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**Abstract**

The direction of the research is to prove whether the discovery learning method can improve the students competence in writing descriptive text or not. The subject is the tenth grade students of MA Nurul Hidayah Batujajar which consist of 16 students. The researcher conducted 2 cycles of classroom action research as the research method. Each cycle comprised pre-test, two meetings for treatment and post-test. In collecting data, the researcher used test and non-test. From the data taken, the result tends to be satisfied. During teaching learning process, the students tend to become active participants. The results of the research showed that the students are more confident in writing descriptive text and know what to write. Furthermore, there are some improvements in their test scores which are the mean score of post-test1 in cycle one (5.65) is higher than the mean score of pretest (4.03) and the mean score of post-test2 in cycle two (6.72) is higher than the mean score of post-test1 in cycle one. From the results of the research, it can be summarized that using discovery learning method can improve the students’ writing descriptive text.
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**INTRODUCTION**

In learning a new language, there are four skills must be mastered by learners. Listening and reading as receptive skills while speaking and writing are productive skills. Writing is the one of those skills which most difficult to be mastered because we have to write what we speak into written words correctly according to social functions, language features and linguistic elements.

This is in line with Hyland’s theory (2004:4) in Wiyaka (2013) who says that writing is like a dancing, allows for creativity and the unexpected, established patterns often from the basis of any variations. Accordance with the affirmation we know that writing is not static but it has many variations in the choosing words until the structure of sentence. In writing the creativity in creating a text is needed. It will make the text more interesting and easy to be understanding. In addition, Meyer (2005:2) in Wiyaka (2013) writing is speaking to others on paper or on computer screen. It means that writing is like speaking with a form. Writing is giving information by letter. Besides, it is more organized and structured.

According to the 2013 curriculum, the students must be able to use and write a text based on the context. It is said that some kinds of text taught in senior high school for instance descriptive, announcement, recount and narrative text. Descriptive text is one of them which be taught in the first semester.

Writing is a process of making the words we speak to a written text on a paper. This is in the line with Keraf’s theory (2000) who says that in descriptive writing, the writer transfer the images, the feeling that writer experience to the reader. The writer tries them in order to readers can image or as if, they are also engaged on it.

Through pre-observation, the researcher observed that students had some difficulties in writing a descriptive text such as they were confused how to begin writing with, they lacked of vocabulary and they did not know how to make a correct sentence especially in the structure. They were also less motivation in the learning process it was shown when they had to write a descriptive text, they did not do it but instead talking to each other.

There are many influences students have those problems. The previous method is inappropriate used in this class. In addition, the schedule of the school they have, there are a lot of activities which should be divided thus when learning English in class, they are tired of and see or even just nod their head to what teacher said.

Based on the problems mentioned earlier, the researcher considers to propose the solution to solve those problems by implementing the discovery learning method in the classroom. According to Mendikbud (2013) in Prawerti (2014), discovery learning is: *“Metode Discovery Learning adalah teori belajar yang didefinisikan sebagai proses pembelajaran yang terjadi bila pelajar tidak disajikan dengan pelajaran dalam bentuk finalnya, tetapi diharapkan siswa mengorganisasi sendiri”.*

In addition, Schunk (2008) in Sofeny (2017) says that discovery learning is when student obtains knowledge by him/herself. It involves constructing and testing hypotheses rather than passively reading or listening to teacher presentations. Furthermore, Hosnan (2014), discovery learning model is a model to improve the way of the active students‘ learning by discovering and investigating themselves, so the result that will get is permanent and memorable in their mind, it is unforgettable to students. By using discovery learning, students are be able to think, analysis and try to solve their issues by themselves.

The researcher considers this method will be effective in improving writing especially writing descriptive text because it contain stimulus stage which can attract students’ motivation when begin a lesson by giving energizing or ice breaking. This method makes the students as learner-center which the students become more active in the learning process by exploring concepts and answering their own questions by testing and experiencing. It has some stages consists of stimulus stage, problem statement stage, data collection stage, data processing stage, verification stage, and generalization stage.

**METHOD**

This research was held at MA Nurul Hidayah Batujajar and the subject was tenth grade students which consist of 16 students. This research chose the tenth grade students because the researcher considered that they are in this age of level should to be able to write down a text different purpose depends on context correctly.

The adopted method in this research is classroom action research. According to Gregory, Kemmis and McTaggart in Argawati (2014) action research is used to refer to teacher initiated classroom investigation which seek to increase the teacher’s understanding of classroom teaching and learning, and to bring about change in classroom practices. The action research typically involves small-scale investigative projects in the teachers’ own classroom, and consists of a number of phases which often recur in cycles; planning, action, observation, and reflection are covered in one cycle.

For the data collection, the researcher used quantitative and qualitative data collections. Quantitative data relates to students’ writing scores that they took both in pre-test and in post-test. Qualitative data deals with any occurrences and changes happen during classroom activities. The researcher collected qualitative data by using observation.

The researcher adopted the assessment rubric of writing which adapted the analytical rubric from Brown (2007).

**Table 2.** The Assessment Rubric of Writing

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Aspect** | | | **Score** | **Performance Description** | | **Weighting** | |
| Content  (C)  30%  -Topic  -Details | | | 4 | The topic is complete and clear and the details are relating to the topic. | | 3 x | |
| 3 | The topic is complete and clear but the details are almost relating to the topic. | |
| 2 | The topic is complete and clear but the details are not relating to the topic | |
| 1 | The topic is not clear and the details are not relating to the topic | |
| Organization  (O)  20%  -Identification  -Description | | | 4 | Identification is complete and descriptions are arranged with proper connectives | | 2 x | |
| 3 | Identification is almost complete and descriptions are arranged with almost proper connectives | |
| 2 | Identification is not complete and descriptions are arranged with few misuse of connectives | |
| 1 | Identification is not complete and descriptions are arranged with misuse of connectives | |
| Grammar  (G)  20%  -Use present tense  -Agreement | | | 4 | Very few grammatical or agreement in accuracies | | 2 x | |
| 3 | Few grammatical or agreement inaccuracies but not affect on meaning | |
| 2 | Numerous grammatical or agreement inaccuracies | |
| 1 | Frequent grammatical or agreement inaccuracies | |
| Vocabulary  (V)  15% | | | 4 | Effective choice of words and word forms | | 1.5 x | |
| 3 | Few misuse of vocabularies, word forms, but not change the meaning | |
| 2 | Limited range confusing words and word forms | |
| 1 | Very poor knowledge of words, word forms, and not understandable | |
| Mechanics  (M)  15%  -Spelling  -Punctuation  -Capitulation | | | 4 | It uses correct spelling, punctuation, and capitalization | | 1.5 x | |
| 3 | It has occasional errors of spelling, punctuation, and capitalization | |
| 2 | It has frequent errors of spelling, punctuation, and capitalization | |
| 1 | It is dominated by errors of spelling, punctuation, and capitalizations | |
|  | 3C + 2O + 2G + 1.5V + 1.5M  40 | | |  | |
| Score = | x 10 | |

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Results**

In this part, the researcher presented the result of the use of discovery learning method to improve the students’ writing descriptive text at the tenth grade of MA Nurul Hidayah Batujajar. The research was conducted in two cycles. Each cycle consisted of these following steps; a) Cycle one: pretest, action/treatment (two meetings), post-test1, b) Cycle two: pretest2/post-test1, action/treatment (two meetings), post-test2.

Firstly, the students carried out a pretest to know how far the their competency in writing descriptive text. For the pretest, the researcher instructed the students to describe all about their seatmate in English. At least, the students write two paragraph which consist of five sentences. During pre-test, the researcher observed the students and they seemed like difficult to writing the text. The researcher figured that out from their gestures and expressions. Then, the researcher analyzed the students’ performance and assessed the pre-test according to the rubric elements of writing, covering; content, organization, grammar, vocabulary and mechanic. The mean score of the pretest was 4.03. The score was too low.

On the contrary, the minimum score or KKM (*Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimum*) that had to be achieved by the students was 6.3. It was caused by the inadequate students’ ability to support their writing skill which covering content, organization, grammar, vocabulary and mechanic. During the students’ performance, they looked still had confused and afraid to do wrong when write words or sentences in English. Instead, they were looking other students’ book and imitated it. Therefore, their results were still far from the researcher’s expectation.

In treatment one, there were two meetings. The first meeting was conducted on Monday, September 17th 2018, and the second meeting was conducted on Monday, September 24th 2018. During treatment, the researcher and students played a game as an energizing to increase students’ motivation because the class begin in the first schedule. Before the treatment is given, most of students were silent, there are no responds and they are less motivation in learning. Furthermore, they did not know what to write and they prefer to be head down. But, after implementation the action or treatment in the class, their motivation raise up and their attention focus on the lesson. Gradually, they could describe a thing or person based on the lesson. After that, the researcher conducted post-test1 on Monday, October 1st 2018. The students had to describe their seatmate again which at least consisted of two paragraphs.

After observation and analyzing the result of the observation in cycle one, the researcher found some strengths and weaknesses. The strengths were the students were more engaged in the lesson, they were more fun and enthusiast to learn English, and their vocabulary and grammar were better than before. The weaknesses were the class cannot be restrained and noisy, and some students still did mistakes in the sentences structure. The lowest score is in grammar, most of them still difficult to put the words in the right place when making sentences, and the result of post-test1 was 5.65, it had not reached the minimum score yet. From the result above, the researcher considered that it was necessary to conduct the cycle two to solve the issues that appear in cycle one.

Cycle two comprised two meetings. The first meeting was held on Monday, October 15th 2018, and the second meeting was conducted on Monday, October 22th 2018. The activity was making a text to describe the person’s characteristics. During class, the researcher used some relevant pictures or slides to stimulate their understanding about the material. After that, the researcher held the post-test2 with the same question on Monday, October 29th 2018 . The post-test2 was going well and the students could do it well. Based on the observation, they are more confident and they are more motivated to write a description text because they had understood what to write about.

The result of teaching learning writing using discovery learning method showed the significant improvement from cycle one to cycle two. It can be seen through the mean score of post-test2 in cycle two was exceeding to the post-test1 in cycle one. The mean score of post-test2 was 6.72, their vocabulary was improved, it was seen from the words in the text were longer and more detail, and their score were higher and reached the minimum score. But, there were the students who had low score especially in grammar aspect. In this aspect, there were some students still did wrong in structure sentences but they were better than before.

**Table 1.** The Results of Students’ Test Score

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Name** | **Score** | | |
| **Pre-test** | **Post-test1** | **Post-test2** |
| 1 | ASAA | 4.25 | 5.375 | 6.5 |
| 2 | DH | 3.375 | 5.0 | 6.25 |
| 3 | LSA | 4.375 | 6.125 | 6.75 |
| 4 | MUS | 4.25 | 6.0 | 6.625 |
| 5 | MA | 4.25 | 6.125 | 7.0 |
| 6 | NA | 4.25 | 5.375 | 6.5 |
| 7 | Nrhsnh | 4.375 | 5.75 | 7.5 |
| 8 | NH | 3.375 | 6.25 | 6.5 |
| 9 | RA | 3.375 | 4.375 | 6.25 |
| 10 | RK | 4.375 | 6.0 | 6.25 |
| 11 | RN | 4.375 | 6.25 | 6.75 |
| 12 | Rsjy | 2.875 | 4.375 | 6.0 |
| 13 | SWR | 4.25 | 5.75 | 7.5 |
| 14 | SL | 4.25 | 6.25 | 7.125 |
| 15 | SM | 5.25 | 6.5 | 7.875 |
| 16 | AD | 3.375 | 5.0 | 6.25 |
| **Mean Score** | | **4.03** | **5.65** | **6.72** |

**Discussion**

From the result above, the researcher can be discussed that teaching and learning English using discovery learning can improve students’ writing descriptive text significantly. It was shown a positive improvement of students’ writing skill, before the action research was conducted, the students had the difficulties in finding vocabulary and produce the words, phrases or sentences to express their ideas, to use grammar in well-formed sentences, and increase their focus and motivation. Through action research, the mean score of the students which earlier was 4.03 in pretest became 5.65 in post-test1 after giving treatment for two meeting and the then final mean score of post-test2 which conducted after giving another treatment to students increased into 6.72.

To more convince this research is valid, the researcher also confirmed it by reffering the reader to read another similar journal. Here, the researcher found relative research on using discovery learning method was done by Annisa, Nappu & Natsir (2018) entitiled The Use of Discovery Method to Improve Students’s Writing on Descriptive Text at the 10th Grade of SMAN 1 Sungguminasa. They claimed that teaching writing by using discovery method can increase the students’ ability to write descriptive text at the Tenth grade of SMAN 1Sungguminasa.

**CONCLUSION**

According to the result of the research, the researcher draw the conclusion that the use of discovery learning method to improve students’ writing descriptive text at tenth grade students of MA Nurul Hidayah is proved that it can enhance students’ writing skill. It was shown from the students’ achievement in test score in each cycle. The comparison between the mean score of pretest, post-test1 and post-test2 are significantly different. It can be defined that there were improvement of students’ writing skill because the mean score of post-test1 in cycle one was exceeding to the mean score of the pretest and the mean score of the post-test2 in cycle two was exceeding to the mean score of the post-test1 in cycle one. It means that there were different improvement between them significantly. In students’ performance, it enhanced significantly as well. The researcher figured out that during learning process, they became active participants and when answering a test, they knew what to write a text in correct ways even though some students was still lacked in grammar.
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