variable X is local wisdom learning model to variable Y is students' writing narrative text ability according to Sugiyono, 2012; Arikunto, 2010. The population of this research is all subject of research. Then sample is taken by using total sampling technique, it is 25 students of English department in Institut Pendidikan Tapanuli Selatan.

### **Research Design**

According to Sugiyono (2013: 3), method of the research is a scientific way to obtain data with specific purposes and uses. The method of this research is experimental research and the research design used is one group pretest-posttest design. The pre-test and post-test group design involved two groups as subjects, experimental treatment is given for one group, while the other did not based on Fraenkelet al., (2006). In this research, the researcher gave writing test to students by measuring students' writing narrative text before taught by local wisdom based learning model, it is called pre test. Then, researcher applied local wisdom based learning model then gave them writing test, it is called post test. It means that, researcher measured students' writing narrative text after taught by using local wisdom based learning model.

### **Instrument and Data Collection**

The instrument to collect the data used in this research is writing test namely writing folktale. Students were asked to write narrative text based on folklore. Students were divided in some groups based on their regions then write narrative text. Students are from Padangsidempuan wrote narrative text entitled "Batu Nadua", from South Tapanuli wrote narrative text entitled "Bahal Temple" and "Si Lundu Ni Pahu", from Middle Tapanuli wrote narrative text entitled "Putri Runduk" then from Panyabungan wrote "Sampuraga". The stories come from students' regions then assessed based on the indicators, they are content, organization, vocabulary, grammar and mechanics.



**Table 2**  
**The Scoring Profile of Writing Test**

<b>Item Analysis</b>	<b>Rubric</b>	<b>Score</b>
Content	Knowledgeable, substantive, thorough development of thesis, relevant to assigned topic.	30-27 Excellent to very good
	Some knowledge of subject, adequate range, limited development of thesis, mostly relevant to topic, but lacks detail.	26-22 Good to average
	Limited knowledge of subject, little substance, inadequate development of topic.	21-17 Fair to poor
	Does not show knowledge of subject, non substantive, not pertinent, or not enough to evaluate.	16-13 Very poor
Organization	Fluent expression, ideas clearly stated/ supported, succinct, well organized, logical sequencing, cohesive.	20-18 Excellent to very good
	Somewhat choppy, loosely organized but main ideas stand out, limited support, logical but incomplete sequencing.	17-14 Good to average
	Non-fluent, ideas confused or disconnected, lacks logical sequencing and development.	13-10 Fair to poor
	Does not communicate, no organization, or not enough to evaluate.	9-7 Very poor
Vocabulary	Sophisticated range, effective word/ idiom choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register.	20-18 Excellent to very good
	Adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form, choice, usage but meaning not obscured.	17-14 Good to average
	Limited range, frequent errors of word/idiom form, choice usage, meaning confused or obscured.	13-10 Fair to poor
	Essentially translation, little knowledge of English vocabulary,	9-7 Very poor



	idioms, word form, or not enough to evaluate.	
Grammar (Language Use)	Effective complex construction, few errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions.	25-22 Excellent to very good
	Effective but simple constructions, minor problems in complex constructions, several errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, preposition, but meaning seldom obscured.	21-18 Good to average
	Major problems in simple/complex constructions, frequent errors of negation, agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions and or fragments, run-ons deletions, meaning confused or obscured.	17-11 Fair to poor
	Virtually no mastery of sentence construction rules, dominated by errors, does not communicate or not enough to evaluate.	10-5 Very poor
Mechanics	Demonstrates mastery of conventions, few errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and paragraphing.	5 Excellent to very good
	Occasionally errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing but meaning not obscured.	4 Good to average
	Frequent errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing, poor handwriting, meaning confused or obscured.	3 Fair to poor
	No mastery of convention dominated by errors of spelling punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing, handwriting illegible or not enough to evaluate.	2 Very poor

Adopted from Hughes (2003: 104)



## Data Analysis

In this research, the technique of data collection is conducting writing test to students. After gaining the data from the test, thus the data are analyzed by using:

### 1. Descriptive analysis

This analysis describes students' writing narrative text before and after taught by local wisdom based learning model. Then the researcher classifies students' mean, median and mode score by using criteria of score as follows:

**Table 1 The Criteria of Students' Score**

No	Class of Score	Predicate
1	80-100	Very Good
2	70-79	Good
3	60-69	Enough
4	50-59	Bad
5	0-49	Fail

### 2. Inferential Analysis

This analysis examines whether the hypothesis is accepted or rejected. The formula used is by Arikunto (2009).

$$t = \frac{\bar{D}}{\sqrt{\frac{\sum D^2 - \frac{(\sum D)^2}{N}}{N(N-1)}}$$

## FINDINGS

### Pretest

Before applying local wisdom-based learning model, students' writing narrative text was pretested before the learning model was applied. From the results of the pretest obtained, the highest score is 73 and the lowest is 27. The mean score is 53.54, it was categorized **bad**, the median score is 53.89 and the mode score is 53.84. For more details the students' writing narrative text before taught by local wisdom-based learning model is detailed in range of 27-34 is 2 students (8%), 35-42 is 0 students (0%), 43-50 is 5 students (20%), 51-58 is 13 students (52%), 59-66 is 2 students (8%), and ranges from 67 to 74 is 3 students (12%). The biggest frequency is in the range of score 51-58 is 13 students or 52%.

Furthermore, the researcher describe the students' writing narrative text based on the indicators, as follows:

a. The students' ability in writing content before using local wisdom-based learning models got average 17.16 which was included to **fair to poor** category.

b. The students' ability in writing organization before using local wisdom-based learning model got average 16.0 which was included to **good** category.

c. The students' ability in vocabulary before using local wisdom-based learning model got average 10.64 which was included to **fair to poor** category.



d. The students' grammar mastery before using local wisdom-based learning model got average 11.8 which was included to **fair to poor** category.

e. The students' ability in mastering mechanics got average 3.08 which was included to **fair to poor** category.

From the description of the results of the pretest it is clear that the students' writing narrative text is still low. Therefore must be improved to be better by using appropriate model namely the local wisdom-based learning model.

## Posttest

After applying the local wisdom-based learning model, the results of the post-test obtained, the highest score is 89 and the lowest score is 75. The mean score is 82.54, it was categorized **very good**, the median score is 78.5 and the median score is 77.3.

From the table above, the range of score 75-76 is 5 students (20%), range 77-78 is 1 person (4%), 79-80 is 4 students (16%), 81-82 is 5 students (20 %), 83-84 is none (0%), 85-68 is 2 students (8%), 87-88 is 2 students (8%) and 89-90 is 6 students (24%). The biggest frequency is in range of 89-90, there are 6 students or 24%. This clearly shows that there is a significant difference with the score before using the local wisdom-based learning model.

Next the researcher describes the students' writing narrative text based on the indicators as follows:

a. The students' ability in writing content after using local wisdom-based learning model got average 26.12 which was included to **good** category.

b. The students' ability in writing organization after using local wisdom-based learning model got average 17.84 which was included to **excellent** category.

c. The students' ability in vocabulary after using local wisdom-based learning model got average 16.0 which was included to **good** category.

d. The students' grammar mastery after using local wisdom-based learning model got average 18.72 which was included to **good** category.

e. The students' ability in mastering mechanics after using local wisdom-based learning model got average 4.0 which was include to **good** category.

Based on the description of each indicators above shows that the highest indicator score is the organization/structure of the text which categorized **excellent**. The students' writing narrative text significantly changed after taught by local wisdom-based learning model.

From the results of the calculation above, it was found that the results of t-observed is 17.63. While the sample number is 25 people, where  $N = 25$  people, so  $(N) - 1 = 24$  people. So the t-observed score at the level of 5% is 2.04. After finding the calculation results, the t-observed and t-table scores are compared. The results show that t-observed is higher than t-table ( $17.63 > 2.04$ ).

Results of hypothesis testing above shows that the results of students' writing narrative text after taught by local wisdom-based learning model is higher than before. In other words, the proposed alternative hypothesis is accepted.

## DISCUSSION

Research result show that there is a significant effect of the using of local wisdom-based learning model on students' writing narrative text in Institut Pendidikan Tapanuli Selatan. Previously researcher has collected data before applying the local wisdom-based learning model



(pretest). The results showed that students' writing narrative text in Institut Pendidikan Tapanuli Selatan was still low. After applying the local wisdom-based learning model, the students' writing narrative text significantly changed.

The low ability previously caused by the lack of interest and knowledge in writing narrative text. This is caused by the learning model that has been applied is considered inappropriate to make students are interested, enthusiasm and increasing students' knowledge about writing narrative text. So, students assume that writing narrative text is very difficult and uninteresting.

Overcoming this problem, researcher offers solution by applying learning model that is considered to improve students' ability in writing. Local wisdom based learning model is applied to improve students' writing narrative text. As explained before that learning model plays an important role to make teaching and learning process be successful, so that the lecturer or teacher must be able to choose the appropriate learning model in teaching.

Local wisdom is a wisdom which has good values that are believed, applied and maintained in a long period of time and inherited from generation to generation in certain regions. Local wisdom-based learning according to Rahyono (2009), has strategic functions include: 1) local wisdom as forming identity, 2) not a foreign value for the owner, 3) emotional involvement in the appreciation of strong local wisdom, 4) able to grow prestige, 5) improve the dignity of the nation. In short local wisdom based learning can encourage students to be more active, cultured, and able to socialize in their communities.

In line with the previous research by Mimi Mulyani (2011) entitled "Writing Learning Model Based on Character-Based Local Wisdom (Quasi-Experimental Study in Magelang 2 Public Middle School students)" which shows that the local wisdom-based learning model that is applied to teach junior high students' writing skill. This is caused by positive values contained in local wisdom and easy for students to get the inspiration to write from their own local culture that has been recognized previously. Thus, the application of local wisdom-based learning model has a significant effect on students' writing narrative text in Institut Pendidikan Tapanuli Selatan.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the research described previously, researcher can draw conclusions as follows: 1) the students' writing narrative text before local wisdom-based learning model is 53.54 or in the bad category. Then, the students' writing ability after using local wisdom-based learning models is 82.54 or in the very good category, 2) there is a significant effect of using local wisdom-based learning model on students' writing narrative text which can be seen from the calculation of t-observed is higher than t-table ( $17.63 > 2.04$ ). In other words, the research hypothesis is accepted.

## REFERENCES

- Arikunto, Suharsimi (2009). *Manajemen Penelitian*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Fraenkel, J. R., Norman E. W., & Helen H. H. (2006). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education (Eighth Edition)*. New York: Mc. Graw Hill Companies, Inc.
- Gerot, Linda and Peter Wignell. (1995). *Making Sense of Functional Grammar*. Sidney: Gerd Strabler.



- Graham, S., & Karen R. Harris. (2005). Improving the writing performance of young struggling writers. *Journal of Special Education*, 39, 1.
- Herlina. (2012). Developing Reading Narrative Text Materials for Eighth Graders of Junior High School Implemented With Character Building. *English Education Journal, EEJ* 2 (2)
- Hughes, Arthur. (2003). *Testing for Language teachers. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition*. United of Kingdom: Cambridge.
- Kellogg, R. T., T. Olive & A. Piolat. (2007). *Acta Psychologica*, 124.
- Meyers, Allan. (2005). *Gateways to Academic Writing: Effective Sentences Paragraph and Essay*. New York: Longman.
- Mulyani, Mimi. (2011). Model Pembelajaran Menulis Berbasis Kearifan Lokal yang Beorientasi Pendidikan Karakter. *Jurnal Pena, Vol. 1 No. 1 Desember*.
- Nurdiyantoro, Burhan. (2010). *Penilaian Pembelajaran Bahasa Berbasis Kompetensi*. Yogyakarta: BPFY-Yogyakarta.
- Rahyono. (2009). *F.X Kearifan Budaya dalam Kata*. Jakarta: Wedatama Widyastra.
- Rukmini, Dwi. (2010). *Evaluating A Text for A Model*. Semarang: Unnes Press.
- Sibarani, R. (2012). *Kearifan Lokal, Hakikat, Peran, dan Metode Tradisi Lisan*. Jakarta: Asosiasi Tradisi Lisan.
- Sugiyono, (2013). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: Penerbit Alfabeta.