

Practicality Of Developing An Essay Writing Training Module In Omproving Students' Literacy Abilities At The High School Level

Shabiel Zakaria^{1*}

¹ Post Graduate (S3) Ilmu Pendidikan, Makassar State University, 90222, Indonesia

Corresponding Author Email: shabielzakaria01@gmail.com

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to determine the practicality of developing an essay writing training module in improving the literacy skills of high school students. The research design used in this study is the ADDIE development research model. This development research was conducted from 15th to 30th December 2023 at UPT SMAN 1 Bone. The subjects of this research are the supervising teachers and students who are members of the KIR UPT SMAN 1 Bone. The objects of this research include: (1) the essay writing ability of students, (2) the response of supervising teachers of KIR UPT SMAN 1 Bone to the developed training module, and (3) the response of students who are members of KIR UPT SMAN 1 Bone to the developed training module. The instruments used to collect information in data collection for this development research are observation sheets and questionnaires. The results of the research show that 83% of the respondents rated the module as very practical to use, and 17% of the respondents rated the module as practical to use in improving the literacy writing skills of students.

Keywords: Literacy; Ability; Essay; Writing; Module

1. Introduction

Based on the initial observations conducted by the researcher at one of the public high schools in Bone Regency, namely UPT SMAN 1 Bone located at Jl. Ternate No. 1 Watampone on October 15, 2021, regarding the literacy condition of the students' reading and writing. The researcher found that the students' activities during break time were more focused on playing with their mobile phones (social media) rather than reading textbooks or other books, and there was a lack of activities supporting the improvement of students' writing skills.

In addition, the author also conducted a brief interview with the Head Librarian of UPT SMAN 1 Bone, Mrs. Haeriah, S.Pd. on October 21, 2021. She revealed that the average student visits to the library were only 10% of the 600 students in the school. She also admitted that the number of additional reading books or enrichment books owned by the library was still very minimal. Therefore, students' interest in reading literature books was relatively low.

Similarly, the results of a brief interview with one of the Indonesian Language teachers at UPT SMAN 1 Bone, Muliana, S.Pd. on November 17, 2021. She said that the results of scientific writing assignments in Indonesian Language lessons were considered weak. When asked to write scientific papers, the students were weak in literature review and discussion of the literature review results. According to her, this happened because there was little time to teach scientific writing materials in depth. In addition, not all teachers were able to teach and guide students in writing good papers.

Not only in the Indonesian Language subject, but also other teachers in UPT SMAN 1 Bone whom the author met and interviewed briefly expressed the same thing. One of them is Mr. Hamrun, S.Pd., a History teacher, who revealed that even in giving simple paper writing

assignments, the students still did not fully meet the rules of scientific writing. He said that this happened because the students were not trained from the beginning of their school years.

Furthermore, Mr. Muhammad Subaer, S.Pd., M.Pd., a Geography teacher at UPT SMAN 1 Bone, on another occasion, stated that the low ability of students to write good scientific papers was due to the lack of time for intensive guidance. The teaching of scientific writing materials was only provided according to specific indicators or achievements in certain Basic Competencies. Meanwhile, further development was not given much attention by the teachers.

One scientific writing that has not been accustomed and trained to students is scientific essay writing. Generally, teachers say that intensive guidance (training) in writing scientific papers, especially essay scientific papers that are often needed and used as prerequisites in the world of work, is very important to be trained to students. Guidance (training) in writing essays must also be done in a structured and systematic manner, up to the evaluation aspect of guidance (training).

This is considered important because writing is one of the literacy skills that students must master at all levels of school, even in higher education. Writing is important for education because it facilitates students' thinking. Writing learning is needed by students because through writing, students can express all their ideas in a good, correct, and interesting form of writing. Writing is a task that requires time and organized thinking. In addition, writing is a way to express ideas, thoughts, opinions, thoughts, and even feelings (Tarigan, 2013: 3; Saddhono and Slamet, 2014: 140).

Regarding this literacy ability, the Indonesian Ministry of Education and Culture (Kemendikbud RI) has released several data on literacy. According to Kemendikbud (2021), Indonesia has a low literacy achievement. Based on surveys by international institutions, the literacy skills of the Indonesian population are still below the average of the surveyed countries. The achievement is described as follows.

The assessment conducted by the Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS), an international study on reading literacy for primary school students (grade IV) coordinated with The International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA). The survey is conducted every 5 years. In the 2011 survey, Indonesia ranked 42 out of 45 surveyed countries. Meanwhile, for the 2016 survey, the results will only be released at the end of 2017.

The Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), which is an assessment system initiated by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) as a periodic student assessment program in the world, also provides data on reading achievement. The PISA achievement in 2018 shows that Indonesia ranks 10th from the bottom out of 79 participating countries. The average reading ability of Indonesian students is 80 points below the OECD average. The reading ability of Indonesian students is also still below the achievement of students in ASEAN countries. The average reading, mathematics, and science abilities of Indonesian students are 42 points, 52 points, and 37 points below the ASEAN student average (Kemendikbud, 2021; Tohir, 2019).

The results of the Programme for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC) test in 2016 for the level of adult competencies show alarming results. Indonesia ranks

at the bottom in almost all types of competencies needed by adults to work and contribute as members of society.

The World's Most Literate Nations, compiled by Central Connecticut State University in 2016, states that Indonesia's literacy ranking is second from the bottom out of 61 countries surveyed. Indonesia is only better than Botswana, a country in southern Africa. This fact is based on a descriptive study that tested several aspects, including five categories: libraries, newspapers, input to the education system, output of the education system, and computer availability (Widayoko et al., 2018).

The quality of reading among Indonesian children ranks 29th out of 31 countries surveyed in Asia, Africa, Europe, and America. This is based on a survey conducted by the International Education Achievement (IEA) in the early 2000s. Meanwhile, there is data on the Human Development Index (HDI) in Indonesia, which ranks 117 out of 175 countries. This is based on a survey by UNDP in 2005 (Ruliana & Ganggi, 2019).

Meanwhile, according to Alwasilah, A. C., & Alwasilah, S. S. in (Amhar, 2020), the ability to write, especially the publication of scientific works by Indonesian students and lecturers, ranks 92nd, below Malaysia, Nigeria, and Thailand.

From the SC Imago portal, it is known that Indonesia ranks 61st with a total of 25,481 publications. Indonesia is far behind neighboring ASEAN countries such as Malaysia, which ranks 37th with 125,084 scientific publications, Singapore, which ranks 32nd with 171,037 publications, and Thailand, which ranks 43rd with 95,690 publications (Subekti, 2018).

Based on the above, it is evident that the need for training in writing, especially essay writing, is very important for students. Along with this, a module for essay writing training is needed to serve as a guide for teachers in schools to conduct intensive training for students. This is expected to improve literacy activities in schools. Therefore, this research is conducted to determine the practicality of developing an essay writing training module to improve the literacy skills of students in high school.

2. Methodology

The type of research used in this study is the ADDIE research development model (Lawhon, 1976; Mulyanitiningsih, 2019). This development research was conducted from 15th to 30th December 2023 at UPT SMAN 1 Bone. The research subjects in this study are the Mentoring Teachers and Students of KIR UPT SMAN 1 Bone. The research objects in this paper include: (1) Students' essay writing abilities, (2) Mentoring Teachers' responses to the developed training module, and (3) Students' responses to the developed training module.

The instruments used to collect information in this development research are observation sheets and questionnaires. The questionnaire consists of a list of written questions that must be answered by the respondents. Data collection techniques using written questionnaires and organizational observation sheets. Questionnaires for the responses of mentoring teachers, training participants, subject matter experts, and media experts are prepared to gather supporting data for the practicality, effectiveness, and validity of the essay training module development. The data analysis that can be used is practicality analysis. Practicality analysis is based on the responses of mentoring teachers and students, as well as the module usage

questionnaire. The Essay Writing Training Module is considered practical if the practicality test results receive positive responses from mentoring teachers and students.

3. Result and Discussion

3.1. Result

In the practicality test of the module development for mentoring teachers of KIR UPT SMAN 1 Bone, there were six respondents with 12 question/statement items used as indicators. These indicators have a range of answer choices: Strongly Agree (SA) = 5, Agree (A) = 4, Disagree (D) = 3, Strongly Disagree (SD) = 2, and Very Strongly Disagree (VSD) = 1. The questionnaire data from mentoring teachers' responses were then analyzed using inferential analysis as follows:

$$\text{Maximum Score} = 12 \times 5 = 60$$

$$\text{Minimum Score} = 12 \times 1 = 12$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mu &= 1/2 (\text{Maximum Score} + \text{Minimum Score}) \\ &= 1/2 (60 + 12) \\ &= 36 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma &= 1/6 (\text{Maximum Score} - \text{Minimum Score}) \\ &= 1/6 (60 - 12) \\ &= 7,5 \text{ (8)} \end{aligned}$$

Based on the calculations above, the categories for the practicality test are as follows.

Table 1. Module Development Practicality Test Categories

Score Range	Category
$X > 48$	Very Practical
$40 < X \leq 48$	Practical
$32 < X \leq 40$	Quite Practical
$24 < X \leq 32$	Impractical
$X \leq 24$	Very Impractical

Table 2. Practical Test Results for Module Development Based on Questionnaire Responses from KIR UPT Teachers at SMAN 1 Bone

Resp.	Indicator												Total	Category
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
1	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	4	56	Very Practical
2	5	4	5	4	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	56	Very Practical
3	5	5	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	5	5	5	54	Very Practical
4	5	4	4	3	3	5	3	4	3	4	5	5	48	Practical
5	4	5	5	4	4	5	4	4	4	5	5	5	54	Very Practical
6	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	60	Very Practical
Average Total Number												54,67	Very Practical	

Source: Processing teacher response questionnaire data (practicality test)

Based on the criteria table above, it can be seen that the average total response of KIR UPT SMAN 1 Bone teachers regarding the use of the module is in the range $X > 48$, namely 54.67 in the VERY PRACTICAL category.

The respondent's response to the validity of the module was a material expert, namely Prof. Dr. Muhammad Rapi M.S., Professor of Languages at Makassar State University (UNM). Questions/statements totaling 10 items were used as indicators. This indicator has a range of answer choices, namely Strongly Agree (SS)= 5, Agree (S)= 4, Disagree (KS)= 3, Disagree (TS)= 2, and Strongly Disagree (STS)= 1.

The material expert response questionnaire data was then analyzed using inferential analysis as follows:

$$\text{Maximum Score} = 10 \times 5 = 50$$

$$\text{Minimum Score} = 10 \times 1 = 10$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mu &= 1/2 (\text{Maximum Score} + \text{Minimum Score}) \\ &= 1/2 (50 + 10) \\ &= 30 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma &= 1/6 (\text{Maximum Score} - \text{Minimum Score}) \\ &= 1/6 (50 - 10) \\ &= 6.6 \\ &= 7 \end{aligned}$$

Based on the calculations above, the categories for material expert validation are as follows.

Table 3. Material Expert Validation Categories

Score Range	Category
$X > 40,5$	Very Valid
$33,5 < X \leq 40,5$	Valid
$26,5 < X \leq 33,5$	Fairly Valid
$19,5 < X \leq 26,5$	Invalid
$X \leq 19,5$	Very Invalid

Table 4. Validity Test Results for Module Development Based on Questionnaire Responses from Material Experts

Number	Component	Assessment Results
1	The contents of the module meet the requirements as a training module	5
2	The contents of the module are in accordance with the aim of increasing students' reading and writing literacy	5

3	The contents of the module are in accordance with the Indonesian Language Subject, especially for the discussion of essays	5
4	The contents of the module are in accordance with the main material regarding essays	5
5	The contents of the module contain images that are appropriate to the discussion	5
6	The content of the module is appropriate to the student's level of thinking	5
7	The writing of the material in the module is in accordance with PUEBI	4
8	The material in the module uses Indonesian properly and correctly	5
9	The presentation of training material with this module is presented systematically and in detail	5
10	The presentation of the material in the essay writing training module is packaged in an interesting way because it is presented via a flip book	5
Total		49

Source: Processing questionnaire data from material expert responses

Based on the criteria table above, it can be seen that the number of material expert responses to the use of the module is in the range $X > 48$, namely 49 in the VERY PRACTICAL category.

Respondents' responses to the validity of other modules were media experts, namely Prof. Dr. Abdullah Sinring, M.Pd., Professor of Educational Psychology/BK at Makassar State University (UNM). Questions/statements totaling 10 items were used as indicators. This indicator has a range of answer choices, namely Strongly Agree (SS)= 5, Agree (S)= 4, Disagree (KS)= 3, Disagree (TS)= 2, and Strongly Disagree (STS)= 1.

Media expert response questionnaire data was then analyzed using inferential analysis as follows:

$$\text{Maximum Score} = 10 \times 5 = 50$$

$$\text{Minimum Score} = 10 \times 1 = 10$$

$$\mu = 1/2 (\text{Maximum Score} + \text{Minimum Score})$$

$$= 1/2 (50 + 10)$$

$$= 30$$

$$\sigma = 1/6 (\text{Maximum Score} - \text{Minimum Score})$$

$$= 1/6 (50 - 10)$$

$$= 6.6$$

$$= 7$$

Based on the calculations above, the categories for media expert validation are as follows.

Table 5. Media Expert Validation Categories

Score Range	Category
$X > 40,5$	Very Valid
$33,5 < X \leq 40,5$	Valid
$26,5 < X \leq 33,5$	Fairly Valid
$19,5 < X \leq 26,5$	Invalid
$X \leq 19,5$	Very Invalid

Table 6. Validity Test Results for Module Development Based on Media Expert Response Questionnaire

Number	Component	Assessment Results
1	The background design with a flip book looks attractive and is in accordance with the theme of the essay writing training	5
2	The choice of writing color on the Flip Book is appropriate and contrasts with the background	5
3	The selection of images is appropriate	4
4	The choice of type of writing on the Flip Book is appropriate, interesting and easy to read	5
5	The Flip Book display is very easy to use	5
6	Flip Book settings are arranged well and neatly	5
7	Instructions for use can be understood well	5
8	The Flip Book Modules are easy to use for students, whether they are new to it	5
9	The Flip Module has security against misuse by other parties.	5
10	The module can be used smoothly without requiring a strong internet network	5
Total		49

Source: Data processing from questionnaire responses from media experts

Based on the criteria table above, it can be seen that the number of media experts' responses to the use of the module is in the range $X > 48$, namely 49 in the VERY PRACTICAL category.

3.2. Discussion

The level of practicality of the module can be determined through a practicality test obtained from the questionnaire responses by the KIR UPT SMAN 1 Bone Supervisor. There are 12 indicator items assessed by the supervisor. These 12 indicators are grouped into three main components: a) supervisor's interest, b) supervisor's attention, and c) training process. The data analysis results show that the average total response of the KIR UPT SMAN 1 Bone supervisor to the use of the module is in the range of $X > 48$, which is 54.67. The average total score falls into the category of VERY PRACTICAL.

The practicality is reflected in the assessment components. First, in the interest component, the supervisors generally state that the module allows them to focus more on providing training assistance, the module content is clear and easy to train, and it is more practical because the module is converted into a PDF format and can be accessed through the flipbook application on the participants' gadgets.

Second, in the attention component, the supervisors generally state that the essay writing training module helps them focus on delivering the training material, the module also helps them remember each sub-subject of the essay better, the module content is easy to understand and implement, the module encourages essay writing, and the material is presented clearly and well through the flipbook.

Third, in the training process component, the supervisors state that the module can be used practically by the students through both training and self-study, and it can be quickly accessed through the flipbook on their gadgets.

Based on the data analysis according to the percentage of assessment by the KIR UPT SMAN 1 Bone supervisors, the practicality of the essay writing training module is that five supervisors state that it is VERY PRACTICAL and one supervisor states that it is PRACTICAL. The practicality percentage is 83% VERY PRACTICAL and 17% PRACTICAL. Therefore, the essay writing training module is considered very practical in improving the literacy of students, especially in improving their writing literacy at the high school level.

4. Conclusion

The design of the essay writing training module to improve students' writing literacy skills is designed with the principles of easy to use, quick access, and practical use. The introduction section consists of: a) module description, b) module user prerequisites, c) module usage instructions, d) ultimate goal of module utilization, and e) competencies. The training implementation section consists of: a) training implementation plan, b) training activities, including: the first descriptive essay training activity, the second expository essay training activity, and the third persuasive essay training activity, and c) evaluation. The closing section includes reinforcement of the material and encouragement to write essays. The module is also converted into a PDF file format and made available in a digital online format through a flipbook application that can be accessed by students through their gadgets. The results of the practicality test of using the essay writing training module show that 83% of respondents rated the module as very practical to use, and 17% of respondents rated the module as practical to use in improving students' writing literacy skills.

5. Acknowledgement

The research report titled "Development of Essay Writing Training Module to Improve Students' Literacy Skills at the High School Level" is based on a study conducted at UPT SMAN 1 Bone, specifically focusing on the self-development organization called Kelompok Ilmiah Remaja (KIR). The research took place from December 15th to 30th, 2023. The study focused on the development of an essay writing training module that was tested on the KIR

UPT SMAN 1 Bone supervising teachers and members. The results of this research include the training module and the participants' essay works.

We would like to express our utmost gratitude to all parties who have assisted throughout the research process until the completion of this research report. Especially to the Promotor and Copromote who have provided guidance during the research and report writing process.

6. References

- [1] Amhar, U., “Searching for Critical Thinking through Writing: An Insight into Senior High School Students Written Work in Indonesia” 8, 2020.
- [2] Kemendikbud, “Risalah Kebijakan Puslitjak (Analisis Hasil PISA 2018)”, 3 April 2021, 2021.
- [3] Lawhon, D., “Instructional development for training teachers of exceptional children: A sourcebook: Thiagarajan, S., Semmel, D. S., & Semmel, M. I. Bloomington”, Ind.: Indiana University, 1974. Pp. 195 \$5.00 paper. *Journal of School Psychology*, 14(1), 75. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-4405\(76\)90066-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-4405(76)90066-2), 1976.
- [4] Ruliana, V., & Ganggi, R. I. P., “Pengaruh Program Wajib Kunjung “Kupu-Kupu Malam” dalam Peningkatan Minat Baca Pelajar SMP Di Dinas Kearsipan dan Perpustakaan Kabupaten Kebumen”, *Jurnal Ilmu Perpustakaan*, 6(3), 111–120, 2019.
- [5] Subekti, N. B., “Rangking Publikasi Ilmiah Internasional Indonesia [Preprint]”, Open Science Framework. <https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/hz6e7>, 2018.
- [6] Tohir, “Hasil PISA Indonesia Tahun 2018 Turun Dibanding Tahun 2015”, <https://matematohir.wordpress.com/2019/12/03/hasil-pisa-indonesia-tahun-2018-turun-dibanding-tahun-2015/>, 2019.
- [7] Widayoko, A., H, S. K., & Muhardjito, M., “Analisis Program Implementasi Gerakan Literasi Sekolah (GLS) dengan Pendekatan Goal-Based Evaluation”, *Jurnal Tatsqif*, 16(1), 78–92, <https://doi.org/10.20414/jtq.v16i1.134>, 2018.