

Research Article**Effectiveness of Double Entry Journals Strategies Learning to Write Text Description ***Raden Ahyar PROBOGATI ¹  Kastam SYAMSI ² **Abstract**

The purpose of this study was to determine the learning strategies effective double entry to the teaching of writing journals description text in class VII student. This type of research is experimental research with a pretest-posttest group control research design. The isolation in this study was VII grade students of Pulosari 2 Public Middle School. The research sample was VII-E students and VII-B class students. The technique of collecting data using a written test is the skill of writing a descriptive text. The analysis technique is carried out using the t-test. The research found that 1) there are differences in effectiveness were significantly ability to write a text description of the students who take the learning to use the strategy of double-entry journals with students who take the learning do not use a strategy of double entry journals in class VII SMP Negeri 2 Pulosari. The results of t-test posttest experimental class and control class obtained t_{count} of 3,445 and p-value of 0,001. The p-value is smaller than the significance level of 5% ($p < 0,05$). 2) strategy double-entry journals are effectively applied in learning to write description text in class VII students of SMP Negeri 1 Pulosari. The results of the pretest t-test and experimental class test post which show the value of t_{count} of 10.650 and the p-value of 0,000.

Keywords: Learning strategies, double entry journals, writing, description text

1. INTRODUCTION

A language is a communication tool. Language as a communication tool can be done directly and indirectly. Direct in terms of communicating is to meet face to face with the communicant opponent. Humans in the process of communicating directly, more often use listening and speaking skills (Sejnost & Thiese, 2010). Whereas in the indirect communication process more often using reading and writing skills. According to Nurjamal, Warta, and Riadi (2011) revealed that there were four language skills, namely listening, speaking, reading and writing. Writing is a person's peak language ability after other language skills. This opinion is in line with the opinion of Iskandarwassid and Dadang (2009) revealing that writing skills are a form of manifestation of ability, and language skill that is most recently mastered after listening, speaking and reading skills. Writing is an activity to express one's thoughts, ideas, and feelings expressed in written language (Hyland, 2007). Writing is an activity to unite thoughts and feelings in the form of writing that is expected to be understood by the reader and serves as an indirect means of communication (Rosidi, 2009). Another opinion delivered by Cargill and O'Connor (2009) reveals that writing is a skill derived from any language, both from a conversation, dialogue, stories, from a spoken language which is then transformed into a skill in written form.

Received Date: 11/04/2019

Accepted Date: 17/07/2019

***To cite this article:** Probogati, R. A. & Syamsi, K. (2019). Effectiveness of double entry journals strategies learning to write text description. *International e-Journal of Educational Studies (IEJES)*, 3 (6), 167-173. DOI: 10.31458/iej.604879

¹ Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesian Language and Literature Education, den.ahyar@gmail.com

² Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Faculty of Language and Arts, Indonesia, kastam_syamsi@uny.ac.id

Corresponding Author e-mail address: den.ahyar@gmail.com

Writing skills are skills that must be mastered by students in learning Indonesian. This makes the teacher must make maximum efforts so that the learning objectives can be achieved properly. Learning student writing skills at junior high school class VII is one of them is writing a descriptive text. Description text aims to provide exposure, details in detail about the object so that it can provide emotional influence and create the imagination of the reader (Semi, 2007). In learning to write description text requires students to be careful, brave, thorough and knowledgeable. This is because students must observe objects carefully, precisely, easily imagined by the reader or listener, then respond to objects that are observed according to the knowledge they know. But in fact, not all students can show their abilities in writing a descriptive text. This makes students feel difficulty in developing their writing. The lack of good interaction between students and teachers will have a negative impact on students' writing skills.

The difficulty of writing description text experienced by students can be solved, is by applying learning strategies (Firkins, Forey, & Sengupta, 2007). Many types of learning strategies that can be used by teachers in carrying out learning in school for language issue in writing. However, not all suitable strategies are applied to convey certain conditions, one of which is to write description text. One of the learning strategies that can be used to teach writing description text is a double entry journals (DEJ) strategy (Ruddel, 2005). The strategy of double-entry journaling in Indonesian is referred to as a two-column journal is a record consisting of two columns, namely the left and right column. The left column is used to describe ideas, concepts, the core of the readings. The left column is useful for presenting students' understanding obtained from reading. The right column is a column for the processing which is called "cooking". Clark (2014) states that a double entry journals strategy is one strategy that can help students more easily conclude ideas, read ideas, and connect their understanding of reading with knowledge that has been known (written) before. Basically, this strategy uses 2 columns, the first column for writing notes, keywords, concept maps, and the second column is an explanation or development of a description of the concept that was written in the first column. In the double entry journals strategy there are stages that train students to gather information, make students careful, detail in writing, and express ideas widely. Then this strategy is appropriately applied in learning to write description text.

1.1. Aims of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the learning strategies effective double entry to the teaching of writing journals description text in class VII student.

2. METHOD

This research is quantitative research. The method used in this study was an experiment with the pretest-posttest control group design technique (Mcglynn & Kelly, 2018). The independent variable in the study is the application of double entry journals strategy, while the dependent variable is the skill of writing a descriptive text. The study population was VII grade students of Pulosari 2 Public Middle School, Pemalang District, Indonesian Country. The population in this study was all seventh-grade students of Pulosari 2 Public Middle School 2018/2019 academic year totaling 224 students. For the selection of samples of this study carried out by probability sampling technique, the type of simple random sampling obtained a random sample of 32 students. The samples were then divided into two groups where the first group received a double-entry journals strategy and the second group did not receive a double-entry journal. The research procedure was divided into 3 stages, 1) pre-experimental stage, 2) experimental stage, 3) post-experiment stage.

In pre-experimental stage, the two experimental groups were given initial tests before each treatment was given. In the experimental stage, the experimental group was treated with the application of a double entry journals learning strategy, while the control group received treatment using conventional strategies in learning to write description texts. In post-experiment stage, the two experimental groups were given the final test after each treatment was given. Data collection

techniques in this study used a test instrument. Tests used to measure students' writing text description skills both before and after being treated.

The purpose of this study was to know a significant difference between students who took part in writing a treatment-treated description using a double entry journals strategy with students who took part in writing a description without being treated using a double entry journals strategy. In addition, to test the effectiveness of the double entry journals strategy in learning to write descriptions for class VII students of SMP Negeri 2 Pulosari.

The instrument of data collection in this study is an assessment rubric to measure students' skills in writing a descriptive text. Test validity uses content validity through expert judgment. After the instrument is corrected by experts, then the reliability test is performed. Instrument reliability was obtained at 0.776, through Cronbach's Alpha and was declared reliable. The data analysis technique of this study uses the t-test but must go through the prerequisite test procedure first. Before carrying out data analysis, the data analysis prerequisite test namely, the normality test and variance homogeneity test. Data processing and calculation are assisted with the SPSS 21 program.

3. FINDINGS

This study developed a media convertible book based on a scientific approach in enhancing the understanding of concepts and character of environmental care with the theme "Love My Country" and the sub-theme "Utilization of Natural Property in Indonesian Country".

The results of this study are in the form of calculation of pretest scores and good posttest scores obtained from the experimental group and the control group. The number of research samples is 64 students. Comparison of statistical data on pretest scores and posttest scores for the control group and the experimental group are as follows.

Table 1. Comparison of statistical data pretest scores and post-test scores of experimental and control groups

Data	N	Lowest value	The highest score	Average
Experimental Pretest	32	50	75	62.53
Experimental Posttest	32	58	88	74.91
Pretest Control	32	50	80	65.31
Control Posttest	32	55	82	67.91

169

The results of the above analysis, the previous first performed the data analysis prerequisite test is a test of normality and homogeneity. Data said normal distribution if the value of $p > 0.05$ (with a significance level of 5%). The following is a summary of the results of the data distribution normality test for the ability to write descriptive text in the experimental group and the control group.

Table 2. Summary of normality test results from pretest data distribution and post text writing skills description

No.	Data	Sig (2-tailed)	Information
1	Experimental Pretest	0.200	Sig (p) > 0.05 = Normal
2	Experimental Posttest	0.200	Sig (p) > 0.05 = Normal
3	Pretest Control	0.200	Sig (p) > 0.05 = Normal
4	Control Posttest	0.200	Sig (p) > 0.05 = Normal

The test results normality of the distribution of data values pretest and posttest score writing skills description text experimental and control groups p -data has been obtained for 0.200 because it is $0.200 > 0.05$, meaning that the data is normally distributed. After a normality test, the homogeneity of the variance test was then carried out. The variance homogeneity test was carried out with the help of SPSS version 21.00 to determine whether or not there were differences in data variants. Data requirements are homogeneous if the value of $p > 0.05$ (with a significance level of 5%). The summary of the variance homogeneity

test the ability to write the description text of the experimental group and the control group can be seen in the following table.

Table 3. Summary of homogeneity test results distribution of pretest data and post text writing skills description

No.	Data	Levene Stat.	df	Sig.	Information
1	Pretest Value	0,471	62	0,302	Sig. (p) > 0.05 = Homogeneous
2	Postest Value	0,020	62	0,736	Sig. (p) > 0.05 = Homogeneous

The homogeneity test results from the distribution of pretest value data and posttest value writing skills in the experimental group description text and the control group have obtained data $p > 0.05$ which means that the data is declared homogeneous.

To measure the initial ability of each group, the pretest of writing description skills was carried out. The pretest in the form of a description test question writes a description text. From the data collection, the experimental group pretest values and the control group pretest scores were obtained. The value achieved by the experimental group obtained an average score of 62,53, the derivation standard was 6,242, the variance was 38.967, the lowest value was 50, and the highest score was 75. The value achieved by the control group obtained an average score of 65,31, a variance of 52,028, the lowest value of 52, and the highest score with a score of 80. Based on the results of the pretest it can be seen that the ability to write a description of the control group and experimental group is still not optimal.

If the pretest score of the experimental group and the control group produces the Sig. (2-tailed) of 0,104. The following is a t-test table from the pretest of the experimental group and the control group.

Table 4. Summary of t-test results data on pretest skills writing descriptions of experimental groups and control groups

Data	t _{count}	df	P	Information
Pretest value experimental and control groups	1,649	62	0.104	Sig. (p) > 0.05 = Significant

Based on the data above, it has been known (t) a count of 1,649 with df 62 and p values are 0,104. The value of $p > 0.005$, which is greater than the significance level of 5%. Thus, the results of the t-test showed no significant difference in the initial ability to write description text between the experimental group and the control group. This means that both groups have the same initial ability to learn to write description texts.

The experimental group in the implementation of writing descriptions was treated with a double entry journals learning strategy. While the control group k in learning to write descriptions using conventional strategies. Different treatment aims to determine the difference in the ability to write description text between the experimental group and the control group. Treatment in learning to write descriptions of the two groups was done 3 times.

After the two research groups finished doing three times the learning treatment, the next step was to measure the ability of each group, then the description writing skills were carried out. Posttest were carried out to obtain data to be analyzed in order to find out the differences in the learning outcomes of the description text writing skills in the two research subjects. Posttest in the form of description questions write description text. The posttest data obtained were then analyzed using the t-test obtained using the SPSS 21.0 0 program. Following is the t-test table of the posttest results of the experimental group and the control group.

Table 5. Summary of t-test results data on the pretest writing skills description of the control group and experiment group

Data	t _{count}	df	p	Information
Postest p-value experimental and control groups.	3,445	62	0.001	Sig. (p) < 0.05 = Not significant (there is a difference)

Based on the data in table 5, it is known that the amount of t_{count} is 3.445 with df 62 and the value of sig (p) equal to 0.001. p value $<0,005$ (5% significance level). Thus, the results of the t-test show that there is a significant difference in the ability to write the description text between the experimental group and the control group after being given treatment.

Furthermore, to test the differences in students' abilities when before and after treatment using the double entry journals and conventional learning strategies on the ability to write descriptions, calculations were made with the related sample t-test. The following table presents the results of the t-test calculation of the pretest and posttest scores of the experimental group and the control group.

Table 6. t-test results from pretest and post-test data writing skills for experimental group descriptions

Data	t_{count}	df	p	Information
Posttest p-value experimental and control groups	10,650	31	0,000	Sig. (p) <0.05 = Not significant (there is a difference)

From the table view above, it can be seen that the t-count is 10.650 with df 31 and the p -value is 0.000. The value of $p < 0.005$, the results of the t-test show that there is a significant difference in the writing text description skills in the experimental group students between before and after the treatment of the application of the double entry journals strategy. Based on the explanation above, learning to write descriptions uses a double entry journals strategy more effective than learning to write descriptions without using double entry journals. Thoreau (2016: 2) reveals that the double entry journals strategy is suitable for application in writing learning. Next, a table of t-test results for the pretest and posttest scores of the experimental group and the control group is presented.

Table 7. t-test results from pretest and post-test data writing skills for control group descriptions

Data	t_{count}	df	p	Information
The posttest value of the experimental group and the control group	2,010	31	0,053	Sig. (P) > 0.05 = significant(no difference)

Based on the table presented above, it can be seen that the amount of t-count is 2,010 with df 31 and the value of p amounting to 0,053. The value of $p > 0,005$, the results of the t-test showed that there was no significant difference in the writing text description skills in the control group students between before and after learning.

4. DISCUSSION and CONCLUSION

Based on data analysis and discussion, this research can be summarized as follows. (1) There is a difference in the ability to write text descriptions that are significant between students who are treated with learning using a double entry journals strategy with students who invite learning without using double entry journals strategy. The difference in the ability to write description text is indicated by the results of the t-test calculation for the posttest free sample of the experimental group and the control group posttest. The result of the calculation shows that t is equal to 3.445 with df 62 and a p -value of 0.001, meaning that the use values of $p < 0.005$. (2) Double-entry journals strategy effectively used in learning to write description text. Effectiveness of double entry journals strategy in learning to write description text indicated by the results of the t-test for the sample related between the pretest and posttest scores of the experimental group. The calculation results show that t count is equal to 10,650 with df 31 and p -value of 0,000. This means that use values p smaller than the significance level of 5% ($p < 0,005$). This shows that the double entry journals strategy effectively used in learning to write description text.

The effectiveness of the double-entry journal's strategy in learning to write description text in the experimental class1 can be seen after the experimental class has received treatment learning strategies. The posttest value of the ability to write experimental class description text1 which received treatment for this strategy experienced a higher increase compared to conventional strategies. It can be proved from the increase in the average pretest and posttest, as well as the significance value ($p < 0.05$)

of the strategy applied to the control class. Based on these results, it was shown that the double-entry journal's strategy was effectively used in learning to write description texts compared to conventional ones. This is relevant to the statement of Thoream (2016) revealing that the double-entry journal's strategy is suitable to be applied in learning writing. Antonanci & O'Callaghan (2011) states at the stage of applying double-entry strategy journals the teacher asks students to choose and respond to parts of the text, indirectly training students to be responsible, to argue, and to develop a broader understanding, focus on things and build understanding the new one. So that it can make students more active in writing with critical thinking.

The DEJ strategy is effective in writing learning, especially in learning to write description texts. In the use of this double-entry journals strategy, students become more creative with the columns provided. Students write in the right column where the column is a translation of what has been written previously in the form of concepts, points, notes, observations in the form of word groupings, as well as images in the left column. In the process of processing written concepts, students observe, add, and develop their ideas. In this right column students can collaborate, which means that students move and develop ideas for essays written in a systematic manner, besides that with the left column, which is useful to record, important things, which will later be material to be explained, it makes students becoming increasingly critical, students become increasingly focused, directed at writing and helping students remember concepts to be elaborated according to their ideas. From that, it unconsciously trains students to be responsible. Same with the statement of Hsieh (2012) which said by using the double-entry journal's strategy, students became more critical, directed, and gave the opportunity for students to think as broad as possible and train students responsibly

The implications of this study theoretically show that a double entry journals strategy effectively used in learning to write descriptions. Therefore, to improve writing skills, a double entry journal strategy can be used as an alternative learning strategy by the teacher in the process of learning Indonesian in school, especially the skill of writing a descriptive text. Based on the conclusions and implications above, there are several suggestions as an effort to improve the ability to write student descriptions, namely as follows. (1) Strategy for double entry journals can be used as an alternative learning strategy for teachers in learning to write descriptions. (2) It should be further research hit double-entry journals strategy in writing learning in addition to the description text. Instead, further research may be conducted on learning to write descriptions of texts using strategies other than double-entry journals.

5. REFERENCES

- Antonanci, P.A. & O'Callaghan, C.M. (2011). *Developing content area literacy*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE.
- Clark, S. K. (2014). *Writing strategies for science*. Huntington Beach, CA: Shell Education Publication, Inc.
- Cargill, M & O'Connor, P. (2009). *Writing scientific research articles strategy and steps*. Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Firkins, A., Forey, G., & Sengupta, S. (2007). Teaching writing to low proficiency EFL students. *ELT Journal*, 61(4), 341-352.
- Hsieh, B. (2012). Challenging characters: learning to reach inward and outward from characters who face oppression. *English Journal*, 102 (1), 48-51
- Hyland, K. (2007). Genre pedagogy: Language, literacy and L2 writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(3), 148-164.
- Iskandarwassid & Dadang, S. (2009). *Strategi pembelajaran bahasa*. Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya.

- Mcglynn, K & Kelly, J (2018). Demistifying reading in the science classroom. *Science Scope*, 42 (3), 14-21.
- Nurjamal, D., Warta, S., & Riadi, D. (2011). *Terampil berbahasa*. Bandung: Alfabeta CV.
- Ruddell, M. R. (2005). *Teaching content reading and writing*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons. Inc.
- Rosidi, I. (2009). *Menulis siapa takut?*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius
- Sejnost, R. L. & Thiese, S. M. (2010). *Building content literacy strategies for the adolescent learner*. USA: Library Congress Catalog in Publication Data.
- Semi, A. (2007). *Dasar-dasar keterampilan menulis*. Bandung: Angkasa.
- Thoream, H. D. (2016). Double entry journal for walden. *Language Arts and Writing*. 3, 66-74.