EFFORTS TO IMPROVE STUDENT'S ABILITY IN BASIC COMPETENCY TO CHANGE INTERVIEW TEXT INTO NARRATIVE TEXT IN INDONESIAN LESSON USING TPS LEARNING MODEL (THINK PAIR SHARE) IN VII CLASS OF SMP NEGERI 3 MUARA SIATAS BARITA 2015/2016 STUDY YEAR

Vanda Manurung[1]
[1]The author is a teacher at SMP Negeri 3 Muara Siatas Barita

Abstract

This study aims to determine the improvement of students' writing skills in basic competency in converting interview texts into narrative texts using the TPS (Think Pair Share) learning model in Indonesian Language Lessons in class VII SMP Negeri 3 Muara Siatas Barita. This type of research is Classroom Action Research. The object of research in this CAR is the enthusiasm of students in learning activities, pronunciation of language sounds, accuracy of intonation, choice of words, composing sentences, calmness, politeness, cohesiveness, and conversation topics. The research subjects were 32 students. The data collection tools used were observations made on students. Based on the observations of the research results, the percentage of students' writing skills increased from 32 students, there were 24.4% of students who had excellent writing skills, 61% of students who had good writing skills, and 14 , 6 students with sufficient writing skill level. The percentage of the students' writing ability completeness level of 32 students in the first cycle of meeting I reached 24.4% of students who completed and 75.6% of students did not complete. In the first cycle of the second meeting there were 41.5% students who completed and 58.5% students who did not complete. In the second cycle of the first meeting there were 58.5% of students who completed and 41.5% of students who did not complete while in the second cycle the second meeting increased to 100% or 32 students who completed. Thus using the TPS (Think Pair Share) learning model) can improve students 'writing skills in basic competency in changing the interview text into students' narrative text.

Keywords: Student Ability, Interview Text, TPS Learning

INTRODUCTION

The National Curriculum for Indonesian subjects is oriented towards the nature of Indonesian language learning. The essence of language learning is learning to communicate. The essence of studying literature is understanding humans and human values. Thus, the essence of language

learning is increasing the ability of students to communicate in good and correct Indonesian lessons orally and in writing.

Indonesian language learning that is given to students includes four aspects, namely listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Among the four aspects in this paper, the author only focuses on the speaking aspect. This speaking aspect was chosen because it really supports the process of communicating orally. By learning to speak students learn to communicate.

Based on experience in the field (empirical) it is known that the ability of grade VII students of SMP Negeri 3 Muara Siatas Barita in the learning process is still low. From the available data, it shows that from the results of the score obtained from 32 students, only 36.59% (12 students) got a score of 60 and above (teacher completeness limit), while the rest or as much as 63.41% (20 students) got grades below 60. In addition, the previous assignments given by the teacher did not show any improvement in students' reading skills.

Based on this background, the researcher tried to make research through classroom action research with the title "Efforts to Improve Students' Writing Ability in Basic Competencies of Changing Interview Texts into Indonesian Language Learning Narrative by Using the TPS (Think Pair Share) Learning Model in class VII SMP Negeri 3 Muara. Siatas Barita TP 2015/2016 ".

Ability is a skill or potential that a person has to take an action. Ability to show that an action can be carried out now. Ability is a word that has experienced affixation (affixation) with the basic word capable means capable.

In the big Indonesian dictionary, ability comes from the word "able" which means power (able, capable) to do something, can, be, be rich, have excessive assets. Ability is an ability, skill, strength in doing something. A person is said to be capable if he can do something he is doing.

According to Chaplin (2009) ability (ability, skill, dexterity, talent, ability) is the power (power) to do an action. Meanwhile, according to Robbins (2008) ability can be an innate ability from birth, or it is the result of training or practice.

Speaking by Mulgrave in Henry Guntur Tarigan (2007: 15) is a tool for communicating ideas that are compiled and developed according to the needs of the listener or listener.

Henry Guntur Tarigan (2007: 15) says speaking is the ability to pronounce articulated sounds or words to express, express and convey thoughts, ideas and feelings. Talking is a demand for human life. As social

beings, humans will communicate with others by using language as their main tool. Furthermore, what about the understanding of children's speech? If we observe a child talking, it can be said that what is meant by child speech is the delivery of a certain intention by saying the sounds of the language so that the sound can be understood by the people who are there and hear around them.

The factors that influence writing skills are: physical, psychological, neurological, semantic, and linguistic factors.

a. Physical factors, namely the means of speaking to produce language sounds, as well as other organs such as the head, hands and face are also used in speaking.

b. Psychological factors, namely giving a sizeable share of fluency in speaking. Emotional stabilization does not only affect the complexity of the information being discussed.

c. Neurological factors are the neural networks that connect the cerebellum to the mouth, ears and other organs that participate in writing activities.

d. Semantic factors, namely those related to the meaning of each symbol of the spoken language representing a specific purpose.

e. Linguistic factors or mastery of linguistic matters such as the structure of words and sentences play a major role in the formation of meaning in speaking activities. This is indicated by the sound produced by the speech tool, such as words that must be arranged according to certain rules to be meaningful.

The Think Pair Share type in cooperative learning was first introduced by Frank Lymn. This type is a very simple type and has many advantages because it can increase student participation and knowledge formation by students. In the cooperative learning method, this type is included in the structural approach (Trianto, 2007: 67). The structural approach emphasizes the use of specific structures designed to influence student interaction patterns. By using a certain procedure or structure, students can learn from other students and try to express their opinions in non-competitive situations before expressing them in writing or text and at the same time being able to communicate them in front of the class. According to Spencer Kagan (in Zainal Aqib 2009: 43) states that Think Pair Share provides an opportunity for students to think for themselves the answers to the statements which then discuss with their partners to reach consensus on these answers and finally the teacher asks students to share the answers they agree on with all students in the classroom. The think pair and share

model is one of cooperative learning that prioritizes cooperation between students in groups. Think pair and share model means giving students time to think about answers to questions or problems that will be given by the teacher. Students help each other in solving these problems with their respective abilities. For example, learning media for word or sentence cards are the media used in learning that contain single words or sentences. This learning media serves to make it easier for students to solve problems in groups. For example, the teacher provides an overlapping discourse, each student, then each student thinks of the right answer to fill in the missing word or sentence with the right word or sentence. The word cards and sentence cards that have been distributed in each group can be used to fill in the missing words or sentences. Students work together to fill in the gaps in the discourse.

RESEARCH IMPLEMENTATION

This research includes classroom action research which aims to improve the learning process in improving the ability to convert interview texts into narrative texts through writing activities in Indonesian language lessons using the tps learning model (think pair share) in class VII SMP Negeri 3 Muara Siatas Barita in the 2015 academic year. / 2016

The subjects in this study were 32 students of grade VII at SMP Negeri 3 Muara Siatas Barita in the 2015/2016 academic year.

The research was conducted in class VII SMP Negeri 3 Muara Siatas Barita in the 2015/2016 academic year. This research was conducted for 3 months starting from the preparation activities until the implementation of the action, namely from mid-March to June 2016.

Research design

This research is a classroom action research using research procedures according to Arikunto (2008: 16) as follows:

Design of PTK Model Kemmis and Targgat

Research procedure

This research was carried out directly in the classroom including the implementation of PTK in the form of preliminary tests, preliminary reflections and observations to identify problems that occur in class. In this study, the researcher was assisted by an Indonesian language teacher in identifying and finding solutions to learning problems in Indonesian class VII SMP Negeri 3 Muara Siatas Barita in the academic year 2015/2016, the implementation of CAR was carried out for two cycles.

Data analysis technique

The research data analysis to be carried out is qualitative in the form of filling out student observation sheets on the implementation of learning carried out by the teacher. This is to determine the speaking or communication skills of students individually

Pembahasan dan Hasil Penelitian

Setelah melakukan penelitian selama 2 siklus (4 pertemuan) dapat disimpulkan bahwa penerapan TPS (*Think Pair Share*) pada Pelajaran Bahasa Indonesia dapat meningkatkan kemampuan menulis siswa baik secara individual maupun secara klasikal. Hal ini juga dapat dilihat dari hasil data rekapitulasi mulai dari siklus I sampai dengan siklus II.

Table. 1. Recapitulation of the Improvement of Observation Results on the Ability to Write Interview Texts into Narrative Texts in Cycle I (Meeting I and II) and Cycle II (Meeting I and II)

Kode Siswa	Siklus I Pertemuan I		Siklus I Pertemuan II		Siklus II Pertemuan I		Siklus II Pertemuan II	
	%	Kategori	%	Kategori	%	Kategori	%	Kategori
1	70,8 %	Baik	62,5%	Cukup	95,8 %	Sangat Baik	95,8 %	Sangat Baik
2	70,8 %	Baik	70,8%	Baik	70,8 %	Baik	70,8 %	Baik
3	95,8 %	Sangat Baik	95,8%	Sangat Baik	95,8 %	Sangat Baik	95,8 %	Sangat Baik
4	41,7 %	Kurang	41,7%	Kurang	70,8 %	Baik	95,8 %	Sangat Baik
5	75 %	Baik	75%	Baik	95,8 %	Sangat Baik	95,8 %	Sangat Baik
6	41,7 %	Kurang	62,5%	Cukup	70,8 %	Baik	95,8 %	Sangat Baik
7	33,3 %	Kurang	62,5%	Cukup	62,5 %	Cukup	70,8 %	Baik
8	45,8 %	Kurang	45,8%	Kurang	70,8 %	Baik	70,8 %	Baik
9	95,8 %	Sangat Baik	95,8%	Sangat Baik	95,8 %	Sangat Baik	95,8 %	Sangat Baik
10	33,3 %	Kurang	33,3%	Kurang	33,3 %	Kurang	70,8 %	Baik
11	33,3 %	Kurang	33,3%	Kurang	33,3 %	Kurang	58,3 %	Cukup
12	50 %	Kurang	70,8%	Baik	95,8 %	Sangat Baik	95,8 %	Sangat Baik
13	75 %	Baik	75%	Baik	95,8 %	Sangat Baik	95,8 %	Sangat Baik
14	62,5 %	Cukup	62,5%	Cukup	62,5 %	Cukup	70,8 %	Baik
15	62,5 %	Cukup	62,5%	Cukup	95,8 %	Sangat Baik	95,8 %	Sangat Baik
16	70,8 %	Baik	70,8%	Baik	70,8 %	Baik	70,8 %	Baik
17	58,3 %	Cukup	62,5%	Cukup	70,8 %	Baik	70,8 %	Baik
18	50 %	Kurang	62,5%	Cukup	70,8 %	Baik	70,8 %	Baik
19	45,8 %	Kurang	45,8%	Kurang	58,3 %	Cukup	58,3 %	Cukup
20	50 %	Kurang	50%	Kurang	58,3 %	Cukup	58,3 %	Cukup
21	45,8 %	Kurang	45,8%	Kurang	45,8 %	Kurang	58,3 %	Cukup
22	41,7 %	Kurang	62,5%	Cukup	62,5 %	Cukup	70,8 %	Baik

23	41,7%	Kurang	62,5%	Cukup	62,5%	Cukup	70,8%	Baik
24	41,7%	Kurang	58,3%	Cukup	58,3%	Cukup	70,8%	Baik
25	50%	Kurang	62,5%	Cukup	70,8%	Baik	70,8%	Baik
26	87,5%	Sangat Baik	87,5%	Sangat Baik	87,5%	Sangat Baik	87,5%	Sangat Baik
27	45,8%	Kurang	45,8%	Kurang	70,8%	Baik	70,8%	Baik
28	45,8%	Kurang	62,5%	Cukup	62,5%	Cukup	70,8%	Baik
29	100%	Sangat Baik	100%	Sangat Baik	100%	Sangat Baik	100%	Sangat Baik
30	58,3%	Cukup	58,3%	Cukup	50%	Kurang	58,3%	Cukup
31	50%	Kurang	50%	Kurang	50%	Kurang	58,3%	Cukup
32	54,2%	Kurang	62,5%	Cukup	70,8%	Baik	70,8%	Baik
Jumlah	1824,70		1999,60		2265,90		2461,50	
Rata – rata	57,0%		62,4%		70,8%		76,9%	
Kategori	Kurang		Cukup		Baik		Baik	

From the data in the recapitulation table above, it can be seen that the average score of increasing the writing ability of students individually continues to increase for 2 cycles (4 meetings). In the first meeting cycle, the average percentage of the students' writing ability level in KD converting the interview text into narrative text was 57.0% (Less). In the first cycle of the second meeting, the average percentage of the students' writing ability level at KD converting the interview text into narrative text was 62.4% (Enough). In the second cycle of the first meeting, the average percentage of the students' writing ability level in KD converting the interview text into narrative text was 70.8% (Good) and in the second cycle the second meeting experienced an increase in the average value of the student's writing ability in changing KD interview text into narrative text reached 76.9% (Good).

Table. 2. Recapitulation of Changes in Ability Level Changing Interview Texts into Classical Student Narrative Texts in Cycle I (Meeting I and II) and Cycle II (Meeting I and II)

No.	Kategori	Siklus I Pertemuan I		Siklus I Pertemuan II		Siklus II Pertemuan I		Siklus II Pertemuan II	
		Jlh	%	Jlh	%	Jlh	%	Jlh	%
1	Sangat Baik	4	9,8%	4	9,8%	9	22%	11	24,4%
2	Baik	4	9,8%	5	12,2%	10	26,8%	15	61%
3	Cukup	5	17,1%	14	46,3%	8	31,7%	6	14,6%
4	Kurang	19	63,4%	9	31,7%	5	19,5%	0	0%
	Jumlah	32	100%	32	100%	32	100%	32	100%

The results of the above data on students' writing skills in basic competency in changing the interview text into narrative text in cycle I at meetings 1 and 2 experienced an increase, as well as in cycle II at meetings 1 and 2 also greatly increased, namely as follows:

1. The very good criteria have increased from cycle I at meetings 1 and 2 to cycle II at meetings 1 and 2 amounting to 24.4% or as many as 8 students.

2. On the good criteria there is a significant increase from cycle I at meetings 1 and 2 to cycle II at meetings 1 and 2 amounting to 61% or as many as 9 students.

3. In the criteria sufficiently decreased from cycle I at meetings I and 2 to cycle II at meetings 1 and 2 amounted to 14.6% or as many as 14 students.

4. Whereas the criteria for less decline from cycle I at meetings 1 and 2 to cycle II at meetings 1 and 2 were 0% or there were no students who were lacking in speaking.

In the diagram above, it can be seen the change in the level of students' classical writing ability in cycle I and cycle II. In the first cycle of the first meeting of 32 students, there were 9.8% of the students' writing ability level in KD changed the interview text into a narrative text very well, 9.8% of the students had the writing ability level of students in KD changing the interview text into a good narrative text, 17.1% of students have a sufficient level of writing ability of students in KD changing the interview text into narrative text is sufficient and 63.4% of students have the writing ability level of students in KD changing the interview text into narrative text is lacking. In the first cycle of the second meeting of 32 students, there were 9.8% of students' writing skill level in KD changing the interview text into a narrative text very well, 12.2% of the students having the writing ability level of students in KD changing the interview text into a good narrative

text, 46.3% of students have a sufficient level of writing ability of students in basic competency in changing the interview text into narrative text sufficiently and 31.7% of students have the level of writing ability of students in basic competency in changing the interview text into narrative text is lacking. In the second cycle of the first meeting of 32 students, there were 22% of the students' writing ability level in KD changing the interview text into a narrative text very well, 26.8% of the students had a good writing skill level, 31.7% of the students had a sufficient level of writing ability and 19.5% of students have a low level of writing skills. And in the second cycle of meeting II the percentage of students' writing ability levels increased from 41 students, there were 24.4% of students with very good writing skills, 61% of students with good writing skills and 14.6% of students with adequate writing skills.

CONCLUSION

From the results of the discussion that has been stated in the previous chapters as well as the analysis that has been there, the research comes to the following conclusions:

1. The use of the TPS (Think Pair Share) Learning Model can improve students' writing on KD converting interview texts into narrative texts in Indonesian language lessons in grade VII (SMP Negeri 3 Muara Siatas Barita in Academic Year 2015/2016.

2. The study was divided into II cycles, each cycle consisting of 2 meetings, the researcher used observational data analysis.

3. The results of the study are based on observations made by the teacher: The average score for the increase in the writing ability of students individually continues to increase for 2 cycles (4 meetings). In the first cycle of meeting I, the average percentage of the students' speaking ability score was 54.3% (Less). In the first cycle of meeting II, the average percentage of the students' writing ability score was 62.4% (Enough). In the second cycle of the first meeting, the average percentage of the student's writing ability level was 69.9% (Good) and in the second cycle of the second meeting, the average score of the writing ability level reached 79.2% (Good). Changes in the level of students' classical writing ability in cycle I and cycle II. In the first cycle of meeting I of 32 students, there were 9.8% of students with very good writing skills, 9.8% of students having good writing skills, 17.1% of students having sufficient levels of writing skills and 63.4% of students having good writing skills. lack of writing skills. In the first cycle of meeting II of 32 students there

were 9.8% of students having a very good level of writing ability, 12.2% of students having a good level of writing ability, 46.3% of students having a sufficient level of writing ability and 31.7% of students having a good level of writing ability. lack of writing skills. In the second cycle of meeting I of 32 students, 22% of students had excellent writing skills, 26.8% of students had good writing skills, 31.7% of students had sufficient levels of writing skills and 19.5% of students had good writing skills. less. And in the second cycle of meeting II the percentage of students' writing ability levels increased from 32 students, there were 24.4% of students with very good writing skills, 61% of students having good writing skills and 14.6% of students having sufficient writing skills. And the percentage of the results of the students' writing ability level of 32 students in the first cycle of meeting I reached 24.4% of students who completed and 75.6% of students did not complete. In the first cycle of meeting II, there were 41.5% students who completed and 58.5% students who did not. In the second cycle of the first meeting there were 58.5% of students who completed and 41.5% of students who did not complete while in the second cycle of the second meeting it increased to 100% or 32 students who completed.

REFERENCES

Aqib, Zainal., Maftuh, M., Sujak., Kawentar. 2009. *Penelitian Tindkan Kelas untuk Guru SMP, SMA, SMK.* Bandung : Yrama Widya

Riyanto, Yatim. 2010. *Paradigma Baru Pembelajaran: Sebagai Referensi bagi Guru/Pendidik dalam Implementasi Pembelajaran yang Efektif dan Berkualitas.* Jakarta : Kencana

Tarigan, Henry Guntur. 2007. Berbicara *Sebagai Suatu Keterampilan Berbahasa.* Bandung : Angkasa

Trianto. 2009. *Mendesain Model Pembelajaran Inovatif-Progresif.* Jakata : Kencana

Tim Penyusun Kamus Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa (1990) Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia cetakan 3, Jakarta : Balai Pustaka