

Teachers' and Students' Reflection on the Problem of Writing Narrative Text in a Remote Area (Flores Island)

Darmawan Labira

wawanlabira@gmail.com

Muhammadiyah Teachers' Training Collage of Maumere, Indonesia

Article History:

Received: 06 November 2023

Accepted: 15 December 2023

Keywords:

EFL; Writing; Narrative;

Remote Area; Rural;

This study investigated teachers' and students' reflection on the problem of writing narrative text in a remote area. The data were taken from 30 students and 15 EFL teachers from purposely selected schools that have reputations of being the best and largest school in the Sikka regency using written test to find out the students' abilities in writing narrative text. The researcher used questionnaire to collect the data regarding student experiences and experiences. The finding indicated grammatical aspect as the biggest student's problem (25 errors), the mechanic aspect of writing revealed 24 errors, 23 errors in vocabulary aspect, writing content revealed 20 errors, writing organization revealed 20 errors. The problems raised when students started to put words on paper, students forgot their storytelling abilities: students couldn't think of topics; omitted relevant details, but go on and on about irrelevant ones; their dialogue was bland; couldn't figure out how to start and how to end. Grammar and vocabulary were mostly performed in writing activities, most teachers used 50-minute time allocations for writing practices and pictures to pictures model was mostly adopted by teachers.

INTRODUCTION

The role of English language is undoubtedly has been getting more and more significant and vital across the globe both in non English speaking countries and English speaking countries including in Indonesia which is according to PWC

Darmawan Labira

(2015) was predicted as one of a future nation to arise economically in the world by 2030. In facing the situation of globalization era and very competitive world, English language is adopted as an EFL (English as Foreign Language) and highly respected as it holds a significant place in Indonesian educational curriculum.

An undeniable fact that people are learning English to get knowledge or for bright future worldwide since English language is considered as a main lingua franca or as an international communicative language in the world. For instance, English holds an important and prominent position as the main language within the community of Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN). English role extends beyond not only in linguistic sphere but also has reach politics, ideologies, cultures, economics as well as science and technology. However, in Indonesia, English is accepted as Foreign Language (FL) instead of considering as Second Language (L2) which means that English is not the official of instruction in education and government.

One of the aims of learning English as a L2 is to develop a global communication skill. According to the Indonesian's Ministry of Education and Culture, the purpose of teaching English is to develop students communicative competence in the interpersonal, transactional, and functional discourse by using various English written and spoken texts accurately and acceptably language features. In order to achieve the goal, one must focusing on listening, writing, speaking and reading.

Writing skill is very significant to generate students thinking skill, interactions and communication skills. In the other hand, ignoring writing skill in the EFL classroom is ignoring a skill to write which means ignoring writing skill's contributions toward other English skills development. Nation (2009) argued that writing skill is affected by reading, listening, and speaking skills. Furthermore, writing skill is prominently useful as the media of global knowledge. However, teaching writing skill in EFL classroom is not an easy job and has been always facing problems.

The paradigm of English language teaching highlights various and numerous definitions of writing, from either grammarians or linguists. In order to have a clear recognition and explanation of writing skill, some definitions were presented below. O'Malley and Pierce (1996) defined writing as the process of transforming writer's idea into a written text. Harmer (2004) stated that writing is a type of final written form which was constructed through some stages. Meyers (2005) stated that writing is the action of organizing ideas and transforming on paper, Flynn and Stainthorp (2006) stated that writing is an orchestration of different simultaneous involving cognitive system. Celce and Murcia (2020) defined writing as a very complex socio-cognitive processing in constructing recorded messages on paper. All in all, writing is a written form of information which are discovered, organized and communicated in the writer's thought.

Brereton (1982) classified writing into narration, description, argumentation and the last one is comparison and contrast. Rebecca (2003) specifically stated that a narrative text is a series of chronological events in a written form. Boardman, A Cynthia, & Frydenberg Jia. (2008) stated that narrative paragraph tells a story about something that happens in the past. Celce and Murcia (2020) defined narrative text as a series of past events that occurred based on chronological order to entertain or amuse the reader. Knapp and Watkins (2005) argued that narrative is written using past action verbs, using mental verbs, using metaphoric verbs, using temporal connectives, using repetition and rhythm.

Brown (2000) stated that a significant effort of theoretical frameworks have been reviewing the concept about teacher's role and writing performance since 1980s. The result mostly emphasizing on strategies-based instruction that highly valued students' variability of pathways to success, such as: student-student negotiation and learner-centered instruction. Therefore, teacher's role is not as an authoritative arbiter but as a facilitator and coach. Practically, teachers have to give their hands to help students to be engaged in the process of composing without imposing teacher's thoughts on student minds.

Writing is undoubtedly very difficult task for students either in L2 or FL even for the native speakers as well. Hartfiel, Hughey, Wormuth, & Jacobs (1985) stated that teachers has to underline some aspects; contents, vocabularies, grammar, mechanics and organizations. In regard with content and organization, the students have to be knowledgeable about the chosen topic to develop their ideas into the paragraphs. Farbrain & Whinch (1996) described that grammar help students in sentence constructions and vocabulary help them to choose word accurately in expressing students ideas in writing. In addition, students should be able to write an essay by considering the mechanical aspects such as spelling, capitalization and punctuation

There were some issues that had been influenced students capability in narrative test, they were: English competence, student's native language, reading habit and motivation. Brown (2004) stated that English competence consists of grammatical competence, vocabulary mastery, and organization. Students who have a poor grammar competence and particularly vocabulary will be very difficult in formulating a paragraph and also a sentence. Harmer (2001) added that even students can be deeply frustrated when they do not know the phrases or words to choose as well as the correct grammar.

Numerous research studies have investigated the role of English competence in writing narrative test committed by EFL students across the globe. Almubarak Amin Ali (2016) explored at multiple challenges of EFL teachers of Jazan University and found out students most problematic area of in writing was the difficulty in grammatcal competence and vocabulary mastery. Fareed, Muhammad & Ashraf, Almas & Bilal, Muhammad. (2016) studied the undergraduate ESL students' writing skill problem revealed that linguistic proficiency insufficiency (grammar, vocabulary and syntax), anxiety, and lack of contents, weak structure organization and reliance on L1.

In indonesian context, Hudri, M. (2015) explored the problems of 20 students in writing and found out grammatical and spelling errors, misused connectors, limited vocabulary and diction. Huni Hikmah Hidayati (2018) found out students

weaknesses in linguistic competence, L1 interference, writing's teaching aid, time and class condition. Muliani, S., Norahmi, M., & Asi, N. (2019) believed that students faced difficulties in using past tenses, direct speech, pronouns, nouns and verbal processes. Yuvirawan, Muhammad & Listia, Rina & Amelia, Rizky. (2021) found out students weaknesses in writing narrative text were either vocabulary in particular and grammar competence. Falihah, Nova & Rahmawati, Eri & Baihaqi, Akhmad. (2022) found out students' difficulties in writing narrative text were using appropriate tenses, using appropriate vocabulary, and (4) developing the ideas. More studies conducted by Salviana (2013); Purwanti (2013); Ananda, Gani, and Sahardin (2014); Janah, Miftahul. (2015); Arigusman, Anggi. (2018); Hasibuan, Asriani & Handayani, Fitri. (2019); Asiah, N., Ardian, E., & Amri, S. (2020).

The influence of native language to their English competence becomes the second issue. Harmer (2004) stated that a successful student's writing performance in EFL is deeply influenced by student's L1. M. Y. Laia, (2019) investigated the problems of 20 students' writing skill revealed that students weaknesses in grammar, limited vocabulary, lack of interest and motivation in learning English and ,the L1 influences. Hayati, W. (2019) found out that the most errors were resulted from L1 interference. Helmiyadi. (2021) believed interlingual and intralingual transfer became the most common problems.

Although some recent studies have investigated the challenges of academic writing narrative text, whether from teachers' perspective or students' perspectives using different approaches and theories such as product-oriented approach, process-oriented approach, skills approach, content-based approach, and multiple approaches, either in ESL or EFL contexts at different levels but every research context is unique. This study undertook teachers' and students' perspectives about their performances by identifying students' difficulties and experiences (challenges) about their abilities in writing narrative text as well as teacher experiences (challenges) in teaching writing narrative text.

METHOD

The participants were purposely selected from schools that have a reputation of being the best and largest school in the regency consisting of 30 students and 15 EFL teachers from three different high schools. The age range of all EFL teachers were between 20 and 45 years old; 10 participants were male and 5 female. EFL teachers level of educations were 10 EFL teachers have master degrees and 5 EFL teachers have bachelor degrees. The data were obtained through three (3) instruments.

The first one was written test to find out the students' abilities in writing narrative text. They write down their narrative texts in three paragraphs in 50 minutes and will be scored using writing assessment rubric by Brown (2007). The test result, would be analysed by the researchers used 4-point Likert-type scale ranged from (4) was classified as excellent to very good, (3) was classified as good to average, (2) was classified as fair to poor and (1) was classified as very poor.

The second research instrumen was a questionnaire regarding student experiences (challenges) in EFL writing activities consisted of 14 questions. The questionnaire was filled by students using self-rated items base on a 4-point Likert-type scale ranged from (4) always, (3) often, (2) sometimes and (1) never. The data were highlighted individually and presented using percentage with different levels and strength. The formula which was used to calculate the answer is below:

$$\frac{\sum x}{N}$$

$\sum x$: Sum of respondents' answer for each statement

N: Total respondents

The third research instrumen was a questionnaire regarding teacher experiences (challenges) in EFL writing activities regarding writing activities students mostly perform, time allocation and teaching strategies or techniques.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

Table 1. The result of 4-point Likert-type scale of students written test

No	Aspect	Performance description	Criteria	Score	Performances	
					F	P (%)
1	Content (Topic and detail of the text)	The topic is clear, complete and the details related to the characterization, plot and theme.	Excellent to very good	4	10	33%
		The topic is clear, complete but the details almost related to the characterization, plot and theme.	Good to average	3	9	30%
		The topic is clear, complete but the details are not relating to the characterization, plot and theme.	Fair to poor	2	7	23%
		The topic is not clear and the details are not relating to the characterization, plot and theme.	Very poor	1	4	13%
2	Organization – (Included orientation, complication, and resolution.)	Orientation, complication, and resolution are complete and arranged with proper connectives.	Excellent to very good	4	10	33%

		Orientation, complication, and resolution are almost complete and arranged with almost proper connectives.	Good to average	3	6	20%
		Orientation, complication, and resolution are not complete and arranged with few misuse connectives.	Fair to poor	2	4	13%
		Orientation, complication, and resolution are not complete and arranged with misuse connectives	Very poor	1	10	33%
3	Grammar (Use past tense)	The constructions is effective and complex, few errors of tense, word order/function, articles, pronouns, agreement, preposition, number	Excellent to very good	4	5	17%
		The grammar is effective in simple construction, minor errors in complex constructions, meaning	Good to average	3	4	13%

		obscured., several errors of tense, word order/function, articles, pronouns, agreement, preposition, number				
		Minor problems in simple constructions, major errors in complex constructions, frequently errors of negation, tense, word order/function, articles, pronouns, agreement, preposition, number, deletions, confused meaning.	Fair to poor	2	11	37%
		Sentence constructions are dominated by errors	Very poor	1	10	33%
4	Vocabulary	Sophisticated, effective choice of word/idiom, appropriate register.	Excellent to very good	4	7	23%
		Adequate, occasional errors of word/idiom form, choice, usage but the	Good to average	3	6	20%

		meaning is not obscured.				
		Limited, frequently errors of word/idiom, choice, confused or obscured meaning.	Fair to poor	2	4	13%
		Essentially word per word translation, limited English vocabulary.	Very poor	1	13	43%
5	Mechanics (Spelling, punctuation, and capitalization)	It uses correct capitalization, punctuation, and spelling.	Excellent to very good	4	6	20%
		Ooccasional errors of capitalization, punctuation, and spelling.	Good to average	3	7	23%
		Frequent errors of capitalization, punctuation, and spelling.	Fair to poor	2	13	43%
		Errors domination of capitalization, punctuation, and spelling.	Very poor	1	4	13%

*F=Frequency, *P=Percentage

Table 1 shows that the result of students' written tests. The 1st aspect was about writing content that focused on the topic and the details related to the characterization, plot and theme which are components of a narrative text that

shaped the basic line of a story. The finding showed that 10 of 30 (33%) students' performances were very good where the topic is clear, complete and the details related to the characterization, plot and theme. In the other hand, 9 of 30 (30%) students' were average (topics were complete and clear but the details were quite almost related to the characterization, plot and theme), 7 of 30 students (23%) were poor (topics were complete and clear but the details were not related to the characterization, plot and theme) and 4 of 30 students (13%) were very poor (topics were not clear and the details were not related to the characterization, plot and theme). Base on the finding, its proof that missing one of those components make the story fall flat while changing any one of these elements can dramatically affect the detail of the story line and eventually make the topic became unclear. Falihah, Nova & Rahmawati, Eri & Baihaqi, Akhmad. (2022) identified one of the difficulty faced by students in writing narrative texts was developing students' ideas. The researchers concluded the cause of students could not develop their ideas in writing narrative text because of spoken expressions, repetition of ideas, mistakenly omitted relevant details until they couldn't think of topics due to L1 influence. This finding was also supported by Harmer (2001) that stated a successful student's writing performance in EFL is deeply influenced by student's L1 and other studies (Hudri, M. (2015); Fareed, Muhammad & Ashraf, Almas & Bilal, Muhammad. (2016); Muliani, S., Norahmi, M., & Asi, N. (2019); M. Y. Laia, (2019); Hayati, W. (2019); Koilara, M., Satria Tambunan, F., Romaito Hutabarat, D., & Ninta Tarigan, S. (2020); Helmiyadi. (2021).

The 2nd aspect was about writing organization which consists of orientations, complication, and resolution arranged with proper connectives to formulate the schematic structure of narrative text. The finding in table 1 showed that 10 of 30 students (33%) were very good (writing orientation, complication, and resolution were complete and arranged with proper connectives) and 20 of 30 students faced different variety of problems. 6 of 30 (20%) students were average (writing orientation, complication, and resolution were almost complete and almost arranged with proper connectives), 4 of 30 students (13%) were poor

(writing orientation, complication, and resolution did not complete and arranged with few misuse connectives) and 10 of 30 students (33%) were very poor (writing orientation, complication, and resolution did not complete, arranged with misuse connectives and even missed one of the parts mostly the resolution part). This aspect revealed students' difficulties in constructing complication and resolution of plot structure in writing narrative text. Those difficulties caused students narrative written test had insignificant meaning, disconnected sequence of events and irrelevant sceneries with the topic. A similar finding by Muliani, S., Norahmi, M., & Asi, N. (2019) who analysed students' difficulties in writing narrative text and unveiled some students' difficulties in constructing and completing the generic structure of the texts even missed one or two parts. This finding is in line by other studies, such as: Helmiyadi. (2021); Firda, Veneza & Fanny, Resita & Juhansar, Juhansar & Amalia, Ulfa & Prasetyoaji, Ari (2022)). The researchers concluded based on the finding combined with other similar findings that students put various ideas without organizing them into paragraphs with proper connectives but rather went on and on about irrelevant dialogues from main character or minor character(s) and eventually couldn't figure out how to end.

The 3rd part was about grammatical aspect of writing. The result showed 5 of 30 students (17%) were very good (sentence constructions were effective and complex, only a few error of tenses, words order/function, articles, pronouns, agreements, prepositions and numbers), 4 of 30 students (13%) were average (sentence constructions were effective but very simple, only minor errors of grammar), 11 of 30 students (37%) were poor (minor problems in simple constructions, major errors in complex constructions, frequently errors of negations, tenses, words order/function, articles, pronouns, subject-verb agreements, prepositions) and 10 of 30 students (33%) were very poor (sentence constructions were dominated by errors). The finding revealed the most frequently were tenses, words order/function, articles, subject-verb agreements and prepositions. Those difficulties caused students narrative written test had insignificant meaning, irrelevant dialogues, confused meaning and even changed

the meaning of the sentence. Brown (2004) stated that students who have a poor grammar competence and particularly vocabulary will be very difficult in formulating a paragraph and also a sentence. These errors have been becoming the most common grammar errors in students' narrative texts as the findings were in line with other studies, such as: Janah, Miftahul. (2015); Almubarak Amin Ali (2016); Hayati, W. (2019); Muliani, S., Norahmi, M., & Asi, N. (2019); Yuvirawan, Muhammad & Listia, Rina & Amelia, Rizky. (2021); Falihah, Nova & Rahmawati, Eri & Baihaqi, Akhmad. (2022).

The 4th part was vocabulary, The result showed 7 of 30 students (23%) were very good (using sophisticated words, effective choice of word/idiom and appropriate register.), 6 of 30 students (20%) were average (using adequate words, errors of word/idiom form occasionally and the meaning were not obscured.), 4 of 30 students (13%) were poor (using limited words, errors of word/idiom frequently and the meaning were confused or obscured) and 13 of 30 students (43%) were very poor (essentially using word per word translation and limited English vocabulary.). The analysis revealed that most students using word per word translation and limited English vocabulary, errors of word/idiom frequently and the meaning were confused or obscured. This finding agreed with Harmer (2005) who stated that there are some difficulties for students in written text, such as; grammar, vocabulary, handwriting, spelling, layout and punctuation. There had been some studies that agreed with this study, such as: Eri & Baihaqi, Akhmad (2022)

The 5th part or the last one was the aspect of mechanic, The result showed 6 of 30 students (20%) were very good (using correct capitalization, punctuation, and spelling.), 7 of 30 students (23%) were average (occasional errors of capitalization, punctuation, and spelling), 13 of 30 students (43%) were poor (frequent errors of capitalization, punctuation, and spelling) and 4 of 30 students (13%) were very poor (errors domination of capitalization, punctuation, and spelling). The mechanic aspect of writing revealed most frequently errors were spellings, capitalizations, commas and missing quotation marks. The problem of

spelling was caused by the complexities of English words spelling system. Some sounds were spelt differently and the same sounds could be pronounced differently, such as: threw and through. In the other hand, most of capitalizations problem were found in in the first word of sentences, names of people/places and name of days/months and the misused of quotation marks to show direct speech The findings of this research were related to some of the previous findings that had been reported in the literature Falihah, Nova & Rahmawati, Eri & Baihaqi, Akhmad (2022); Firda, Veneza & Fanny, Resita & Juhansar, Juhansar & Amalia, Ulfa & Prasetyoaji, Ari (2022)

Students questionnaire about the difficulty in writing narrative text

Table 2. Questionnaire about the difficulty in writing narrative text

No	Questions	Students responses							
		Always		Often		Sometimes		Never	
		1		2		3		4	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	I can not write narrative text quickly in English.	17	57%	8	27%	2	7%	3	10%
2	I can not use my thought independently in writing narrative text.	9	30%	8	27%	5	17%	8	27%
3	I can't write a clear topic sentences.	8	27%	6	20%	10	33%	6	20%
4	I can not revise my own writing on spelling and punctutions	9	30%	6	20%	8	27%	7	23%

5	I can not identifying problems in my own writing	11	37%	7	23%	8	27%	4	13%
6	I can not revise my own writing on grammar.	13	43%	7	23%	6	20%	4	13%
7	I can not logically support and develop my main idea into a paragraph	8	27%	8	27%	5	17%	9	30%
8	I can not develop any sentence structures variation.	14	47%	5	17%	5	17%	6	20%
9	I can not use effective word forms to convey my ideas.	10	33%	6	20%	7	23%	7	23%
10	I can not write under time constrains effectively.	7	23%	12	40%	7	23%	4	13%
11	I can not write regular/irregular verbs effectively	3	10%	6	20%	7	23%	14	47%
12	I can not differentiate between singular/plural nouns effectively.	4	13%	6	20%	9	30%	11	37%
13	I can not effectively identify the	5	17%	5	17%	5	17%	15	50%

	subject and verb in a sentence.								
14	I can not effectively differentiate between noun, noun phrase, or pronoun.	3	10%	6	20%	6	20%	15	50%

*F=Frequency, *P=Percentage

This questionnaire was about student's perspectives about their difficulty in writing narrative text. The analysis unveiled question number 1 about 17 of 30 students (57%) could not write narrative text quickly in English while 8 of 30 students (27%) agreed that they often faced similar difficulty. This finding was supported with the result of question number 2, question number 3, question number 7, question number 8 and question number 10. The result of question number 2 showed that there were 12 of 30 students (40%) claimed that they always could not use their own independent thinking in writing and 8 of 30 students (27%) agreed that they often could not use their own independent thinking in writing. The question number 3 revealed 8 of 30 students (27%) claimed that they always could not write a clear topic sentences, 6 of 30 students (20%) agreed that they often could not write a clear topic sentences, 10 of 30 students (33%) said that sometimes they could not write a clear topic sentences. These findings were supported with the result of students' written test in the aspect of writing content where 20 students still faced problems in developing their ideas to create topics and paragraphs connected to characterizations, plots and themes and had been proven by Fareed, Muhammad & Ashraf, Almas & Bilal, Muhammad (2016); Mustafa, Faisal & Kirana, Mulya & Ys, Syamsul. (2017) and Falihah, Nova & Rahmawati, Eri & Baihaqi, Akhmad. (2022).

In regard with writing organization, the finding in question number 7 revealed that only 8 of 30 students (27%) claimed that they could not always logically support and develop their main idea into a paragraph, 8 of 30 students (27%) agreed that they often could not logically support and develop their main idea into a

Darmawan Labira

LET: Linguistics, Literature and Language Teaching Journal Vol. 13 No. 2 2023

paragraph and question number 9 revealed that only 10 of 30 students (33%) claimed that they always could not use effective word forms to convey my ideas, 6 of 30 students (20%) agreed that they often could not use effective word forms to convey my ideas, 7 of 30 students (23%) said that sometimes they could not use effective word forms to convey my ideas, 7 of 30 students (23%) (10%) argued that they could use effective word forms to convey my ideas. The result of students' written test strongly proof this problem with 20 students admitted through the questionnaire. Mostly, students faced problems on completing and even missed either orientation, complication or resolution. This finding confirmed student's' problem on omitted relevant details, but went on and on about irrelevant ones; their dialogues were bland; couldn't figure out how to start and how to end. In fact, some students wrote many ideas into paragraphs without organizing them and even sometimes, some students lost their ideas and did not write anything on their papers. There had been similar finding by other studies, Hudri, M. (2015) found out some of problems faced by students were difficulties in using connectors and unable to select the appropriate diction while Fareed, Muhammad & Ashraf, Almas & Bilal, Muhammad. (2016) argued that some of the major problems are lack of ideas and weak structure organization.

In term of writing mechanic and grammatical aspect, question number 4 revealed that only 9 of 30 students (30%) claimed that they always could not revise their own writings on spelling and punctutions, 6 of 30 students (20%) agreed that they often could not revise their own writings on spelling and punctutions, question number 5 revealed that only 11 of 30 students (37%) claimed that they always could not identifying problems in their own writings, 7 of 30 students (23%) agreed that they often could not identifying problems in their own writings, 8 of 30 students, question number 6 revealed that only 13 of 30 students (43%) claimed that they always could not revise their own writings on grammar. 7 of 30 students (23%) agreed that they often could not revise their own writings on grammar, 6 of 30 students (20%) said that sometimes they could not revise their own writings on grammar, question number 9 revealed that only 14 of 30 students (47%) claimed that they always could not develop any sentence structures variation, 5 of 30

Darmawan Labira

students (17%) agreed that they often could not develop any sentence structures variation, 5 of 30 students (17%) said that sometimes they could not develop any sentence structures variation. The finding showed students' perspectives on their grammatical aspect showed that they could not revise their own writings on grammar and could not develop any sentence structures variation. The result of students' written test in the aspect of writing mechanic and grammatical aspect showed the cause of students' problems. This finding was in line with some studies, such as: Yuvirawan, Muhammad & Listia, Rina & Amelia, and Rizky. (2021); Mubarak, Y., & Budiono, T. (2022); Safitri, Laila & Chairuddin, Chairuddin. (2022).

EFL teachers' reflections in teaching writing narrative text

Writing activities

The most common challenge in teaching writing narrative texts is in some occasions of teaching writing activities, teacher does not train the students' writing skill, such as; choose the appropriate dictation, use the correct grammar, and use random sentences to organize ideas. Table 3 showed the result of students writing activities that mostly perform in the classroom

Table 3. Writing activities students mostly perform in the classroom

Item	Options	<i>Teachers</i>	
		<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
Which writing activities students mostly perform?	Content (Topic and detail of the text)	0	0
	Organization – (Included orientation, complication, and resolution.)	3	20
	Grammar	5	33
	Vocabulary	5	33
	Mechanics (Spelling, punctuation, and capitalization)	2	13
Total		15	100

Darmawan Labira

LET: Linguistics, Literature and Language Teaching Journal Vol. 13 No. 2 2023

Table 3 showed that most of the writing activities students mostly perform were grammar which was 5 of 15 teachers (33%) and vocabulary which was 5 of 15 teachers, 3 of 15 (20%) said organization – (orientation, complication, and resolution.) and mechanics (spelling, punctuation, and capitalization) which was 2 of 15 teachers (13%),

Time allocation

Regarding time allocation for students to practice their writing skills, 7 of 15 teachers (30%) of them gave 50 minutes practicing, 3 of 15 teachers (20%) of them gave 30 to 40 minutes practicing; 3 of 15 teachers (20%) of them gave 25 to 30 minutes practicing and 2 of 15 teachers (13%) of them gave 20 minutes practicing.

Table 4. Writing activities students mostly perform in the classroom

Item	Options	<i>Teachers</i>	
		<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
Time allocation	50 minutes for writing practice	7	46
	30 to 40 minutes for writing practice	3	20
	25 to 30 minutes for writing practice	3	20
	20 minutes for writing practice	2	13
	No time for writing practice at all	0	0
Total		15	100

Teaching techniques

Teaching technique in EFL classroom is the appropriate technique of presenting the language to the students to achieve the teaching-learning purposes. EFL teachers have been using many different techniques in teaching narrative texts and must be able to choose the best and most relevant to students. The finding showed that 5 of 15 teachers (30%) of them adopted pictures to pictures model while 4 of 15 teachers (20%) of them adopted mind-mapping; 3 of 15 teachers

(20%) of them adopted role playing games and 3 of 15 teachers (20%) of them adopted dispersion imaginations.

Table 5. Teaching techniques

Item	Options	<i>Teachers</i>	
		<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
Teaching techniques that the teachers adopt for teaching writing	Dispersion Imaginations	3	20
	Role Playing Games	3	20
	Pictures to Pictures Model	5	33
	Mind-mapping	4	26
Total		15	100

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

The research was conducted with aimed to explore students of senior high school problems in writing narrative text, their experiences (factors hampering development of their writing skills) in EFL classroom during writing narrative text activities and teachers' experiences (challenges) in EFL writing narrative text activities students mostly perform, time allocation in writing narrative text activities and teaching strategies. The first finding consisted of 112 errors in total were grammatical aspect as the dominant errors (25 errors), the mechanic aspect of writing revealed 24 errors, 23 errors in vocabulary aspect, writing content revealed 20 errors, writing organization revealed 20 errors. The errors made by students when writing a thesis were caused by lack of attention, carelessness, fatigue, ideas, reading and writing practice, interference from the learner's first language, overgeneralization, translation from the first language, incomplete application of rules, or some other aspect of performance. The result of the 2nd questionnaire showed that problems raised when students actually started to put words on paper, students forgot their storytelling abilities: students couldn't think of topics; omitted relevant details, but go on and on about irrelevant ones; their dialogue were bland;

Darmawan Labira

couldn't figure out how to start and how to end. The 3rd questionnaire showed grammar and vocabulary were mostly performed in writing activities, most teachers used 50 minutes time allocations for writing practices and pictures to pictures model was mostly adopted by teachers.

REFERENCES

- Arigusman, A. (2018). An Analysis of Student's Narrative Text: An SFL Approach. *Language and Literature*. DOI:[10.18178/ijll.2018.4.2.156](https://doi.org/10.18178/ijll.2018.4.2.156)
- Asiah, N., Ardian, E., & Amri, S. (2020). A Study on the Students' Factor Difficulty in Writing Narrative Text at VIII Grade of MTS Sabial Muhtadin Tembilahan. *J-Shelves of Indragiri (JSI)*, 1(2), 84–97. <https://doi.org/10.32520/jsi.v1i2.1057>
- Boardman, C., & FrydenbergJia. (2008). *Writing to Communicate 2 Paragraphs and Essays Third Edition*. New York: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Brereton, J. C. (1982). *A Plan for Writing (2nd ed)*. New York: HOLT, Rinehart & Winston.
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. San Fransisco: Longman.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. (2nd Ed.). New York: Longman
- Celce-Murcia (2020). *Discourse and context in language teaching*, USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Fairbairn, Gavin J., Winch, Christopher. (1996). *Reading, writing and reasoning: a guide for students* (2nd ed). Maidenhead: Open University Press
- Fareed, M., Ashraf, A., & Bilal, M. (2016). ESL Students' Writing Skills: Problems, Factors and Suggestions. *Journal of Education and Social Sciences*. 4. 81-92. DOI:[10.20547/jess0421604201](https://doi.org/10.20547/jess0421604201)
- Falihah, N, Rahmawati. E & Baihaqi, A. (2022). EFL Students' Difficulties in Writing Narrative Text. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Cultural Studies*. DOI:[10.48181/jelts.v5i1.15026](https://doi.org/10.48181/jelts.v5i1.15026)
- Flynn, N., & Stainthorp, R. (2006) *The Learning and Teaching of Reading and Writing*
- Harmer, J. (2001). *The Practice of English Language Teaching* (3rd Edition ed.). Pearson Education Ltd
- Harmer, J. 2004. *How to Teach Writing*. Essex: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Hasibuan, A., & Handayani, F. (2019) An Analysis of Students' Ability in Writing Narrative Text (A Study at the Eighth Grade of SMP Negeri 2 Tambangan

- in 2018/2019 Academic Year). *Journal MELT (Medium for English Language Teaching)*, 3. 71. 10.22303/melt.3.1.2018.55-63
- Hayati, W. (2019). An Analysis of Written Errors; A Case of Second Semester Students of English. *LET: Linguistics, Literature and English Teaching Journal*, 9(1), 77. <https://doi.org/10.18592/let.v9i1.3078>
- Helmiyadi. (2021). An Error Analysis of Students' Writing in Narrative Text. *JESS (Journal of Education on Social Science)*, 5(1), 51–64 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24036/jess.v5i1>
- Hidayati, K. (2018). Teaching Writing to EFL Students: An Investigation of Challenges Confronted by Indonesian Teachers. *Langkawi: Journal of The Association for Arabic and English*. DOI: [10.31332/lkw.v4i1.772](https://doi.org/10.31332/lkw.v4i1.772)
- Hudri, M. (2015). Analysis of Student's Ability in Writing Narrative Text. *Linguistics and ELT Journal*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.31764/leltj.v3i1.313>
- Janah, M. (2015). Analysing the Students' Grammatical Error on Writing Narrative Text. *Jurnal Smart*. DOI: [10.26638/118.203X](https://doi.org/10.26638/118.203X)
- Koilara, M., Satria Tambunan, F., Romaito Hutabarat, D., & Ninta Tarigan, S. (2020). Students' Difficulties in Writing Narrative Text. *EJI (English Journal of Indragiri): Studies in Education, Literature, and Linguistics*, 4(1), 157 - 167. <https://doi.org/10.32520/eji.v4i1.906>
- Knapp, P. and Watkins, M. (2005). *Genre, Text, grammar: Technologies for Teaching and Assessing Writing*. Sydney: University of New South Wales Ltd.
- .M. Y. Laia, "The Difficulties of Students to Write Narrative Text at The Eighth Grade Students of Smp Negeri 1 Lolowau", *Jurnal Education and Development*, vol. 7, no. 1, p. 125, Jan. 2019
- Meyers, A, *Gateways Academic Writing, Effective Sentence, Paragraph, and Essays*, Longman: 2005.
- Morse, S. (2016). *Beyond the 4 skills: Looking at 21st century skills*
- Mubarok, Y., & Budiono, T. (2022). An error analysis on EFL students' writing. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*, 9(2), 187-203. <https://doi.org/10.22373/ej.v9i2.11386>
- Muliani, S., Norahmi, M., & Asi, N. (2019). The Analysis of Difficulties in Writing Narrative Text. *LET: Linguistics, Literature and English Teaching Journal*, 9(2), 112. <https://doi.org/10.18592/let.v9i2.3312>
- Mustafa, F., Kirana, M., & Syamsul, B. (2017). Errors in EFL writing by junior high students in Indonesia. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning*. DOI: [10.5861/ijrsl.2016.1366](https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrsl.2016.1366)
- Nation, I. S. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL reading and writing*. New York: Routledge

- O'Malley, J. Michael and Lorraine Valdez Pierce, *Authentic Assessment for English Language Students. Practical Approaches for Teachers*, (Great Britain: Longman, 1996), p. 136.
- Paul D. (2007). *Teaching English to children in Asia*. Hongkong: Pearson Longman Asia ELT. Education, Inc.
- Peter Knapp and Megan Watkins, *Genre, Text, Grammar: Technologies for Teaching and Assessing Writing*, University of New South Wales Press Ltd, 2005, p. 220-221
- Price Waterhouse Coopers (PWC). (2015). *The World in 2050: Will the shift in global economic power continue?* Retrieved from www.pwc.co.uk/economics
- Purwanti, I. S. (2013). *Descriptive analysis of grammatical errors in writing descriptive essay among the 8th-grade students in MTs Amal Sholeh Sumogawe* (Bachelor's thesis). Sekolah Tinggi Agama Islam Negeri Salatiga, Salatiga
- Rebecca, J. L. (2003). *A Critical Handbook of Children's Literature*. Massachuset: Pearson Education, Inc
- Safitri, Laila & Chairuddin, Chairuddin. (2022). A Textual Analysis of Students' Writing IN Narrative Text. *Linguamedia Journal*. DOI:[10.56444/lime.v2i02.2739](https://doi.org/10.56444/lime.v2i02.2739)
- Salviana. (2013). *Error analysis on students' writing* (Bachelor's thesis). Universitas Syiah Kuala, Banda Aceh.
- Yuvirawan, Muhammad & Listia, Rina & Amelia, Rizky. (2021). Students' Problems in Reading Narrative Text. DOI:[10.2991/assehr.k.210222.013](https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.210222.013).