

The use of participatory method in learning of short story writing based on personal experience at SMKN 1 Labang

Ardiyansah

ardiyansahardana1996@gmail.com

SMKN 1 Labang

Abstract: The purpose of this study is to describe the activities of teachers in learning to write personal experiences using participatory methods. This research takes the form of descriptive qualitative on class action supported by quantitative data. The research instrument used in the form of observation checklist on the activities of teachers and students, and tests of learning outcomes. The results of student learning at the first meeting on cycle 1 were still below the achievement of student pension criteria with a 19% completeness. Meanwhile in the second meeting on cycle 2, it can be seen in the achievement of the average learning outcomes of 66.66 with 33% completeness of learning outcomes so that it can be concluded the learning outcomes of writing short stories based on personal experience using participatory methods are quite effective.

Keywords: Short Story Writing, Personal Experience, Participatory Methods

Learning applied in schools is conventional learning for many reasons. This system or method tends to be aligned with the teacher's more active role compared to the student's role. As a result, students are not accustomed to developing creativity in the learning process in the classroom. To overcome these problems, it is necessary to conduct research that aims to make students more active in the learning process and choose appropriate learning methods and in accordance with the needs and characteristics of students, so they will get good learning outcomes. The purpose of this study is to train students more actively to try to solve problems by connecting knowledge and its application in their lives. The teacher in delivering personal experience writing material chooses the participatory method as the right method to motivate students to be active and creative in linking learning material with their daily lives or experiences.

In this research, the preferred method is the learning method that will be used in learning to write short stories based on personal experience, the participatory method. In language learning, often a teacher uses the lecture method, questions and answers, the task of reading a book that can unwittingly make students bored, bored, and there is no passion for learning.

Learning by using the participatory method is one method that can help teachers in learning Indonesian especially writing. The participatory method places more emphasis on full student involvement. Students are invited to actively combine lessons with existing experience or reality. In addition, in participatory methods, the teacher only acts as a facilitator so that dialogical communication occurs between the teacher and students and eliminates the impression of patronizing (Suyatno, 2014: 36).

The research purpose of this study as follows:

1. To describe learning outcomes of students in learning to write short stories base on personal experience of Indonesian subjects before using participatory methods on students in XI grade of RPL.1 SMK 1 Labang ,
2. Describe the application of participatory methods in writing short stories of Indonesian subjects based on personal experience to students in XI grade of RPL.1 SMK 1 Labang ,
3. Obtain a description of student learning outcomes in XI grade of RPL.1 SMKN 1 Labang in learning to write short stories based on personal experience using participatory methods.

RESEARCH METHODS

The study is descriptive qualitative research on class action that is used to determine how the implementation of learning happen relating to the use of participatory methods in learning to write short stories based on personal experience.

This research is also a naturalistic qualitative study. The term naturalistic indicates that the implementation of this research occurs naturally, as is, in normal situations that are not manipulated in conditions and conditions emphasizing the description naturally. Data retrieval or phenomenon selection is carried out from a reasonable condition.

In this study also will display the results of learning 21 students related to short story writing, to memperkuat simpulan research so pe nelitian data- supported by quantitative data at au called *descriptive kualitative Supported by kuantitative the data* .

The things that will be investigated in this study are a description of some things related to learning to support success and facilitate students in understanding the material. The method that will be used during learning is a participatory method that brings students' full involvement in writing short stories based on personal experience and the teacher here only acts as a facilitator.

The instrument used for this study was the observation sheet of teacher activities and student activities. This observation sheet contained observations of teacher activities and student activities in learning to write personal experiences in the classroom when teaching and learning took place. Meanwhile, to find out the learning outcomes used by the instrument in the form of individual assignments to write short stories in the form

of narratives based on personal experience with several criteria, namely, the suitability of the contents with predetermined themes, accuracy in choosing words, the use of grammar, story wrangling, and authenticity students in composing and completeness of all criteria. This is done in order to achieve the purpose of learning to write short stories by using participatory method.

The technique of collecting data is a way to get the data by using a tool or instrument to obtain the data needed to use the technique as follows : 1. Observation, and achievement test in the form of writing short story.

This research uses descriptive qualitative analysis supported by quantitative data. Data analysis is divided into three activities, namely data reduction, data display (data display), and drawing conclusions (data verification). Further explanation is as follows: 1. Data reduction, 2. Presentation of data (Data Display), and 3. Drawing conclusions (Data Verification)

RESULTS

1. Teacher's Activity

Teacher activities provide examples or illustrations at the first meeting with a percentage of 16.25% and the second meeting 10%. The second meeting is given the freedom to determine the theme essay. Thus students can put their imagination or ideas into written form. Teacher activity motivates at the first meeting with a percentage of 26.25% while at the second meeting 13.75%. This is because the teacher sees the student's development and does not hesitate to ask questions about something not yet understood and the activity of motivating students to ask questions is reduced. Thus the teacher's role during the learning process is only as a facilitator.

Teacher activity answers questions at the first meeting with a percentage of 11.25% and the second meeting 23.75%. This activity is to help students understand learning materials and things that show students interest in learning to write or compose personal experiences. The teacher's activity asks questions at the first meeting with a percentage of 13.75% and at the second meeting with a percentage of 23.75%. This is to find out students' understanding of learning to write or compose personal experiences. Thus the teacher can know students who do not understand about learning to write personal experiences.

Teacher activities give learning tasks at the first meeting with a percentage of 5% while the second meeting 7.5%. This is the teacher's effort so that students are accustomed to writing or composing personal experiences, especially the steps in writing. Activities determine the success of student learning in writing personal experiences by applying participatory methods.

Teacher activities guide students to complete assignments at the first meeting with a percentage of 17.5% while at the second meeting with a percentage of 16.25%. This is

because students need peace in learning and students need to understand the material being taught. Thus the activity of the emergence of the teacher guiding students to complete the task is more decreased.

From the results of this study, it is known that the quality of teacher activity during learning from the first meeting to the second has decreased better by fully involving the role of students in the learning process using participatory methods and the teacher no longer dominates of learning.

2. Student Activities

Based on the research results of student activities above there are changes that indicate the weaknesses and strengths of the activity during the learning process. Student activities respond to teacher apperception at the first meeting with a percentage of 11.25% while at the second meeting is 3.75%. Thus the activity of responding to teacher's apperception decreases more and students can be more optimal in learning to write.

Student activities pay attention to the teacher's explanation at the first meeting with a percentage of 23.75% while at the second meeting is 11.25%. In other words students pay attention to the teacher's explanation not based on the percentage of emergence but rather than the learning and implementation process. Student activity asked questions at the first meeting with a percentage of 11.25% while at the second meeting was 23.75%. This change is in line with the development of the quality of the content of questions raised by students regarding learning material.

Student activities answered the questions at the first meeting with a percentage of 11.25% while at the second meeting was 23.75%. This is because students quite understand and are active in the learning material delivered by the teacher on learning to write personal experiences. Activities of students doing assignments at the first meeting with a percentage of 5% while at the second meeting was 7.5%. This is because students are given freedom by the teacher so students more quickly complete their assignments in the allotted time.

Student activities presented learning outcomes at the first meeting with a percentage of 15% while at the second meeting was 17.5%. Thus students can correct errors or deficiencies that exist optimally in learning to write.

3. Student learning achievement

From the results of the study can be known the average value (mean) learning outcomes of students learning to write short stories based on personal experience with participatory methods of meeting one and two experienced changes the better, namely 61.14 and 66.66.

Tabel of Achievement
Students achievement on Cycle 1 and Cycle 2

No	Name of students	Mark Cycle I	Mark Cycle II
1	Afi	48	64
2	Ain	56	60
3	Afi	56	72
4	Dim	60	60
5	Din	68	68
6	Fad	60	68
7	Far	64	64
8	Fah	48	64
9	Fai	48	60
10	Fik	76	88
11	Irf	68	72
12	Mau	64	64
13	Mit	64	64
14	Moh	64	72
15	Muh	60	64
16	Mus	60	64
17	Pray	68	72
18	Qom	64	64
19	Sah	64	72
20	Sar	64	60
21	She	60	64
Total		1284	1400
Mean		61.14	66.66

The average value of student learning outcomes at the first meeting is still below the achievement of student scoring criteria with a completeness of 19%. The factor is because students are not accustomed to writing or composing personal experiences, both in terms of story wrangling, spelling, word / diction selection and title determination. Students' vocabulary mastery can be said to be minimal or less so that the teacher is more intensive in the question and answer activities and assignments continuously and not limited to the surrounding environment. In the second meeting it can be seen in the achievement of the average learning outcomes of 66.66 with 33% completeness of learning outcomes so that it can be concluded the learning outcomes of short story writing based on personal experience using participatory methods are quite effective.

Meanwhile, in the second meeting, it can be seen in the achievement of the average learning outcomes of 66.66 with a mastery of 33% learning outcomes so that it can be concluded that the learning outcomes of short story writing based on personal experience using the sipatori method run quite effectively because it has a form of change from 19% headed for 33%. Completeness of criterion minimum is not very high at 65, but it can be concluded that, as mentioned above that the use of the participatory method is very good to use.

According to Suyanto, (2014) based on the attitude of teachers to students, participatory assume that each student is unique. Student has strengths and weaknesses, therefore, process uniformity and equal treatment would kill the uniqueness. Hence he explained that uniqueness should be given a place and find a chance to be more developed, a boy is not adults in small form, the way of children thinking is not always the same as the way adults think. Adults must be able to dive into how children feel and think. And he added that children are playing world, worth of children is the most creative age in human life.

In the participatory method, students are active, dynamic, and act as subjects. Student activeness is in the form of carrying out activities independently. However, that does not mean the teacher must be passive, but the teacher is also active in facilitating learning. Students with sound, pictures, wall writing, and so on. Teachers act as guides a motivated, intelligent experienced as a mediator and creator. Dealing with the curriculum in 2013 that promotes learning with a model of **student center** where the teacher does not dominate in the learning process however as a motivator and facilitator for the students and the participatory method is a method that can be applied and in accordance with the concept of approach sciences (Scientific Approach).

CONCLUSIONS

The results of data analysis obtained in this study can be concluded that the most dominant teacher activity at the first meeting before using participatory methods is to motivate students to ask questions with learning material (26.25%), besides that the teacher also provides examples or illustrations in explaining the learning material so the state of the class is passive. In the second meeting using the Participatory Method all weaknesses or deficiencies can be overcome so that the teacher does not dominate in motivating students to ask questions so students are more active in the learning process.

The dominant activity of students in cycle 1 in giving attention to the explanation of teachers (23.7%) and submit opinions and responses (22.5%), while in a cycle 2, the activities of students whose dominant for asking questions (23.75%), answering questions (23.75%), presenting the results of the assignment (17.5%). Thus learning to write based

on personal experience using the participatory method works effectively and in accordance with the achievement of learning objectives.

REFERENCES

- Arikunto, Suharsimi. 2006. *Metodologi Penelitian*. Jakarta: PT: Rineka Cipta
- Arikunto, Suharsimi. 2007. *Dasar-Dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara
- Djiwandono, Soenardi. 2011. *Tes Bahasa, Pegangan Bagi Pengajar Bahasa*. Jakarta; PT. Indeks
- Hamalik. 2009. *Proses Belajar Mengajar*. Bandung: Bumi Aksara
- Priyatni, Endah Tri. 2008. *Membaca Satra Dengan Ancangan Literasi Kritis*. Jakarta: Bumi aksara.
- Priyatni, 2010. *Pedoman Mahir Menulis / Mengarang*. Jakarta: Prestasi Pustaka
- Putra, Nusa. 2012. *Research & Development Penelitian dan Pengembangan: Suatu Pengantar*. Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo Persada
- Rahyubi, Heri. 2012. *Teori-Teori Belajar dan Aplikasi Pembelajaran*. Bandung: Nusa Media.
- Sugiono. 2009. *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan*. Bandung: Alfabeta
- Sugiono. 2011. *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D*. Bandung: CV, Alfabeta
- Suparno dan Mohammad Yunus 2008, *Ketrampilan Dasar Menulis*. Jakarta : Universitas Terbuka
- Tarigan, Henry Guntur, 2008. *Menulis sebagai Suatu ketrampilan berbahasa*. Bandung: Angkasa.
- Warsito, Bambang. 2018. *Teknologi Pembelajaran (Landasan dan Aplikasinya)*. Jakarta: PT. Rineka Cipta