

THE COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF STUDENTS' WRITING ABILITY BETWEEN RECOUNT TEXT AND DESCRIPTIVE TEXT AT SMAN 18 MAKASSAR

Dewi Astari Putry Utami¹, Hj. Nurfaizah Sahib², Ulfah Syam³

¹²³English Language Education Department, Bosowa University, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

This writing aims to analysis the difference between students' ability in writing recount text and descriptive text at SMAN 18 Makassar (comparative analysis). The population of this writing was the tenth-grade students of SMAN 18 Makassar at the first semester 2021/2022 academic year. The writer took 270 students as population. The data were obtained from the writing text. The writer choose of class X IPA 3 and the writer took 30 students as a sample. The results of the writing used inferential analysis of t-test by SPSS v.16. It showed that there was a significant difference in the students' mean score writing ability between recount text and descriptive text. The mean score of the students' writing test recount text is 82.20 while descriptive text is 76.43. The significance value calculated 0.014 is smaller than 0.05 (P-value = 0.014 < 0.05). Therefore, the hypothesis of these writing was accepted. It means that, there were a Comparative difference of Students' Writing Ability Between Recount Text and Descriptive Text at SMAN 18 Makassar. The writer concluded, that the students are easier to express ideas, understanding, composed and write a recount text than descriptive text. Based the results above, the writer can difference between students' ability in writing recount text and descriptive text at SMAN 18 Makassar (comparative analysis).

Keywords: Recount Text and Descriptive Text, Writing Ability, Comparative Analysis.

INTRODUCTION

The writing can be one of communication tools in the text and the writer is used to apply their thoughts in the written form, can suppose their ideas, meanings, and any other understanding in writing form. Writing abilities are different from other skills which is all thoughts and ideas are expressed in written form. Writing can be called good writing if it has unity among the ideas in it. Then, coherence is the arrangement and relationship between ideas in the paragraph. The aspect was very important to produce good writing. Sometimes students have difficulty interpreting, differentiating, comparing and understanding the meaning of text in sentences because the vocabulary they have is still lacking. It is supported by Meyers (2005:2) who defines: writing is a way to produce language you do naturally when you speak. Writing is speaking to other on paper or on a computer screen. Writing is also an action a process of discovering and organizing your ideas, putting them on a paper and reshaping and revising them.

THE ACADEMIC

Journal of English Language Education
ISSN: 2528-3677; E-ISSN: XXXX-XXXX

Volume 6 No. 2 December 2021

Sometimes, the students were difficult to find their ideas, not understand what should they do, just ask to write based on topic in the text book without checking their ability in mastery aspect of writing, difficult in composing sentences well in their writing in a succinct manner, difficulty to compare between the structure of one with another in a paragraph, they cannot faster to get information of the text, and probably they think learning English is difficult especially in writing. It can happen because the students have lacking vocabulary. So that, their confused to starting the write. This is evident when students write, they do not consider correct grammar and proper punctuation. Thus, students should think clearly to make a good writing. Students are not forced to make their own writing. It keeps students low in writing. In relation to learning difficulties, according Abdurrahman (2003: 9) In Indonesia, there is no standard definition of learning difficulties. The teachers generally view all students who get low learning achievement as students with learning difficulties.

In this writing, the writer compared two kinds of text in writing test. The purpose of this research is how the difference between the both text and which text is more effective to used writing test. The first text was recount text that retell of story in the past with the structure and features that determine it, the purpose of recount text is to entertain the reader and recount text using past tense. The main point of recount text is to make the student active learning writing and improve their knowledge and their vocabulary. The second text that used for comparison is descriptive text. Descriptive text was one of kind of writing text that description about subject, people, place or other. Also have structure and features but this text using simple past. In this case, there are some different between the both text such as: recount text focused on the retell story and using simple past whereas descriptive text focused on characteristic of text and using simple present tense.

The writer was compared students' ability in writing recount text and descriptive text in writing test because of from the background above we can see the difficulties of students in writing recount text and descriptive text. The researcher is interested to find out the difference between the both text in writing test and also the researcher interested to do the research in SMAN 18 Makassar because the text makes the students confused to difference of the text both.

Based of explanation above, the writer can conclude that the writing as a basic communication, and the student have a several difficult to write a good writing especially recount text and descriptive text. So, the writer can compare the different of students writing ability between recount text and descriptive text.

METHOD OF THE RESEARCH

The research design used a comparative design with mix method to understanding the material about recount text and descriptive text with two variables and one sample. Two variables are recount text and descriptive text while one sample is one class. It is intended to see how the students' writing ability in comparative between recount text and descriptive text. The first step to apply this method is quantitative process by calculating and collecting students results in writing recount text and descriptive text. This writer carried out at SMAN 18 Makassar at the first semester 2021/2022 academic year. The writer took second meeting. The research time took place in August - September 2021. The population of research were tenth-grade students of SMAN 18 Makassar at the first semester 2021/2022 academic year. The total of this population were 309 students. The writer took the students from class X IPA 3 randomly as the sample. In this research the writer took 30 students as a sample. In this test, the questions were in the form of an essay, consisting of two numbers, the first question is making a recount text about holiday. While, the second question is making a descriptive text about tourist attraction and each question may have more than 150 words. the question that will be made by students are personal recount text and descriptive text. This test was giving to students only once in one meeting, the writer gives at one two questions related with the title of the research, namely about recount text and descriptive text. The writer gives test for students so that can see the results of writing students. Then, the writer can compare the students' writing ability between recount text and descriptive text and to see whether the students' writing ability gave a significant different or not.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The findings of this writing present the results of writing recount text and descriptive text. These findings related to the writing text scores and classifications. The previously mentioned, students' writing ability were assessed from students' observations of the lessons presented. The results of the writing ability about recount text and descriptive text gave to students of SMAN 18 Makassar. Data was calculated based on the results of the writing ability about recount text and descriptive text. The writer conducted observations and tests during the research activities in this chapter.

Table 1 Rate Frequency (F) and Percentage (P) of The Students Score in Recount Text and Descriptive Text in Content.

No	Classification	Score	Recount Text		Descriptive Text	
			F	P	F	P
1	Very good	30-27	9	30%	8	26,66%

THE ACADEMIC

Journal of English Language Education
ISSN: 2528-3677; E-ISSN: XXXX-XXXX

Volume 6 No. 2 December 2021

2	Good	26-22	14	46,66%	7	23,33%
3	Fair	21-17	7	23,33%	12	40%
4	Poor	16-13	-	-	3	10%
Total			30	100%	30	100%

The writer found that in the recount text, the students has understanding and easy to write text. While, in the descriptive text there were three students classified as a poor because the students were confused and understanding to write text. These results show that there is a comparative in the students' writing ability in content.

Table 2 Rate Percentage (P) and Frequency (F) of The Students Score in Recount Text and Descriptive Text in Organization

No	Classification	Score	Recount Text		Descriptive Text	
			F	P	F	P
1	Very good	20-18	11	36,66%	8	26,66%
2	Good	17-14	18	60%	21	70%
3	Fair	13-10	1	3,33%	1	3,33%
4	Poor	9-7	-	-	-	-
Total			30	100%	30	100%

The writer found that in the recount text, the students were organized their idea into the text, but in the descriptive text only 8 students get classified as a very good. Thats mean, the students had difficulty in organizing their idea into the text.

Table 3 Rate Percentage (P) and Frequency (F) of The Students Score in Recount Text and Descriptive Text in Vocabulary

No	Classification	Score	Recount Text		Descriptive Text	
			F	P	F	P
1	Very good	20-18	13	43,33%	10	33,33%
2	Good	17-14	11	36,66%	7	23,33%
3	Fair	13-10	5	16,66%	10	33,33%
4	Poor	9-7	1	3,33%	3	10%
Total			30	100%	30	100%

The writer found that in the recount text, the students were easier to choosing a vocabulary, but in the descriptive text, the students still had difficulty

in choosing vocabulary. This result shows that there is an improvement in the students, writing ability in vocabulary.

Table 4 Rate Percentage (P) and Frequency of The Students Score in Recount Text and Descriptive Text in Language Use/Grammar.

No	Classification	Score	Recount Text		Descriptive Text	
			F	P	F	P
1	Very good	25-22	10	33,33%	10	33,33%
2	Good	21-18	15	50%	8	26,66%
3	Fair	17-11	5	16,66%	11	36,66%
4	Poor	10-5	-	-	1	3,33%
Total			30	100%	30	100%

The writer found in the recount text, most the students can make a good text, but in the descriptive text, only 8 the students can make a good text. These results shows that there a comparative students of writing ability in grammar.

Table 5 Rate Percentage (P) and Frequency (F) of The Students Score in Recount Text and Descriptive Text in Mechanics.

No	Classification	Score	Recount Text		Descriptive Text	
			F	P	F	P
1	Very good	5	10	33,33%	11	36,66%
2	Good	4	15	50%	6	20%
3	Fair	3	5	16,66%	10	33,33%
4	Poor	2	-	-	3	10%
Total			30	100%	30	100%

The writer found in the recount text, the students can mastery of conviction but in the descriptive text, most the students writing was dominated by errors of spelling. These results shows that there is a comparative of the students writing ability in mechanics.

Table 6 Rate Percentage (P) and Frequency (F) of The Students Score in the Five Components Observed.

No	Classification	Score	Recount Text		Descriptive Text	
			F	P	F	P
1	Excellent	91-100	9	30%	8	26,66%
2	Good	76-90	13	43,33%	8	26,66%
3	Average	61-75	7	23,33%	8	26,66%

4	Poor	51-60	1	3,33%	5	16,66
5	Very poor	0-50	-	-	1	3,33%
Total			30	100%	30	100%

The writer found in the recount text, most the students can be got an excellent and good score. But in the descriptive text, most the students got a low score like poor classification. These result shows that there is comparative of students writing ability in five components observed.

After conducting the students' recount text and descriptive text score in writing test class, the writer used a t-test for the hypothesis test. The T-test is a test to measure whether or not there is a significant difference between the results of the students' mean score in the recount text and descriptive text. By using inferential analysis of t-test or test of significance run by SPSS Version 16, the significant differences can be easier to analyze.

In this research, the Null hypothesis (H_0) stated that there is not the comparative between students writing ability in English at the tenth-grade of SMAN 18 Makassar at the first semester 2021/2022 academic year. While, the Alternative hypothesis (H_1) state that there is the comparative between students writing ability in English at the tenth-grade of SMAN 18 Makassar at the first semester 2021/2022 academic year. If the value of significance is 2 or sig. (2-tailed) lower than 0,05, H_1 accepted and H_0 rejected.

Table. 4.9 The Result t-test

		Paired Differences					T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Recount text - Descriptive text	5.7666	12.093	2.207	1.2508	10.282	2.612	29	.014

The result of the t-test stated that sig. (2-tailed) was 0,014. The result provided that the sig. (2-tailed) the table was lower than the level of significance. So, the alternative hypothesis (H_1) was accepted and the null hypothesis (H_0) was rejected. It means that there is the comparative between students writing ability in English at the tenth-grade of SMAN 18 Makassar at the first semester 2021/2022 academic year.

DISCUSSION

From the findings, it's clear that there was significant difference of the students' recount text and descriptive text, it showed that the recount test of students was understood, interested, creative, and easier to showed their ideas compared descriptive text in writing ability especially for five components (Content, Organization, Vocabulary, Grammar and Mechanics). Therefore, the writer took concluded that the writer can compare the difference of writing skills students between recount text and descriptive text.

Content: The students were the categories of very good (30-27) was knowledge, substantive, relevant to assigned topic. The categories of good (26-22) was some knowledge of subject, adequate range, mostly relevant to topic but lacks detail. The categories of fair (21-17) were limited knowledge, little substance, Inadequate development of the main idea. The categories of poor (16-13) were does not show knowledge of subject, substance, not enough to evaluate. The writer concluded that in content score, the students has understanding and easy to write text. While, in the descriptive text there were three students classified as a poor because the students were confused and understanding to write text. These results show that there was comparative in the students' writing ability in content.

Organization: The students' categories of very good (20-18) were Fluent expression, ideas clearly stated and supported, well-organized, logical sequencing. The categories of good (17-14) were somewhat choppy, loosely organized but minimum ideas stand out, limited support, logical but incomplete sequencing. The categories of fair (13-10) were non-fluent, ideas confused or disconnected. The categories of poor (9-7) were does not communicate, no organization, not enough to evaluate. The writer concluded that in organization score, the students were organized their idea into the text, but in the descriptive text only 8 students get classified as a very good. Thats mean, the students had difficulty in organizing their idea into the text.

Vocabulary: The students' categories of very good (20-18) were sophisticated range, effective word/idiom choice and usage. The categories of good (17-14) were adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom, choice, and usage out meaning not occurred. The categories of fair (13-10) were limited range, frequent errors of word/idiom from choice, and usage. The categories of poor (9-7) were essential translation, little knowledge of English vocabulary. The students score in vocabulary, the students were easier to choosing a vocabulary, but in the descriptive text, the students still had difficulty in choosing vocabulary. This result shows that there is an improvement in the students, writing ability in vocabulary.

Grammar: The students' categories of very good (25-22) were effective complex construction. The categories of good (21-18) were effective but simple construction. The categories of fair (17-11) were mayor problems in sample /complex construction. The categories of poor (10-5) were virtually no mastery

of sentence construction rules. The students score in language use/grammar, most the students can make a good text, but in the descriptive text, only 8 the students can make a good text. These results shows that there a comparative students of writing ability in grammar.

Mechanics: The students' categories of very good (5) were demonstrate mastery of convictions. The categories of good (4) were occasional errors of spelling, punctuation capitalization. The categories of fair (3) were frequent errors of spelling, punctuation capitalization. The categories of poor (2) were no mastery of connections, dominated by errors of spelling. Capitalization paragraphing. The students score in mechanics, the students can mastery of conviction but in the descriptive text, most the students writing was dominated by errors of spelling. These results shows that there is a comparative of the students writing ability in mechanics.

The statistical analysis of the students' writing ability showed that from their recount text score, 9 students (30%) classified as excellent, 13 students (43,33%) classified as a good, 7 students (23,33%) classified as an average, 1 student (3,33%) classified as a poor and none of the students were classified as a very poor. While in the descriptive text, 8 students (26,66%) were classified excellent, good and average, 5 students (16,66%) classified as a poor and 1 student (3,33%) classified as a very poor. There some students not chance classification because their vocabulary is still less and it was difficult to make the sentence into a paragraph, and the students the recount text the score is higher more than in descriptive text is low.

The result of the t-test analysis show that there was a significant between the result of recount text and descriptive text. The mean score at the recount text is 82,20 and classified good. While, the total mean score at descriptive test is 76,43 and classified as fair. It means that the students' writing skill in writing was effect significantly that difference between recount text and descriptive text. The result of t-test stated that Sig. (2-tailed) was 0,014. The result provided that the Sig. (2-tailed) table was lower than level of significance. This result means that there was a significant different between the result recount text and descriptive text.

In addition, after doing research the writer found, the writing test there are some advantages is there is the students quickly to understand the meaning of the questions. They are also more active during the writing test process. However, the writing test has disadvantages is the students of lack of vocabulary and difficulty to translate Indonesian language to English. So that, the story who students make achievement 150 word.

Although there are obstacles encountered during the research process, the recount text and descriptive text writing tests have many benefits. Therefore, referring to the results above, it can be said that in this research, there is a comparison of students' abilities in writing recount text and descriptive text. The

students of class X IPA 3 of SMAN 18 Makassar got good achievements in writing recount text and descriptive text ability.

Based explanation of discussion above, the writer found the comparative of students writing ability between recount text and descriptive text. which, the students easier to write a good recount text than descriptive text, it's looks from the different of five component score (content, organization, grammar, vocabulary and mechanics).

CONCLUSION

The result of conducting the students' recount text and descriptive text scores in the writing test class, the writer used a t-test for the hypothesis test. The result of the t-test stated that Sig. (2-tailed) was 0,014. The result provided that the Sig. (2-tailed) the table was lower than the level of significance. Therefore, the alternative hypothesis (H_1) was accepted and the null hypothesis (H_0) was rejected. The population of the writing were tenth grade students of SMAN 18 Makassar at the first semester 2021-2022 academic year and the total of this population were 309 students. While the sample of this writing were 30 students and the writer took the students from class X IPA 3. It also, the writer concluded that the data of students showed that: In recount text: the students are more understanding and easier to write recount. The students more were interesting and happy when write recount text, have a good writing like the writing test were construct, complete and organized. The students easy to found the idea. Based explanation above the writer showed the score of five component in recount text: 9 students (30%) classified as an excellent, 13 students (43,33%) classified as a good, 7 students (23,33%) classified as an average, 1 student (3,33%) classified as a poor and there are no the students classified as a very poor. In descriptive text: the students difficult to found idea because lack of vocabulary. So that, the result of writing test students not much. The students not interest to write descriptive text and have a bad writing test. The writer showed the score of five component in descriptive text: 8 students (26,66%) classified as an excellent, 8 students (26,66%) classified as a good, 8 students (26,66%) classified as an average, 5 students (16,66%) classified as a poor and 1 student (3,33%) classified as a very poor. Based the explanation above the writer concluded that the population of the writing were tenth grade students of SMAN 18 Makassar at the first semester 2021-2022 academic year and the total of this population were 309 students. While the sample of this writing were 30 students and the writer took the students from class X IPA 3. There is the different writing ability of students in write recount text and descriptive text. According the score of five component in recount text are 9 students (30%) classified as an excellent, 13 students (43,33%) classified as a good and there is no student get classified as a very poor. Meanwhile in descriptive text are 8 students (26,66%) classified as an excellent, 8 students (26,66%) classified as a good and 1 student get classified as a very poor.

THE ACADEMIC

Journal of English Language Education
ISSN: 2528-3677; E-ISSN: XXXX-XXXX

Volume 6 No. 2 December 2021

REFERENCE

- Ade, D. J. (2019). *Students' Writing Ability in English Descriptive Text Grade VIII in SMPN 33Padang*. Politeknik Raflesia, 3 (1), 80-81
- Agusta, K. Yohanes, B. M., & Ita P. S., (2020). *Kesulitan Belajar Menulis Pada Siswa Kelas II Sekolah Dasar*. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar Perkhasa*, 6 (2), 141-142
- Allieni, H., Mohd. A., Desmawati, R. (2014). *An Analysis of Students' Difficulties in Writing Recount Text at tenth grade of SMAN N 1 Sungai limau*. Journal. Vol, 2 No.3
- Arbi, S. (2020). *Alasan Mengapa Menulis Itu Penting dan Manfaat Menulis*. Bahan Ajar KTI Fung, 1-4.
- Bela, P. M., Endang, K. & Siti, S. F. (2019). *Analyzing Students' Ability in Using the Language Features in Writing Descriptive Text*. *Research in English and Education Journal*. Vol, 4 No. 4. 184-185.
- Blanka, F. K. (2013), *The Importance of Writing*. Universitas of Hradec Kralove, Vol, 2 No. 1. (9)
- Erikson, S. & Elizabeth, H. & Meiliana, S. & Sonia, S. & Yesinta P. (2019). *Comparative Analysis of Male and Female in Writing Recount Text*. Journal. Vol. 10 No. 2. Hal. 65 & 66.
- Eukharistia, N. (2017). *An Analysis of Errors in Simple Present Past Tense in RTS Written by Eighth Grade Students of SMP Pangudi Luhur 1 Yogyakarta*. Universitas Sanat Yogyakarta. Thesis (10).
- Fatimatuz, Z. N. (2015). *Improving Students' Writing Ability in Recount Text by Using Cooperative Integrated Reading a Composition*, Thesis. 21.
- Gadis, S. S & Kammer S. (2018). *An Error Analysis of Using Phrases in Writing Recount Text at Tenth Grade in SMA Parulian 2 Medan*. A journal of culture, English Language, Teaching and Literature. Vol. 18 No.1
- Harris, A., Ansyar, M., & Radjab, D. (2014). *An Analysis of Students' difficulties in Writing Recount Text at Tenth Grade of SMA N 1 Sungai Limau*. *English Language Teaching (Elt)*, 2(3).
- Mardiana, H. (2018). *A Comparative Study ON Teaching Writing in Recount Text by Using Interactive Writing and Guided Writing Techniques at SMPN 2 Lanrisang Pinrang*. State Islamic Institute (IAIN) Parepare. Skripsi.
- Muhammad, A. R & Rahmawati. (2015). *Perbandingan Hasil Belajar Siswa Dengan dan Tanpa Menggunakan Alat Peraga Dalam Memahami Konsep Segitiga Di Kelas VII MTS Siti Mariam Banjarmasin Tahun Pelajaran 2013/2014*. *Skripsi, JPM IAIN Antasari*. Vol 03 No. 01. 69-71
- Ni, P. E. F. D, Nengah, M. & Wayan, W. (2016). *Kesulitan Belajar Keterampilan Menulis Cerita Pendek Siswa Kelas IXC SMP Negeri 3 Singaraja Tahun Pelajaran 2016/2017*. E-journal Prodi Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia, Undiksha. Vol 5 No. 3. (7-10)
- Nugrahaini, A. (2016). *The Power of Two Strategy and the Mastery of Recount Text Classroom Action Research in the Tenth Grade Students of MA Al-Manar Tangerang in the Academic Year of 2015/2016*, Thesis. (10).

THE ACADEMIC

Journal of English Language Education
ISSN: 2528-3677; E-ISSN: XXXX-XXXX

Volume 6 No. 2 December 2021

- Oktavianus, B. K. (2017). *The Effect of Field Trip as A Medium for Developing Students' Writing Skill of Descriptive Text at SMP Negeri 35 Makassar*. Skripsi, Tidak Diterbitkan. Universitas Bosowa Makassar.
- Rini, K. N., Nurli S., & Sylvia R. (2019). *Meningkatkan Keterampilan Menulis Tegas Bersambung Dengan Menggunakan Metode Drill Pada Siswa Kelas I SD*. *Journal of Elementary Education*, 02 (01), 21-22.
- Risky, G. (2020). *Descriptive Text: Pengertian, Purpose, Dan Structure*. (Online). Kompas.com. 26/10/2020, 1.
- Rizqi, C. W., Nursalim., Fadlia, R. S. (2019). *Students Ability in Constructing Paragraph of Recount Text*. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa*. Vol. 6 No. 1. Hal 34.
- Sri, R. S., & Nursahara, (2020). *Students' Ability in Writing Description Text*. Vol, 8 No. 01. (83).
- Valerie, P., Astrid, M.& Barbar, B. (2017). *Qualitative Comparative Analysis as An Evaluation Tool: Lessons from An Application in Development Cooperation*. Sage Journal. Published August 28, 2017.
- Victoria, F., Robert, R., & Nina, H. (2017). *An Introduction to Language*, The United States of America. Vol. 11 No. 1. (2-5).