

Profile of Students Writing Students in Learning Language and Arts Appreciation by Using Problem Based Learning Method Through Experiential Learning Approach

Isah Cahyani

isahcahyani@upi.edu

Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia

ABSTRACT

The low ability to compose sentences, shallow mastery of spelling, and lack of understanding in the development of writing ideas among students make researchers try to apply learning problem based learning innovation through experiential learning approach with the aim to improve the ability to appreciate language and art toward literacy writing among students. The research method used is qualitative research method with the aim to get the profile picture of students ability in writing by raising the diversity of culture, language and art in Indonesia. Writing literacy or literacy on written or printed texts is described as activities and skills that relate directly to the printed text, either through the form of reading or writing. In developed countries, a person who has the ability to read and write at a certain level is considered a modern society. They suspect that the use of print or writing media is a major activity in their daily lives. The results of research that the ability to write students progress. The explanation of the literacy literacy capability of the students on the condition of prates and pascates experienced a better transformation of the content aspect, organizational ideas, vocabulary, and linguistic rules.

Keywords: Experiential learning PBL model, Student Writing Capability Profile, Writing Literacy

INTRODUCTION

The ability to write Indonesian society is still not encouraging. Data from the International Publisher Association of Canada (2015) shows Indonesia is only able to publish 5000 titles of books per year. The number is still less than the Japanese who publish 65,000 books per year, Germany 80,000 books per year and 100,000 English books per year. This proves in general the ability to write should be improved. Many are responsible for it, ranging from lecturers to less productive in research, lecturers are not fond of writing, students who do not live in writing culture, and ineffective learning (Bandura, 1971; Bengio, Courville, & Vincent, 2013; AY Kolb & Kolb, 2005). This low skill proves that the education process has not developed the students' competence and interest in knowledge. Educational practices have not functioned as learning organizations that make all citizens lifelong learners (Kang et al., 2009; Report, 2005).

Writing literacy requires practice, motivation, and problem-solving writing difficulties (Carter, Ferzli, & Wiebe, 2007; Ferguson, 1998). This is reasonable because writing demands experience, time, opportunity, special skills, teaching experienced lecturers to be writers as well as through a long and tedious process (Tarigan, 2008 and Alwasilah, 2007). Higher education has failed to print the writing culture of students (Alwasilah, 2012).

This condition becomes a challenge for LPTKs, in this case UPI to produce professional lecturers who are able to write with diverse themes about language and art based on experience in solving problems. Directly lecturer candidates have the ability to appreciate and examine the work of the archipelago. The results of examining the language and art of the archipelago are manifested in writing (Bem, 2003; Paltridge, 2004; Whitehead, 2000).

To overcome the problem of literacy writing, it needs learning innovation of Problem Based Learning through Experiential Learning approach in developing literacy capability writing about understanding and appreciation to the language and art of archipelago (Bergin et al., 2004; DA Kolb, 1984; McCarthy, 2010; Woodhouse, Hall, & Wooster, 1985). Innovative Learning Problem Based Learning with Experiential Learning approach is implemented to increase interest and motivation to write about the cultural treasures of archipelago which is reflected in the appreciation of language and art (Gabb & Vale, 2011; Savery, 2006; Savin-Baden & Major, 2004; SCHMIDT, 1983). The researcher tries to see the difference of students' writing ability profile before and after the implementation of Problem Based Learning model through Experiential Learning approach in developing literacy ability writing about understanding and appreciation to language and art of archipelago.

RESEARCH METHOD

The research method used in this study is a quasi experiment with the aim to see the effectiveness of Problem Based Learning model with Experiential Learning approach to literacy writing ability of students in Language and Art Appreciation lecture. This research was conducted in

Prodi Pendidikan Bahasa Indonesia FPBS UPI. Research subjects were 79 students of academic year 2016/2017. Withdrawal of subjects purposively because there is a certain purpose of the implementation of the course. In addition, consider the limitations of time, effort, and opportunities and distance of research. Product effectiveness test using pre-experiment pre-experiment design in single group. Here is an experimental design done.

$$O_1 \times O_2$$

Information:

O₁ = pretes

X = treatment model

O₂ = postes

The test data were analyzed statistically using paired sample T test if the data distribution was normal. The data analysis is done on the literacy skill profile of students in terms of content, organizational aspects, vocabulary, and linguistic rules.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The effectiveness of the development of problem-based learning model (PBL) with experience approach (EL) on literacy development writing in this research related to the result of questionnaire and research result. This model proved to be effective in improving literacy. This increase occurs both on the value of pascates. In this regard, it describes matters relating to the development outcomes that comprise (1) the analysis of fantasy story writing skills and (2) testing the nature of the data. Here's the explanation. At the trial stage, prates and postcates writing scientific papers are presented as follows.

a) Preview in Experiment Class (Class A)

Prates in this study aims to see students' early ability to write fantasy stories. From the results of prates, obtained information that the average student has not understood the concept of appreciation of language and art in the scope of literacy development. Students still do not understand the formal aspects, structure, and spelling of Bahasa Indonesia as a provision of a paper. Thus, the value of students at this stage is still fairly presented in the following table.

Table 1. Prates Writing Literacy

Interval	Change Value	Four Scale	Information	Number of Students
	1–4	D–A		
86 – 100	4	A	Very well	16
76 – 85	3	B	Good	13
56 – 74	2	C	Enough	7
10 – 55	1	D	Less	4
Total				40 people

Based on the table, the students' pretest value at the broad trial stage is at the Very Good, Good, Fair and Less stage. Based on qualitative data analysis, the researcher concludes twenty elements about the literacy ability of writing on the experimental test stage experimental stage, which is as follows.

No	Aspect of Assessment	No	Aspect of Assessment
1	formulation of the problem	11	use of capital letters, spelling, and punctuation
2	presentation of facts	12	use of vocabulary, the formation of words and terms
3	presentation of understanding	13	the use of effective sentence sentences
4	parsing / troubleshooting	14	the preparation of a coherent and cohesive paragraph
5	application of theory	15	mastery of the content of writing
6	inclusion of title and author name	16	writing organization
7	the identity of the author	17	vocabulary mastery
8	distribution of papers with ideal proportions in each section: introduction 15%, content 75%, and cover 10%	18	effective sentence mastery
9	use of referrals and referring techniques	19	mastery of spelling
10	use of bibliography and writing techniques	20	mastering of mechanical writing

The following explanation profile literacy writing ability of students on the condition of prates in terms of content, organizational aspects, vocabulary, and linguistic rules.

- a. Judging from the content of literacy writing, experimental class is able to write contents, organization essay, choice of words, sentences, mechanics, and have the ability to write literacy well. But there are still some shortcomings, especially content, sentences, choice of words, and spelling and mechanics.
- b. Viewed from the aspect of the organization described is still less than the maximum. Majority students use paper systematics: introduction, content, and closing. But less intact so much truncated information.
- c. Judging from the vocabulary aspect, they still use popular / non-standard vocabulary.
- d. Judging from the aspect of the accuracy of linguistic rules, almost all students have many errors EBI (sentence, spelling, and mechanical Indonesian).

b) Pascates in Experiment Class (Class A)

Post-test results in the pilot phase in class A after learning with PBL learning model with EL approach has increased. This is seen from the value of students who are already on the value of categorized Baik Baik. Furthermore, the value varies over the Good, and Cuku categories. Students have understood the formal aspects, structure, and spelling of Bahasa Indonesia as a provision of a scientific paper. Student scores are displayed in the following table form.

Table 2. Pascates Writing Literacy

Interval	Change Value	Four Scale	Information	Number of Students
	1–4	D–A		
86 – 100	4	A	Very well	29
76 – 85	3	B	Good	8
56 – 74	2	C	Enough	3
10 – 55	1	D	Less	0
Total				40 orang

Based on the table, it is seen that the value of pascates of students in the testing phase is at the stage of Good Once 72.5%, Good 20%, and Simply 7.5%. Accordingly, data representing the literacy assessment results of each category are described as follows. Based on qualitative data analysis, the researcher concludes twenty elements about post literate literacy writing at the test phase (class A), which is as follows.

No	Aspect of Assessment	No	Aspect of Assessment
1	formulation of the problem	11	use of capital letters, spelling, and punctuation
2	presentation of facts	12	use of vocabulary, the formation of words and terms
3	presentation of understanding	13	the use of effective sentence sentences
4	parsing / troubleshooting	14	the preparation of a coherent and cohesive paragraph
5	application of theory	15	mastery of the content of writing
6	inclusion of title and author name	16	writing organization
7	the identity of the author	17	vocabulary mastery
8	distribution of papers with ideal proportions in each section: introduction 15%, content 75%, and cover 10%	18	effective sentence mastery
9	use of referrals and referring techniques	19	mastery of spelling
10	use of bibliography and writing techniques	20	mastering of mechanical writing

The following description of the profile of literacy ability of writing students on pascates conditions in terms of content, organizational aspects, vocabulary, and linguistic rules

- a. Judging from the content of the literacy writing, the experimental class is able to write the contents, organization essay, choice of words, sentences, mechanics, and have the ability to write literacy well. But there are still some shortcomings, especially content, sentences, choice of words, and spelling and mechanics.
- b. Viewed from the aspect of the organization is sufficiently elaborated maximally. Majority students use paper systematics: introduction, content, and closing.
- c. In terms of vocabulary aspect, they have been able to develop a standard vocabulary.

- d. Judging from the aspect of the accuracy of linguistic rules, almost all students still have errors EBI (sentence, spelling, and mechanical Indonesian).

CONCLUSION

Model of Problem Based Learning innovation through Experiential Learning approach can improve the ability to appreciate language and art toward literacy writing. The learning process with this learning model is held in an interactive, inspirational, fun, challenging, and motivating students to actively participate in the learning process. This can be seen from the differences in the profile of students' skills that increased kea rah better in terms of content, organizational aspects, vocabulary, and linguistic rules

REFERENCES

1. Alwasilah, A.C., Senny, s.A. (2012). *Pokoknya Menulis*. Bandung: Kiblat.
2. Bandura, A. (1971). Social learning theory. *Social Learning Theory*.
3. Bem, D. J. (2003). Writing the Empirical Journal Article. *American Psychological Association*, 171–201.
4. Bengio, Y., Courville, A., & Vincent, P. (2013). Representation learning: A review and new perspectives. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 35(8), 1798–1828.
5. Bergin, J., Marquardt, K., Manns, M. L., Eckstein, J., Sharp, H., & Wallingford, E. (2004). Patterns for Experiential Learning. *Learning*, (Nov 25, 2002), 477.
6. Carter, M., Ferzli, M., & Wiebe, E. N. (2007). Writing to Learn by Learning to Write in the Disciplines. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 21(3), 278–302.
7. Ferguson, L. M. (1998). Writing learning objectives. *Journal of Nursing Staff Development : JNSD*, 14(2), 87–94.
8. Gabb, R., & Vale, C. (2011). Learning cultures of problem-based learning teams. *Engineering*, 17(1), 1–8.
9. Kang, M. J., Hsu, M., Krajbich, I. M., Loewenstein, G., McClure, S. M., Wang, J. T., & Camerer, C. F. (2009). The wick in the candle of learning. *Psychological Science*, 20(8), 963–974.
10. Kolb, A. Y., & Kolb, D. a. (2005). Learning Styles and Learning Spaces : Enhancing Experiential Learning in Higher Education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 4(2), 193–212.
11. Kolb, D. A. (1984). The Process of Experiential Learning. *Experiential Learning. Experience as the Source of Learning and Development*.
12. McCarthy, M. (2010). Experiential Learning Theory: From Theory To Practice.
13. Paltridge, B. (2004). Academic writing. *Language Teaching*, 37(2), 87–105.
14. Report, N. R. C. B. on E. S. and R. of the D. of E. and L. S. B. on the C. (2005). Learning to Think Spatially. *The National Academics*.
15. Savery, J. R. (2006). Overview of Problem-based Learning : Definitions and Distinctions. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Problem-Based Learning*, 1(1), 9–20.
16. Savin-Baden, M., & Major, C. H. (2004). Foundations of problem-based learning. *SRHE and Open University Press Imprint*, 216.
17. Tarigan. & Guntur, H. (2008). Menulis sebagai suatu keterampilan berbahasa. Bandung : angkasa.
18. Schmidt, H. G. (1983). Problem-based learning: rationale and description. *Medical Education*, 17(1), 11–16.
19. Whitehead, D. (2000). *Academic writing. Professional nurse (London, England)* (Vol. 16).
20. Woodhouse, D., Hall, E., & Wooster, A. (1985). Experiential learning and discipline. *Pastoral Care in Education*, 3(3), 215–222.