



Implementasi Strategi Strategi Pembelajaran Bahasa Dalam Menulis Teks Deskriptif di Wilayah Terbuka di Sekolah Menengah Atas di Kabupaten Tana Toraja

Implementing Language Learning Strategies in Writing Descriptive Text in an Open Area at Senior High School in Tana Toraja Regency

Julianty*, Andi Anto Patak, Kisman Salija

English Education Program, Postgraduate Program Universitas Negeri Makassar.

*Penulis Koresponden: julianty70@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

The sample was taken by Random Sampling Technique. The research findings showed that the tenth grade students of SMA Negeri 5 Tana Toraja had fair to poor score in Pre-test. (1) The result of the research were the mean score of content obtained by the students through Pre-test was 1.72 and Post-test was 2.45. Mean score of form Pre-test was 1.87 and Post-test was 2.87. Mean score of vocabulary Pre-test was 1.84 and Post-test was 2.72. Mean score of grammar Pre-test was 1.81 and Post-test was 2.63. Mean score of mechanic Pre-test was 1.84 and Post-test was 2.48. (2) The significant difference students' achievement in terms of Content is Sig. (2-tailed) is $0.000 < 0.05$. The significant difference students' achievement in terms of Form is Sig. (2-tailed) is $0.000 < 0.05$. The significant difference students' achievement in terms of Vocabulary is Sig. (2-tailed) is $0.000 < 0.05$. The significant difference students' achievement in terms of Mechanic is Sig. (2-tailed) is $0.001 < 0.05$. The results of the research shows: (1) Implementing Language Learning Strategies in Writing Descriptive Text in an Open Area is effective. (2) There is a Significant Difference Students' Achievement Before and After Being Taught Using Language Learning Strategies in Writing Descriptive text in an Open Area.

Keywords: Language Learning Strategies, Descriptive Text, Open Area, Writing Skill

ABSTRAK

Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa siswa kelas X SMA Negeri 5 Tana Toraja memiliki skor cukup di Pre-test. (1) Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa rata-rata skor isi yang diperoleh siswa melalui Pre-test adalah 1.72 dan Post-test adalah 2.45. Nilai rata-rata bentuk Pre-test adalah 1.87 dan Post-test adalah 2.87. Nilai rata-rata kosakata Pre-test adalah 1.84 dan Post-test adalah 2.72. Rata-rata skor tata bahasa Pre-test adalah 1.81 dan Post-test adalah 2.63. Nilai rata-rata Pre-test mekanika adalah 1.84 dan Post-test adalah 2.48. (2) Perbedaan yang signifikan prestasi siswa dalam hal isi Sig. (2-tailed) yaitu $0.000 < 0.05$. Perbedaan yang signifikan prestasi siswa dalam hal bentuk Sig. (2-tailed) yaitu $0.000 < 0.05$. Perbedaan yang signifikan prestasi siswa dalam hal kosakata Sig. (2-tailed) yaitu $0.000 < 0.05$. Perbedaan yang signifikan prestasi siswa dalam hal mekanika Sig. (2-tailed) yaitu $0.001 < 0.05$. Hasil dari penelitian menunjukkan: (1) Penerapan Strategi- Strategi Pembelajaran Bahasa dalam Menulis Teks Deskriptif di Wilayah Terbuka efektif. (2) Ada Perbedaan yang Signifikan Prestasi Belajar Siswa Sebelum dan Sesudah Diajar Menggunakan Strategi- Strategi Pembelajaran Bahasa Dalam Menulis Deskriptif teks di Wilayah Terbuka.

Kata Kunci: Strategi-Strategi Pembelajaran Bahasa, Teks Deskriptif, Wilayah Terbuka, Keterampilan Menulis

1. INTRODUCTION

Teaching students to understand English, especially in writing, requires a variety of factors, such as the instructors' classroom learning techniques, learning methodologies, and so on. Many teachers, on the other hand, have difficulty assisting students in learning English, particularly writing. Additionally, teachers faced difficulties in resolving these issues. English teachers at Tana Toraja's senior high school, for example, had a lot of trouble teaching English, particularly writing. Based on preliminary research findings, the researcher identified three problem areas: First, the students struggled to express themselves in effective phrases or paragraphs. Second, there was a grammatical error on the students' part. Third, the students disliked learning English in the classroom. Finally, there was no way to improve a student's originality or imagination.

To address these issues, English instructors thought critically about developing innovative methods for teaching writing that engaged students throughout the learning process. For teaching English writing, the open area Learning Method is an excellent or inventive strategy. According to Ndari (2019), the best setting for experimental learning was in the open, Playing was important for children's healthy development, according to a large body of evidence. The open area for English language learning provided a variety of challenges and helped students develop a variety of skills and abilities while also making the exercise fun. When students participated in open area English language learning activities, such as how to successfully lead and navigate, they gained and developed leadership skills.

The researcher chose this strategy for the following reasons: First and foremost, this method was both effective and enjoyable. Because all activities took place outside of the classroom, the open area learning strategy not only encouraged students to study more, but it also made learning English interesting and enjoyable. Second, this technique was simple to put into action; this strategy was simple to put into action because the location was easy to find. Third, the method reached the research resources; by employing this strategy, the researcher might be able to avoid designing materials as much as possible because all of the materials were readily available in the school setting.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. English Language Learning

Learning is one of the most significant subjects in psychology today, yet its definition is difficult to come by. Learning is the acquisition of information, insight, or competence via experience or study." A teaching theory is seen as something that is created by the particular instructor. This viewpoint sees teaching as being driven by instructors' attempts to combine theory and practice.

The Indonesian government has decided that English will be the first foreign language taught in Indonesian schools. In Indonesia, foreign language instruction serves three purposes. The functions are as follow:

- 1) As an international communication tool.
- 2) As a means of assisting in the modernization of the Indonesian language.
- 3) As a tool for growth by employing current science and technology.

2.2. Learning Strategies

Second and foreign language learners use learning strategies to control and improve their own learning (Oxford, 2022). "Learning strategies lead to greater autonomy and meaningful learning". Students use learning strategies. However, teachers can help students develop and apply effective learning strategies.

Oxford (2022) discusses language learning strategy features. The first features communicative competence. The second feature, learning strategies help students become more self-directed. The third feature is that teachers' roles are expanded. The Next feature, problem-based learning strategies are a feature.

The researcher goes over the learning strategies proposed by Oxford in greater detail because their taxonomy is more specific than the others'. Furthermore, her taxonomy is understandable, practical, and consistent with the learners' situation when dealing with language tasks. This research focuses on the types of language learning strategies proposed by Oxford. The following is a discussion of Oxford's proposed learning strategies (2022).

- 1) Direct Strategies, according to Oxford (2022), are language learning strategies that directly involve the target language.

- 2) Indirect Strategies, according to Oxford (2022), are language learning strategies that are used for overall learning management.

2.3. Learning Strategies in Writing

There are six different learning strategies that can be used to learn how to write. The following is a discussion of writing strategies (Oxford : 2022).

1) Memory Strategies

Learners can use memory strategies to connect a new item to something they already know. The strategies can help you remember information. Learners can also use the strategies to recall information from memory when they need it for comprehension or production.

2) Cognitive Strategies

Cognitive strategies aid learners in associating new and previously learned information, as well as facilitating information mental restructuring. Practice is the first cognitive strategy.

3) Compensation Strategies

Learners can use compensation strategies to overcome knowledge gaps in their language skills. They are designed to compensate for a lack of grammar and vocabulary knowledge. They also assist learners in making up for knowledge gaps when writing in English.

4) Metacognitive Strategies

Learners can use metacognitive strategies to manage themselves as learners, general learning processes, and specific learning tasks. They are different types of learning behaviors that are used for focusing, arranging, planning, and evaluating information. The strategies are necessary for language learning to be successful.

5) Affective Strategies

Identifying one's feelings and becoming aware of the learning circumstances of tasks that evoke him/her are examples of affective strategies. Learners can use the techniques to gain more control over their emotions, attitudes, and motivations when it comes to language learning. Affective strategies help students feel confident about completing writing assignments.

6) Social Strategies

Learning a language entails interacting with others, and effective social strategies are critical in this process. The strategies make it easier for students to learn with others and to understand the culture of the language they are learning. These strategies

give learners confidence in their ability to learn the language.

2.4. Writing

Cole and Feng (2015:4) assert that writing is a basic aspect of language. According to Elhabiri (2013:19), writing is a form of communication and is regarded as a skill that should be developed through study and practice. Yagelski (2015), is a powerful means not just to describe but also to evaluate, reflect on, and comprehend our thoughts, feelings, ideas, actions, and experiences.

Prewriting (during which the writer must prepare and plan what will be written, the writer also takes idea and details at this stage), writing (Use the ideas created from prewriting as guidance while writing the initial draft of our paragraph), revising (When students rewrite, they examine their writing in light of the criticism provided in the previous step. They go over what they wrote again to assess how well they expressed their meanings to the reader, and editing (After revising for the content and style, the next step is editing for error grammar, punctuation and spelling) are all steps in the writing process.

2.5. Descriptive Text

Dirgayasa (2012) descriptive text is a means of describing or illuminating an object, which could be a person, a thing, or an idea, that was observed by the author. According to Karsinah (2015), descriptive text is a type of text that describes a certain item, person, or thing.

According to Anderson and Anderson in Artamani (2013:9), aspects of a factual description are thought to match the general structure of descriptive language.

1) Identification

Identification (introduction) is a generic starting remark in the first paragraph or phrase that introduces the listener to the subject of the description. Furthermore, it can provide the audience with brief data regarding the specified subject's when, where, who, and what.

2) Description

A description is a sequence of paragraphs discussing a subject, each beginning with a topic phrase. The topic sentence foreshadows the elements that will be included in the rest of the paragraph. Furthermore, each paragraph should

describe one aspect of the subject, and all paragraphs should contribute to the overall explanation of the subject.

3) Conclusion

The last section of the descriptive text is optional. The writer finishes the text or restates the identification or description in this section. A conclusion is not required; yet, it is sometimes highly useful to the reader because it generally signifies the end of the work. Furthermore, it reminds the reader of the main idea, or in other words, it encourages the reader to envision the issue.

2.6. Learning in an Open Area

According to Johnson (2008: 1), a schoolyard outdoor classroom may be created as a natural environment for hands-on learning and should be allowed to adapt over time as new users refine and contribute. Outdoor education is increasingly being employed in teaching and learning as an effective technique for the implementation of activities connected to active learning and the training of abstract concepts (Bilasa & Arslangilay, 2016). Furthermore, Lynch (2016) proposed that outdoor education activities focused at strengthening the visual arts in elementary schools might improve the subject's teaching efficacy.

The teaching and learning process is not only done in the classroom with some learning media and many books on the table, but it can also be done outside of the classroom (outdoor activity) with a different situation and interesting condition in order for the students to be active and more understand the lesson.

Additionally, Jacobi (2013), the following are the advantages of teaching outside the classroom:

1) Physical Benefit

When children are provided extended playing in environments rich in plant and animal life, they are innately compelled to move. Outdoor play areas with plenty of greenery may actually enhance physical activity compared to traditional commercially built playground equipment set on a bare plain.

2) Cognitive Benefit

Children absorb a vast range of knowledge during nature play that is not available indoors. They explore and create in outside environments using all of their senses.

3) Socioal/Emotional Benefit

Children learn to trust their own ideas when they are encouraged to study, ask questions, and seek answers.

3. RESEARCH METHOD

3.1. Research Design

The researcher conducted quantitative research in this study. The following are the main features of quantitative research:

- 1) Describing a research topic through a description of trends or a requirement for an explanation of the relationship between variables.
- 2) Providing a significant role for the literature by providing research questions to be answered, explaining the research problem, and generating a requirement for the study's direction (purpose statement and research questions or hypotheses).
- 3) Formulating clear, limited, quantifiable, and observable purpose statements, research questions, and hypotheses.

An experimental research design is used in this study. According to Cresswell (2012), an experiment is when you test an idea (or practice or technique) to see if it impacts a result or dependent variable. Thus, before administering the therapy, the writer gave a pretest and subsequently a posttest of the students writing skills in an open area. To determine the effect of utilizing open area and students' motivation when learning English in an open area, the writer compared the students' writing ability and students' motivation before and after treatment.

3.2. Population and Sample

1) Population

The population in this research was the students of the tenth grade students of SMAN 5 TANA TORAJA in academic year 2020-2021. There were 8 (eight) classes. Total populations in this research were 255 students. Population was defined by Saunders et al. (2012) as the entire set of cases from which a sample was drawn.

2) Sample

The researcher used random sampling technique because all of subjects had a chance to be chosen. In this case, the researcher took only one class (33 students) as a representative of the population as a sample.

3.3. Research Instrument

The researcher used a writing test as the instrument in this study, both done before and after therapy. This study included two tests: a pre-test and a post-test. The pre-test was used to determine the students' prior knowledge, while the post-test was used to determine the students' achievement in creating descriptive text using the approach that was provided. The researcher administered a writing test and students were instructed to write a descriptive text about their school.

3.4. Procedures of Collecting Data

The researcher collected the data by giving a test to students. The test technique was one of the data collecting techniques in a quantitative research. In collecting the data, the researcher used the following procedures:

- 1) The researcher gave pre-test to students.
- 2) The researcher applied the treatment for six times by discovery learning method.
- 3) After giving treatment, the researcher gave post-test to the students.
- 4) The researcher used writing test in the pre-test about descriptive text.
- 5) The researcher used writing test also as the post-test, the researcher asked students to write descriptive text about their school.
- 6) The teacher analyzed and scored the data by using the following criteria.
- 7) Scoring and classifying the students' skill the following criteria using intra-rater theory (The researcher analyzed and scored the data without involving others).

3.5. Techniques of Data analysis

After collecting the data, the researcher used the result of the test to analyze the data. The researcher calculated the score before and after giving the treatment. The data obtained through the pre-test and post-test. The data would be compared from the mean score of pre-test and post-test. After got the data, it analyzed and processed by using IBM SPSS Statistic 25.0.

To find out the effectiveness of learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area.

The researcher used some statistic and took steps as follows:

- 1) Identified the students' mistakes in writing one by one. In writing, the researcher identified the errors

related content, form, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanic.

- 2) Classified the score answer by using scoring rubric.
- 3) Calculating the mean score of the students, the researcher applied IBM Statistic SPSS 25.0 Software.

To find out the students' achievement before and after being taught using learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area.

The researcher used statistic and took step as follow:

The significant difference (t-test) between the students' Pre-test and Post-test, the researcher applied IBM Statistic SPSS 25.0 Software. The criteria for the hypothesis testing are as follow:

The criteria of hypothesis testing is if Sig (2-tailed) lower than level of significance, $\text{Sig} < \alpha$ ($0.000 < 0.05$), so it indicates that the students score of content, form, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanic between Pre-test and post-test is significantly different and surely improve.

4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Findings

The data which were analyzed in this research was the result of the test. Firstly, the researcher gave pretest. After giving treatment, the researcher gave post-test to the students. The scores of the students were compared using formula on chapter III to prove whether there was effectiveness and significant difference between before and after being taught.

After the teaching writing descriptive text process was done, the researcher analyzed the data of the writing. The description includes the mean, the percentage of improvement, the standard deviation and T-test.

The findings of the research that teaching writing descriptive text in an open area could improve writing descriptive text in content, form, vocabulary, grammar, and also could increase writing descriptive text in mechanic. For further interpretation of the data analysis are given below:

The Effectiveness of Language Learning Strategies in Writing Descriptive Text in an Open Area at Senior High School in Tana Toraja.

Students' writing descriptive text using language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area had different in pre-test and post-test.

In pre-test, students still less understand about content, form, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanic, but after applying language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area, the students more understand about content, form, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanic. Can be seen clearly in the Table 1. and 2.

Table 1. The Mean Score of Pre-test

Statistics						
		Content	Form	Vocabulary	Grammar	Mechanic
N	Valid	33	33	33	33	33
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		1,72	1,87	1,84	1,81	1,84

Table 2. The Mean Score of Post-test

Statistics						
		Content	Form	Vocabulary	Grammar	Mechanic
N	Valid	33	33	33	33	33
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		2,45	2,87	2,72	2,63	2,48

Table. 1 and 2. shows that, students' writing descriptive text using language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area had different in Pre-test and Post-test. The mean score of Components of writing skill (Content, Form, Vocabulary, Grammar, and Mechanic) from students in Post-test improved after teaching writing descriptive text in terms of components of writing skill by implementing language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area.

The mean score of the students in pre-test of content were 1.72 and post-test which to be 2.45. The mean score of the students in pre-test of form were 1.87 and post-test which to be 2.87. The mean score of the students in pre-test of vocabulary were 1.84 and post-test which to be 2.72.

The mean score of the students in pre-test of grammar were 1.81 and post-test which to be 2.63. The mean

score of the students in pre-test of mechanic were 1.84 and post-test which to be 2.48.

Frequency Tables of Pre-test and Post-test

1) Frequency Tables of Pre-test and Post-test in terms of Content

Table 3. Frequency of Content Pre-test

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Excellent to Very Good	0	0
	Good to Average	3	9,1
	Fair to Poor	18	54,5
	Very Poor	12	36,4
	Total	33	100,0

Table 4. Frequency of Content Post-test

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Excellent to Very Good	0	0
	Good to Average	15	45,5
	Fair to Poor	18	54,5
	Very Poor	0	0
	Total	33	100,0

Table 3. and 4. show that the frequency of the student's score in content skill from pre-test there are 3 (9,1%) students got good to average, 18 (54,5 %) students got fair to poor, and 12 (36,4%) students got very poor, and none of them got excellent to very good. While, from post-test there are 15 (45,5 %) students got good to average, 18 (54,5 %) students got fair to poor, and none of them got excellent to very good and very poor.

2) Frequency Tables of Pre-test and Post-test in terms of Form

Table 5. Frequency of Form Pre-test

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Excellent to Very Good	0	0
	Good to Average	3	9,1
	Fair to Poor	23	69,7
	Very Poor	7	21,2
	Total	33	100,0

Table 6. Frequency of Form Post-test

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Excellent to Very Good	4	12,1
	Good to Average	22	66,7
	Fair to Poor	7	21,2
	Very Poor	0	0
	Total	33	100,0

Table 5. and 6, show that the frequency of the students' score in form skill from pre-test there are 3 (9,1 %)

students got good to average, 23 (69,7 %) students got fair to poor, 7 (21,2 %) students got very poor, and none of them got excellent to very good. While, from post-test there are 4 (12,1 %) students got excellent to very good, 22 (66,7 %) students got good to average, 7 (21,2 %) students got fair to poor, and none of them got very poor.

3) Frequency Tables of Pre-test and Post-test in terms of Vocabulary

Table 7. Frequency of Vocabulary Pre-test

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Excellent to Very Good	0	0
	Good to Average	2	6,1
	Fair to Poor	24	72,7
	Very Poor	7	21,2
	Total	33	100,0

Table 8. Frequency of Vocabulary Post-test

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Excellent to Very Good	4	12,1
	Good to Average	16	48,5
	Fair to Poor	13	39,4
	Very Poor	0	0
	Total	33	100,0

Table 7. and 8, show that the frequency of the students' score in vocabulary skill from pre-test there are 2 (6,1 %) students got good to average, 24 (72,7 %) students got fair to poor, 7 (21,2 %) students got very poor, and none of them got excellent to very good. While, from post-test there are 4 (12,1 %) students got excellent to very good, 16 (48,5 %) students got good to average, 13 (39,4 %) students got fair to poor, and none of them got very poor.

4) Frequency Tables of Pre-test and Post-test in terms of Grammar

Table 9. Frequency of Grammar Pre-test

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Excellent to Very Good	0	0
	Good to Average	7	21,2
	Fair to Poor	13	39,4
	Very Poor	13	39,4
	Total	33	100,0

Table 10. Frequency of Grammar Post-test

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Excellent to Very Good	2	6,1
	Good to Average	18	54,5
	Fair to Poor	13	39,4
	Very Poor	0	0
	Total	33	100,0

Table 9. and 10, show that the frequency of the students' score in grammar skill from pre-test there are 7 (21,2 %) students got good to average, 13 (39,4 %) students got fair to poor, 13 (39,4%) students got very poor, and none of them got excellent to very good. While, from post-test there are 2 (6,1 %) students got excellent to very good, 18 (54,5 %) students got good to average, 13 (39,4%) students got fair to poor, and none of them got very poor.

5) Frequency Tables of Pre-test and Post-test in terms of Mechanic

Table 11. Frequency of Mechanic Pre-test

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Excellent to Very Good	2	6,1
	Good to Average	3	9,1
	Fair to Poor	16	48,5
	Very Poor	12	36,4
	Total	33	100,0

Table 12. Frequency of Mechanic Post-test

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Excellent to Very Good	0	0
	Good to Average	17	51,5
	Fair to Poor	15	45,5
	Very Poor	1	3,0
	Total	33	100,0

Table 11. and 12, show that the frequency of the students' score in mechanic skill from pre-test there are 2 (6,1%) students got excellent to very good, 3 (9,1 %) students got good to average, 16 (48,5 %) students got fair to poor, 12 (36,4 %) students got very poor. While, from post-test there are 17 (51,5 %) students got good to average, 15 (45,5 %) students got fair to poor, 1 (3,0 %) student got very poor, and none of them got excellent to very good.

The Significant Difference of Students' Achievement between Before and After Implementing Language Learning Strategies in Writing Descriptive Text in an Open Area.

The result of the data analysis of the students' writing descriptive text through language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area is tested by using T-test analysis. In this case, the researcher used t-test (test of significance) for paired sample test, that is, a test to know the significant difference between the result of students' mean scores in pre-test and post-test the researcher used t-test analysis on the level of significant (α) = 0.05.

The hypothesis testing that was done by Using IBM Statistic SPSS 25.0 Software shows that $\text{Sig} < \alpha$ ($0,000 < 0,05$), so it indicates that the students' score of content, form, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanic between Pre-Test and Post-Test is significantly different.

The normality data test is intended to determine whether the data distributed was normal or not. The normality test in this research was intended to the test in terms of content, form, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanic. The normality test in this research was using the SPSS 25.0 Software through Kolmogorov-Smirnov.

a. Content

Table 13. Tests of Normality in Terms of Content

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.
Content_Pre	,305	33	,000	,768	33	,000
Content_Post	,361	33	,000	,635	33	,000

Table 13. shows that, based on the output of the normality table, the significance value of the pre-test is 0.000 and the post-test is 0.000. The value is < 0.05 , so it can be concluded that the value is significantly different.

b. Form

Table 14. Tests of Normality in Terms of Form

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.
Form_Pre	,376	33	,000	,718	33	,000
Form_Post	,338	33	,000	,761	33	,000

Table 14. shows that, based on the output of the normality table, the significance value of the pre-test is 0.000 and the post-test is 0.000. The value is < 0.05 , so it

can be concluded that the value is significantly different.

c. Vocabulary

Table 15. Tests of Normality in Terms of Vocabulary

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.
Vocabulary_Pre	,405	33	,000	,679	33	,000
Vocabulary_Post	,263	33	,000	,783	33	,000

Table 15. shows that, based on the output of the normality table, the significance value of the pre-test is 0.000 and the post-test is 0.000. The value is < 0.05 , so it can be concluded that the value is significantly different.

d. Grammar

Table 16. Tests of Normality in Terms of Grammar

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.
Grammar_Pre	,250	33	,000	,796	33	,000
Grammar_Post	,303	33	,000	,748	33	,000

Table 16. shows that, based on the output of the normality table, the significance value of the pre-test is 0.000 and the post-test is 0.000. The value is < 0.05 , so it can be concluded that the value is significantly different.

e. Mechanic

Table 17. Tests of Normality in Terms of Mechanic

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.
Mechanic_Pre	,276	33	,000	,797	33	,000
Mechanic_Post	,334	33	,000	,710	33	,000

Table 17. shows that, based on the output of the normality table, the significance value of the pre-test is 0.000 and the post-test is 0.000. The value is < 0.05 , so it can be concluded that the value is significantly different.

4.2. Discussion

In this research, the students were going out from classroom in order to learn. Language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area did not take a place away from the school and did not require a long time. The used of language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area can help the teaching and learning process run well. By using this strategy, the students got in real pictures of the things that would be written to create a descriptive text. The students wrote about their school by seeing in open area (outdoor) the class directly. This strategy also made the students to be motivated to develop imagination, thoughts and ideas in accordance based on the real situation faced by the students in writing descriptive text. It made the students not only heard but also saw the real situation. Through the language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area, the students can easily organize their ideas in writing descriptive text.

By seeing the effectiveness of the students' Content, Form, Vocabulary, Grammar, and Mechanic in writing skill, it is concluded that Language Learning Strategies in Writing Descriptive Text in an Open Area could improve the students writing skill in Terms of Content, Form, Vocabulary, Grammar, and Mechanic. It could be showed from the students' writing test in Pre-test and Post-test. In Pre-test, some students were difficult to write descriptive text especially the content, form, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanic. But, the students' writing descriptive text in Post-test, which the content, form, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanic could be understood. And then, the students were easy to generate their ideas and write it to be a good descriptive text.

Based on the findings of the research, It has found that the students who were taught by using Language Learning Strategies in Writing Descriptive Text in an Open Area method has been improved in teaching writing descriptive text than the students who were taught without using Language Learning Strategies in Writing Descriptive Text in an Open Area because the students who were taught could give spirit in studied. It made them more understanding the descriptive text because they got saw immediately what would they made the object, learn outdoor class also made them more passion in learning given a lot of inspiration in learning writing, because they felt atmosphere of the

new that was no boring, and the students were enthusiastic in learning descriptive text.

Language Learning Strategies in Writing Descriptive Text in an Open Area could be a complement to improve students learning as the research point out, but it was important to take into account that students could respond differently to teach and could have different attitudes concerning how to be taught.

Positive attitudes towards the outdoors were also found in Fägerstam's and Blom's (2013) study of high school pupil's attitudes towards learning biology and mathematics outdoors in comparison to indoor learning. Participants in the study mentioned variation as a reason for why they liked outdoor teaching. It was also perceived by many as more stimulating, fun, and relevant than their usual school environment.

From the discussion above, it can be concluded that Language Learning Strategies in Writing Descriptive Text in an Open Area can improve students' understanding about the materials given. Such findings from Albiyar (2013) found that disability students can easily understand the part of plant by using outdoor learning strategy. For this case, the findings above in line with this research, the students of SMAN 5 Tana Toraja can easily understand the materials. Language Learning Strategies in Writing Descriptive Text in an Open Area was good strategy in teaching writing because it helped the students to increase their imagination in writing and also it made the students feel enjoyable and enthusiastic in writing.

5. CONCLUSION

After conducting The Experimental Research about Implementing Language Learning Strategies in Writing Descriptive Text in an Open Area and based on the researcher findings in the previous chapter, the researcher concluded that:

- 1) Language Learning Strategies in Writing Descriptive Text in an Open Area is effective to improve the students' writing descriptive text in terms of Content, it was shown by the mean score of content before and after giving treatment is 1.72 becomes 2.45. Language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area is also effective to improve the students' writing descriptive text in terms of Form, it was shown by

the mean score before and after giving treatment is 1.87 becomes 2.87. Next, language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area is also effective to improve the students' writing descriptive text in terms of Vocabulary, it was shown by the mean score before and after being taught is 1.84 becomes 2.72. After that, language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area is also effective to improve the students' writing descriptive text in terms of Grammar, it was shown by the mean score before and after being taught is 1.81 becomes 2.63. Finally, language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area is effective to improve the students' writing descriptive text in terms of Mechanic, it was shown by the mean score before and after giving treatment is 1.84 becomes 2.48. It means that Implementing Language Learning Strategies in Writing Descriptive Text in an Open Area is effective to be implemented.

- 2) There is a significant difference students' achievement before and after being taught using language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area in every term of components of writing. First, the significant difference students' achievement between before and after being taught in terms of Content, it is known that the value Sig. (2-tailed) is $0.000 < 0.05$. Second, the significant difference students' achievement between before and after being taught in terms of Form, it is known that the value of Sig. (2-tailed) is $0.000 < 0.05$. Third, the significant difference students' achievement between before and after being taught in terms of Vocabulary, it is known that the value of Sig. (2-tailed) is $0.000 < 0.05$. Fourth, the significant difference students' achievement between before and after being taught in terms of Grammar, it is known that the value of Sig. (2-tailed) is $0.000 < 0.05$. Finally, the significant difference students' achievement between before and after being taught in terms of Mechanic, it is known that the value of Sig. (2-tailed) is $0.001 < 0.05$. It means that, there is a significance difference between before and after giving the treatment.

REFERENCES

Akincilar, V.2010. The effect of PLEASE Strategy Training Through The Self-Regulated Strategy Development (SRSD) Model on Fifth Grade EFL

- Students' Descriptive Writing : Strategy Training on Planning. Middle East TechnicalUniversity.Retrievedfrom<http://etd.lib.metu.edu.tr/upload/3/12611947/index.pdf>.
- Albihar, Alief P. 2013. Outdoor Study Terhadap Pemahaman Konsep Bagian Tumbuhan Beserta Fungsinya Untuk Anak Tunanetra. A thesis of UNESA Surabaya.
- Amelia, M. 2017. *Creative Teaching Strategy: An Alternative Solution to Teachers' Problem in Teaching Reading on Descriptive Text at Junior High School*
- Artamani, Ni Wayan Nadia Redma. 2013. *Teaching Descriptive Text Through PPP Technique to the Eighth Grade Students of SMP Dharma Wiweka in Academic Year 2012/2013*. Unpublished Thesis: Mahasaraswati Denpasar University.
- Baumeister, R.F. (2016). Toward a General theory of Motivation: Problems, Challenges, Opportunities, and the Big Picture. *Motivations and Emotions*, 40 (1), 1-10.
- Bilasa P & Arslangilay AS. 2016. Views of secondary education teachers on the conditions and efficiency of the inservice training activities they attend (Yalova and Erzurum in-service training sample). *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 13(1):1058–1071.
- Ceylan S & Kılinc N. 2016. Determining the views of pre-school children and their parents regarding museums: Safranbolu case. *International Journal of Education*, 8(1):129–143.
- Christie, F. (2016). Writing Development as a Necessary Dimension of Language and Literacy Education. PETAA Project 40 Essay 3.
- Cole, J., & Feng, J. (2015). Effective Strategies for Improving Writing Skills of Elementary English Language Learners. Online Submission.
- Cooper, Allen. 2015. Nature and The Outdoor Learning Environment : The Forgotten Resource in Early Childhood Education. *International Journal of Early Childhood Environmental Education*, 3(1), 86-97.
- Cosgriff M. 2016. The Reconceptualisation of Outdoor Education in the Primary School Classroom in Aotearoa. New Zealand: *how might we do it? Education* 3-13, 44(3):339–352.
- Creswell, John W. "Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research." *Educational Research*, 2012.
- Dirgayasa, W. (2012). Maritime English Writing: A

- Genre Based Approach.
- Elhabiri, H. (2013). Teaching the Writing Skills through Literary Texts. Unpublished Dissertation Submitted in Candidacy for the Degree of Magister in Didactics of Literary and Civilisation Texts, at Djilali Liabes University (Algeria).
- Fägerstam, Emilia. 2012. Space and Place Perspectives of Outdoor Teaching and Learning. Printed by : Liu-tryck.
- Glyn & Akamca OG. 2017. The effect of Outdoor Learning Activities on the Development of Preschool Children. *South African Journal of Education*, 37(2).
- Hakim, Luqman. "English Language Teaching Learning for Juvenile Offenders in Kutoarjo Juvenile Corrections." UIN Walisongo, 2015.
- Harper NJ & Webster AL. 2017. Higher Learning: Impacts of a High-altitude Adventure-based Field School on College Student Development. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning*, 17(1):67–81.
- Hongqin, Zhang. 2014. Academic Writing Instruction for EFL Undergraduation: an Inteltextuality Approach. *International Journal of English and Education*.
- Jacobi-Vessel, J.L. 2013. Discovering Nature : The Benefits of Teaching Outside of the Classroom. *Dimension of Early Childhood*, 41(3), 4-10.
- Jacobs, H.L., Stephen, A., Zingkggraf, D.R., Wormuth, V., Faye, H., Jane, B., and Hughey. (1981). Testing ESL Composition: A Practical Approach. Rowley: Newbury House Publisher, Inc.
- Jay, J, Hesterman, S. & Knaus, M. (2014). Discussion Paper 1: A Call for High Quality Early Childhood Education in the Early Years of School in Western Australia. Alliance for High Quality Education in the Early Years of Schooling. Retrieved from <<http://eyes.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/Alliance-Discussion-Paper-No1v2.pdf>>
- Johnson, Lauri Macmillan. 2008. *Creating Outdoor Classroom (Schoolyard Habitats and Gardens for the Southwest)*. Texas: Univeristy of Texas Press
- Karsinah. 2015. *Teaching Descriptive Text by Using Attribute Listing to SMK*.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. & Anderson, M. 2013. *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching* 3rd Edition. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Larsson, Daniel. "English Teaching Outdoors – Student Responses and Attitudes towards Outdoor EFL Teaching" (2014).
- Lynch J. 2016. *The Primacy of Place in Education in Outdoor Settings*. In B Humberstone, H Prince & KA Henderson (eds). Routledge International Handbook of Outdoor Studies. London, UK: Routledge.
- Masitoh, Siti. 2015. Improving Students' Ability in Writing Descriptive Text Using Genre Based Approach (GBA) at The Eight Grade Students of SMP Islam Terpadu Fitrah Insani. *Eltin Journal, Journal of English Language Teaching in Indonesia*, 3(1).
- Meer, Hunble. 2016. *Four Different Types of Writing Styles: Expository, Descriptive, Persuasive, and Narrative*.
- Nation, I.S.P., and John Macalister. *Teaching ESL/EFL Reading and Writing. Teaching ESL/EFL Reading and Writing*, 2020.
- Ndari, Susianty selaras, Chandrawaty Chandrawaty, Imam Mujtaba, and Mafaza Conita Ananto. "Children's Outdoor Activities and Parenting Style in Children's Social Skill." *JPUD - Jurnal Pendidikan Usia Dini* 13, no. 2 (2019).
- Nurhidayah. *The Implementation of Online Learning by English Lecturers in Teaching Writing Skill at English Department of Lancang Kuning University*, 2020.
- Oxford University Press. <http://www.oed.com/viewdictionaryentry/Entry/11125> (accesed March 16, 2022).
- Palavan O, Cicek V & Atabay M. 2016. Perspectives of Elementary School Teachers on Outdoor Education. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 4(8):1885–1893.
- Pongsapan, Nehru Pasoloran, and Andi Anto Patak. "English Language Learning-Based Open Space (ELLBOS) for Young Learners in the Tourism Area." *International Journal of Humanities and Innovation (IJHI)* 3, no. 4 (2020).
- Rahmayati, Anies. 2015. Penerapan Outdoor Learning Process Berbantu Puzzle Blocks Materi Ekosistem Untuk Meningkatkan Aktivitas Belajar dan Sikap Peduli Lingkungan. A Thesis of UNNES Semarang.
- Ramadani, S. A. 2013. *Improving Students Writing Ability in Writing DescriptiveText Through Field Trip at SMAN 1 Godean*.
- Reszy, Y.H. (2013). Teaching Writing Descriptive Text by Using Environmental Observation Strategy. *English Language Teaching*, 30-38.

- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2012). *Research Methods for Business Students* (6 ed.): Pearson.
- Suardi, Rahmat. 2012. *The Students Writing Ability Through Dictation Method (A Classroom Action Research at Xi Program Students of SMA 2 Bantaeng*. Thesis. Makassar:Unismuh.
- Thorburn M & Allison P. 2017. Learning Outdoors and Living Well? Conceptual Prospects for Enhancing Curriculum Planning and Pedagogical Practices. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 47(1):103–115.
- Triana, Roqib N. 2017. *The Effectiveness of the Outdoor Learning on Students' Achievement in Writing Descriptive Text the Tenth Grade Students of MA Ma'arif Balong Ponorogo in Academic Year 2015/2016*
- Walsh, K. (2010). *The Importance of Writing Skills: Online Tools to Encourage success*.
- Yagelski, R. P. 2015. *The Essential Writing Ten Core Concepts*. Stamford : Cengage Learning