Jurnal Onoma: Pendidikan, Bahasa dan Sastra, **Vol. 10, No. 3, 2024**

Applying Fact Reason Elaboration Shift (FRESH) Technique to Develope Writing Skill of SMAN Model Terpadu Madani

Yanti Permatasari [1]
Abdul Kamaruddin[2]
Afrillia Anggreni[3]
Nur Sehang Thamrin[4]
[1234] Tadulako University , Indonesia

[1] permatasariyanti2808@gmail.com
[2] abdul_kamaruddin@untad.ac.id
[3] afrillthe1st@gmail.com
[4] nursehangthamrin@yahoo.com

Abstract

The aims of this research is to find out whether or not the Applying Fact Reason Elaboration Shift (FRESH) Technique can develope the student's skill to write descriptive text. This research applied a quasi-experimental research design that involved experimental group and control group. The sample of this research was 48 student's, which were divided into 26 students of class Xl E as the experimental group and 22 student's of class XI D as the control group. The sample was selected by using clusters technique. The data was collected by administering a writing test consisting of a pre-test and post-test. Then the treatment was only given to the experimental group. The result of the pre-test shows that the mean score of the experimental group is 29.8 while the mean score of the control group is 40.8. This demonstrated that the pre-test mean score of the experimental group were lower compared to the control group. After conducting the treatment, the result of the post-test shows that the mean score of the experimental group is 75.13 while the mean score of the control group is 65.5. It indicates that the experimental group has shown improvement in their writing skill compared to the control group. By applying 46 degree of freedom (df) and 0.05 level of significance, it can be seen that the $t_{counted}$ (3.76) is higher than the t_{table} (2.021). It means that the research hypothesis is accepted. In conclusion, that the Applying Fact Reason Elaboration Shift (FRESH) Technique can develope the student's writing skill to the elevent grade of SMAN Model Terpadu Madani.

Keywords: *Fresh Technique, Developing, Writing Skill*

Introduction

Writing is the way expressing thoughts, opinions and ideas in a series of sentences. It is important because it can develop creativity, namely by finding ideas and concepts, collecting materials, and clarifying a problem. To produce good writing, we must have good organization, content, vocabulary, grammar and mechanisms. Therefore writing is not an easy thing, but requires complex skills and abilities.

Writing is one of the skills taught in high school. In Merdeka Curriculum, the students are expected to write a kinds of text, such as narrative, descriptive, exposition, procedure, argumentation, discussion and authentic text are the main references in learning English in this phase. Therefore, the students are expected to be able to understand how to write good texts from these texts.

In conducting Pre observation in SMAN Model Terpadu Madani when learning writing in class, teachers often gave students a title or topic. Students were then asked to create a text. Students cannot write a text and organize their ideas into a good text.

Students have problems in grammar, vocabulary and also lack in organization. Lack of vocabulary knowledge makes students' grammar poor, making it difficult to write good texts. Furthermore the researcher also experiences that writing is the most challenging English skill for students, because in writing process, students does not only transfer thoughts and ideas into written form, but also they need to pay attention to grammar, organization, and vocabulary. Therefore, it is important for teachers to acquire knowledge to teach writing to the students. Thus the students can produce good writing in terms of grammar, vocabulary, and organization. When we teach lessons to students, especially writing, we have to give them new things or we have to use interesting methods or techniques in teaching. One technique that seems effective to solve the students problem is the Fact-Reason-Elaboration-Shift (FRESH) technique.

Fact-Reason-Elaboration-Shift (FRESH) is one of the techniques which use in teaching writing. According to F. Faisal, Krisna Suwandita (2013), Fact-Reason-Elaboration-Shift (FRESH) is one of the techniques that enable to the students to improve their comprehension. The strategy used in this model is the "F stands for "Fact". "Fact" in this study means the identification of the object or it called general description of the object. Usually, it contains object's name, kind of the object, etc. "R" stands for "Reasons" which means a supporting idea that streng then the fact. "E" stands for "Elaboration" "Elaboration" means the logical explanation. Students tell it, explaining it in detail, so that readers can get a clear picture of the object. "SH" is an abbreviation of "Shif", which can also mean decision or conclusion. This technique is consider for creating something new in teaching writing descriptive text. Therefore, the researcher tries to offer Fresh technique that makes students interested in learning to write. This can be a good way to improve students' skill in writing descriptive text, especially in grammar, organization and vocabulary. Because the teacher will guide them to create a descriptive text containing facts and reasons for the topic before breaking it down into a good text. It is hoped that this activity can improve the quality of students answers.

Method

In conducting this research, the researcher uses the quasi experimental research. There was one class as an experimental class and one class as a control class that would not choose randomly. Both of groups were taken from the class that has been formed by looking at the same condition. The experimental class will be taught by using FRESH technique while the control class will be taught by using another technique. It means that the treatment will be implemented only in the experimental group. This study will use a design which proposed by Cohen et al (2007) as follows:

Eksperimental : O_1 X O_2

Control O_3 X O_4

Where : O1 : pre-test of experimental class
O2 : post-test of experimental class
O3 : pre-test of control class
O4 : post-test of control class

In conducting research, the researcher needs population as the subject of the research. Population is the object of the research. The object can be people or things. According to Dornyei (2010), the population is the group of people who the survey is about. The population in this research would be the Elevents Grade Students of SMAN Model Terpadu Madani Palu, which contain of 172 learners. In this school, class elevents

divided into sevent parallel classes (six Natural Sciences class and one Social Sciences class).

In collecting data, The research use a test as the instrument is test consists of pre-test and post-test. This reserch conduct in eight meetings. A pre-test will be given to both of class experimental class and control class. Before doing the post-test, the experimental class will given the treatment. The treatment will be a writing text, there are minimum five of sentences in each paragraph. The treatment conducted in six meetings. Then, post-test would be given to both of classes after finish the treatment for the experimental class. The post-test will be used as a measurement to know how well the technique works in improving the students' achievement in writing descriptive text.

To analyze the data of this research, the researcher uses one kind of data analysis. Therefore, in analyzing the test, firstly, the researcher uses formula proposed by Arikunto (2006:240)

$$\sum = \frac{x}{n} \text{x } 100$$

Where :

$\sum$ = Standard score
x = Obtained score
n =Maximum score

To calculated mean of the class on pre-test and post-test, this study used formula proposed by Hatch and Farhady (1982:55);

$$X = \frac{\sum X}{N}$$

Where :

X = Mean
$\sum$x = Amount of score
N = Amount of data

After getting the mean score of both experimental and control group, this Study computed the squared deviation. It uses to know the significant difference between the experimental and control group. This study uses a formula proposed by Arikunto (2006:312)

a. The formula for experimental class $\sum x^2 = \sum x^2 - (\frac{\sum x^2}{N})$
b. The formula for control class $\sum y^2 = \sum y^2 - (\frac{\sum y^2}{N}$

Where :

$\sum x^2$ = Sum of square deviation of experimental class
$\sum y^2$ = Sum of square deviation of control class
N = Number of Student

Then the study analyzed the data in order to know thesiqnificant difference or testing hypothesis by using t-count formula as proposed by Arikunto (2006:311) as follows:

$$t = \frac{Mx - My}{\sqrt{\left[\frac{\sum x^2 + \sum y^2}{n_x + n_y - 2}\right]\left[\frac{1}{n_x} + \frac{1}{n_y}\right]}}$$

Where :

Mx = Mean of experimental group
My = Mean of control group
$\sum$x = Sum of square of experimental group
$\sum$y = Sum of square of control group
N_x = Number of student of experimental group
N_y = Number of student of control group

Results

The data were gotten by using test as the instrument of the research. There were two kind of the test in this research; pretest and posttest. The tests were administered to the bothm group. Experimental and control class, pretest before applying the treatment and posttest after applying the treatment by using Fact Reason-Elaboration-Shift (FRESH) technique in experimental class. The pretest was administered in order to know the students' ability in writing descriptive text in the first meeting. Posttest was given after the treatments were applied in experimental class. The result of each test was compared to measure whether the use of Fact-Reason-Elaboration-Shift (FRESH) technique can improve students' writing skill or not.

The Result of the Pre-Test

The researcher conducted a pre-test before giving the treatment. This pre-test aimed to measure the prior skill of the elevent-grade students of SMAN Model Terpadu Madani Palu to write a descriptive text. The pre-test was conducted on February $28^{th,}$ 2024.

Student's Score on Pre- test in experimental group

No	Initial Name	Writing Component: Grammar (3-0)	Organization (3-0)	Vocabulary (3-0)	Total Score	Final Score (X_1)	Qualification
1	MY	0	0	1	1	11.1	Failed
2	NF	0	0	1	1	11.1	Failed
3	W	0	0	1	1	11.1	Failed
4	H	0	1	1	2	22.2	Failed
5	SK	0	1	1	2	22.2	Failed
6	F	0	0	1	1	11.1	Failed
7	CW	0	1	1	2	22.2	Failed
8	MA	1	2	2	5	55.5	Failed
9	T	1	1	2	4	44.4	Failed
10	PSW	2	2	2	6	66.6	Failed
11	AF	0	0	1	1	11.1	Failed
12	MFB	1	1	1	3	33.3	Failed
13	NMD	3	2	2	7	**77.7**	Successful
14	TK	0	0	1	1	11.1	Failed
15	MAF	0	1	1	2	22.2	Failed
16	SV	0	1	1	2	22.2	Failed
17	S	0	1	2	3	33.3	Failed
18	MS	0	0	1	1	11.1	Failed
19	MF	0	1	2	3	33.3	Failed
20	AM	1	0	1	2	22.2	Failed
21	AMD	1	0	2	3	33.3	Failed
22	M	0	1	2	3	33.3	Failed
23	KV	2	1	1	4	44.4	Failed
24	MO	2	2	2	6	66.6	Failed
25	AO	0	1	1	2	22.2	Failed
26	BS	1	0	1	2	22.2	Failed
Total					**70**	**777**	

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the highest score was 77,7, and the lowest score was 11,1. Refers to (KKTP) of the school, there were only one student successful and twenty five student's failed. After calculating the student's score, the researcher computed the mean score of the pre-test of the experimental group by using the formula describe by Arikunto (2010:313) below.

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

$$Mx = \frac{777}{26}$$

$$Mx = 29{,}8$$

After calculating the data, it can be seen that the mean score of the pre-test of the experimental group is 29,8.

Student's Score on Pre- test in control group

No	Initials Name	Writing Component Grammar (3-0)	Organization (3-0)	Vocabulary (3-0)	Total Score	Final Score (Y_1)	Qualification
1	ZY	1	2	2	5	55.5	Failed
2	AB	2	2	2	6	66.6	Failed
3	IR	1	0	1	2	22.2	Failed
4	MAG	1	0	1	2	22.2	Failed
5	NS	2	2	3	7	**77.7**	Successful
6	FH	1	1	1	3	33.3	Failed
7	PG	1	2	1	4	44.4	Failed
8	JA	1	0	1	2	22.2	Failed
9	MD	1	1	1	3	33.3	Failed
10	RW	2	3	2	7	**77.7**	Successful
11	MI	0	0	1	1	11.1	Failed
12	YS	1	0	1	2	22.2	Failed
13	G	1	0	0	1	11.1	Failed
14	DS	2	0	1	3	33.3	Failed
15	CR	1	0	2	3	33.3	Failed
16	F	1	1	2	4	44.4	Failed
17	MA	2	1	2	5	55.5	Failed
18	AR	1	1	1	3	33.3	Failed
19	AA	2	2	3	7	**77.7**	Successful
20	TS	1	0	1	2	22.2	Failed
21	NF	1	1	1	3	33.3	Failed
22	AN	2	2	2	6	66.6	Failed
Total					**81**	**899,1**	

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the highest score was 77,7, and the lowest score was 11,1. Refers to (KKTP) of the school, there were only three student's successful and nineteen student's failed. After calculating the total score, the researcher computed the mean score of the pre-test of the control group by using the formula proposed Arikunto (2010:313) below.

$$My = \frac{\sum y}{N}$$

$$My = \frac{899{,}1}{22}$$

My = 40,8

After calculating the data, it can be seen that the mean score of the pre-test of the control group is 40,8.

Furthermore, the researcher compared the mean score of the pre-test of the control group was (40,8>29,8) of the pre-test of the experimental group.

The Result of the Post-Test

After the treatment, the researcher administered the post-test to measure the effectiveness of the technique applying Fact Reason-Elaboration-Shift (FRESH) technique in developing writing skill. The researcher used a similar type of test as in the pre-test, but on a different topic to know whether there was any impact after the researcher gave the treatment.

Student's Score on posttest in Experimental Group

No	Initial Name	Writing Component: Grammar (3-0)	Organization (3-0)	Vocabulary (3-0)	Total Score	Fainal Score (X_2)	Qualification
1	MY	2	2	2	6	66.6	Failed
2	NF	2	2	2	6	66.6	Failed
3	W	2	2	2	6	66.6	Failed
4	H	2	2	3	7	**77.7**	Successful
5	SK	1	3	3	7	**77.7**	Successful
6	F	2	2	2	6	66.6	Failed
7	CW	2	2	3	7	**77.7**	Successful
8	MA	3	2	2	7	**77.7**	Successful
9	T	2	3	2	7	**77.7**	Successful
10	PSW	2	3	3	8	**88.8**	Successful
11	AF	2	2	2	6	66.6	Failed
12	MFB	2	2	3	7	**77.7**	Successful
13	NMD	3	2	3	8	**88.8**	Successful
14	TK	1	3	3	7	**77.7**	Successful
15	MAF	3	2	2	7	**77.7**	Successful
16	SV	3	2	2	7	**77.7**	Successful
17	S	2	2	2	6	66.6	Failed
18	MS	2	2	2	6	66.6	Failed
19	MF	3	2	2	7	**77.7**	Successful
20	AM	2	2	2	6	66.6	Failed
21	AMD	3	2	2	7	**77.7**	Successful
22	M	2	2	3	7	**77.7**	Successful
23	KV	3	1	3	7	**77.7**	Successful
24	MO	2	2	3	7	**77.7**	Successful
25	AO	3	2	2	7	**77.7**	Successful
26	BS	2	2	3	7	**77.7**	Successful
Total					**176**	**1.953, 6**	

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the highest score was 88,8, and the lowest score was 66,6. Refers to (KKTP) of the school, there were eighteen student's successful and eight student's failed. After calculating the total score, the researcher

computed the mean score of the post-test of the experimental group using the formula proposed by Arikunto (2010:313) below.

$$Mx = \frac{\sum x}{N}$$
$$Mx = \frac{1.953,6}{26}$$
$$Mx = 75,13$$

After the data were calculated, it can be seen that the mean score of the post-test of the experimental group was 75,13.

Student's score on posttest in Control Group

No	Initial Name	Writing Component: Grammar (3-0)	Organization (3-0)	Vocabulary (3-0)	Total Score	Final Score (Y_2)	Qualification
1	ZY	2	2	2	6	66.6	Failed
2	AB	3	2	2	7	**77.7**	Successful
3	IR	1	2	2	5	55.5	Failed
4	MAG	1	2	2	5	55.5	Failed
5	NS	2	3	2	7	**77.7**	Successful
6	FH	3	2	1	6	66.6	Failed
7	PG	2	2	2	6	66.6	Failed
8	JA	2	2	2	6	66.6	Failed
9	MD	2	2	1	5	55.5	Failed
10	RW	3	2	2	7	**77.7**	Successful
11	MI	3	2	2	7	**77.7**	Successful
12	YS	2	2	2	6	66.6	Failed
13	G	3	1	2	6	66.6	Failed
14	DS	2	1	2	5	55.5	Failed
15	CR	2	1	2	5	55.5	Failed
16	F	3	2	1	6	66.6	Failed
17	MA	2	2	2	6	66.6	Failed
18	AR	2	1	2	5	55.5	Failed
19	AA	2	2	2	6	66.6	Failed
20	TS	3	1	1	5	55.5	Failed
21	NF	2	2	3	7	**77.7**	Successful
22	AN	2	2	2	6	66.6	Failed
Total					**130**	**1.443**	

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the highest score was 77,7, and the lowest score was 55,5. Refers to KKTP (70) of the school, there were five student's successful and seventeen student's failed. After calculating the total score, the researcher computed the mean score of the post-test of the control group using the formula proposed by Arikunto (2010:313) below.

$$My = \frac{\sum y}{N}$$
$$My = \frac{1.443}{22}$$
$$My = 65,5.$$

After the data were calculated, it can be seen that the mean score of the post-test of the control group was 65,5.

Furthermore, the researcher compared the mean score of the post-test of the control group was (65,5<75,13) of the post-test of the experimental group.

Deviation Score

The researcher calculated the deviation and squared deviation of the student scores after calculating their achievement on the pre- test and post- test. The results are shown in the table below.

Deviation and Squared Deviation of Experimental Group

No	Initial Name	Writing Component Pretest (X_1) Students Score	Posttest (X_2) Students Score	$X_2 - X_1$ X	X^2
1	MY	11,1	66,6	55,5	3080,2
2	NF	11,1	66,6	55,5	3080,2
3	W	11,1	66,6	55,5	3080,2
4	H	22.2	77,7	55,5	3080,2
5	SK	22,2	77.7	55,5	3080,2
6	F	11,1	66.6	55,5	3080,2
7	CW	22,2	77,7	55,5	3080,2
8	MA	55,5	77.7	22,2	492,8
9	T	44,4	77,7	33,3	1108,8
10	PSW	66,6	88.8	22,2	492,8
11	AF	11.1	66,6	55,5	3080,2
12	MFB	33,3	77,7	44,4	1971,3
13	NMD	77,7	88.8	11,1	123,2
14	TK	11,1	77,7	66,6	4435,5
15	MAF	22,2	77,7	55,5	3080,2
16	SV	22,2	77,7	55,5	3080,2
17	S	33,3	66,6	33,3	1108,8
18	MS	11,1	66,6	55,5	3080,2
19	MF	33,3	77,7	44,4	1971,3
20	AM	22.2	66,6	44,4	1971,3
21	AMD	33.3	77,7	44,4	1971,3
22	M	33.3	77,7	44,4	1971,3
23	KV	44.4	77,7	33,3	1108,8
24	MO	66,6	77,7	11,1	123,2
25	AO	22.2	77,7	55,5	3080,2
26	BS	22.2	77,7	55,5	3080,2
	Total Score			**1176,6**	**58893,2**

Deviation and Squared Deviation of Control Group

No	Initial Name	Writing Component: Pretest (y_1) Students Score	Posttest (y_2) Students Score	$y_2 - y_1$ X	y^2
1	ZY	55,5	66,6	11,1	123,2
2	AB	66,6	77,7	11.1	123.2
3	IR	22,2	55,5	33,3	1108,8
4	MAG	22,2	55,5	33,3	1108,8
5	NS	77,7	88,8	55,5	3080,2
6	FH	33,3	66.6	33,3	1108,8
7	PG	44,4	66,6	22,2	492,8
8	JA	22,2	66.6	44,4	1971,3
9	MD	33,3	55,5	22,2	492,8
10	RW	77,7	77.7	0	0
11	MI	11.1	77,7	66,6	4435,5
12	YS	22,2	66,6	44,4	1971,3
13	G	11,1	66,6	55,5	3080,2
14	DS	33,3	55.5	22,2	492,8
15	CR	33,3	55.5	22,2	492,8
16	F	44,4	66,6	22,2	492,8
17	MA	55,5	66,6	11,1	123,2
18	AR	33,3	55,5	22,2	492,8
19	AA	77,7	88,8	11,1	123,2
20	TS	22.2	55,5	33,3	1108,8
21	NF	33.3	66,6	33,3	1108,8
22	AN	66,6	77,7	11,1	123,2
	Total Score			**621,6**	**23655,3**

Next, the researcher analyzed the mean deviation scores of both groups as shown below.

$$\mathbf{Mx} = \frac{\sum x}{N} = \frac{1176,6}{26} = \mathbf{45,25}$$

$$\mathbf{My} = \frac{\sum y}{N} = \frac{621,6}{22} = \mathbf{28,25}$$

Then, the researcher analyzed the sum of the square deviation of both experimental and control groups as follows.

1) The sum of the square deviation of the experimental group

$$\sum x^2 = \sum x^2 - \left(\frac{(\sum x)^2}{N}\right)$$

$$= 58893,2 - \left(\frac{(1176,6)^2}{26}\right.$$

$$= 58893,2 - \left(\frac{1384387,5}{26}\right)$$

$$= 58893,2 - 53245,6$$

$$\sum x^2 = 5.647,6$$

$$\sum y^2 = \sum y^2 - \left(\frac{(\sum y)^2}{N}\right.$$

$$= 23655,3 - \left(\frac{(621,6)^2}{22}\right.$$

$$= 23655,3 - (\frac{386386,5}{22})$$
$$= 23655,3 - 17563,1$$
$$\sum y^2 = 6.092,2$$

Last, to determine the significant between experimental and control groups, the researcher used the t-test formula as shown below.

$$t = \frac{Mx - My}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\sum x^2 + \sum y^2}{Nx + Ny - 2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{Nx} + \frac{1}{Ny}\right)}}$$
$$t = \frac{45,25 - 28,25}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{5647,6 + 6092,2}{26 + 22 - 2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{26} + \frac{1}{22}\right)}}$$
$$t = \frac{17}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{11739,8}{46}\right)(0,8)}}$$
$$t = \frac{17}{\sqrt{(255,21)(0.08)}}$$
$$t = \frac{17}{\sqrt{20,4168}}$$
$$t = \frac{17}{4,52}$$
$$t = 3.76$$

Discussion

The result of the test shows that the writing skill of the elevents grade students of SMAN Model Terpadu Madani Palu could be improved by applying Fact-Reason Elaboration-Shift (FRESH) technique. To make it more obvious, the study explained briefly the students' improvement before having treatment, getting treatment, and after having treatment.

First, the pretest gave to the experimental and control class before treatment to know their knowledge in writing descriptive text. The test was contained a prompt. The students asked to write simple descriptive text. Both of experimental and control class received the same kind of pretest. The result of the pretest was under the standard score. In experimental class, 0 (0%) students were considered pass the test, the mean score was 29,8. While in the control class, 0 (0%) students were also considered pass which the mean score was 40,8. The study calculated that both of the class had similar ability in writing because they made many mistakes in making descriptive text.

Based on the result of pretest, in fact the students had some problems in writing, on line with the forms of this research which concerned with some aspect of writing; organization, grammar and vocabulary. First, the study found that the students did not write anything for minutes when they were asked to write descriptive text. It means that they confused when they were going to start writing something. They did not know how to express their ideas. Second. they also often made mistakes in organization of the paragraph and could not put their ideas in the right part. The last, the students almost did not master the construction of grammatical sentences well especially in simple present tense. So, they produced text in grammatical errors, meaningless sentences, used Bahasa Indonesia styles and even wrong. The students basically translate word by word what they want to write from Indonesia to English. Furthermore, the researcher gave treatment in order to help the students in experimental class to improve their writing skill.

After conducted a pretest in both classes. The treatment were conducted to experimental class in six meetings. Both classes were taught with different technique. The experimental class was taught writing descriptive text through Fact-Reason-

Elaboration-Shift (FRESH) technique. While the control class was taught through conventional technique as their teacher taught in school. The material for both classes were provided related to the merdeka curriculum about descriptive text. In experimental class, the first and second meeting they were taught about descriptive text, the generic structures and tenses that used in descriptive text. From the third to the six meetings, they were taught several topics by applying Fact-Reason-Elaboration Shift (FRESH) technique.

There are some procedures that writer used in developing students' writing skill. First of all, teacher gave students' attention and asked some students questions related to the topic. Then, the teacher delivers the learning obiectives that will be done at this meeting. In applying the treatment, teachers introduced and explained to them what Faet-Reason-Elaboration-Shift (FRESH) technique is and how to make descriptive text by applying Fact-Reason-Elaboration-Shif (FRESH) technique. After that, the students got a topic about descriptive text. Next step, they were asked to write the fact about the topic. Third, after write the topic, the learners were asked to write the reason about the fact that they already write. Fourth, after done two steps before, the learners were asked to elaborate the fact and the reason that they have stated before. Last, after finishing all steps before, the learners were asked to write a conclution about their text.

In the process of teaching learning, the students were active, interested, and enthusiastic. They gave their participation to do the task and asked the researcher about related vocabulary that they did not know. Furthermore, the teacher help the students check their error in writing. And the last the students were given exercise. Finally, the researcher gave the learners posttest to measure their writing skill after having treatment both of the class.

The result of posttest showed the significance progress the students in experimental class. Although in the control class had progress also, but its progress was different. The study found in the experimental class, there were 18 (69,23 %) students got score higher than standard score and 8 (30,77%) students got lower the standard score. The highest score was 88.8. The study found the mean score of posttest in experimental class was 75,13. Meanwhile, in control class. there were 5 (22.73%) learners got score higher than standard score and 17 (77,27%) leaners got score lower the standard score. Furthermore, the mean score of posttest in the control class was 65,5. Based on the results, the score of the students in experimental class were higher than the learners in the control class. Finally, the study concluded that the applying Fact-Reason-Elaboration-Shift (FRESH) technique is effective to improve writing skill of the elevents grade students at SMAN Model Terpadu Madani Palu.

By applying Fact-Reason-Elaboration-Shift (FRESH) technique in teaching and learning writing process. Based on teaching procedures, the learners could be active when the learners getting and organizing idea from the topic. The technique was guided the learners to organize their idea in the written form, therefore this technique was effective for the student’s to practice their developing ideas as well as increasing vocabulary knowledge and practicing student’s grammar skills. The learners in the experimental class were guided to get the ideas, grammar and vocabulary used to make descriptive text.

Conclusion

Based on the results of the data analysis, the researcher draws conclusions as follows. The study concludes that the applying Fact-Reason-Elaboration-Shift (FRESH) technique is effective to improve writing skill of the elevents grade students at SMAN

Model Terpadu Madani Palu. Especially in the some aspects of writing, there are organization, grammar and vocabulary. It was supported by the mean score between the mean score of posttest in experimental class (75,13) is higher than the mean score of posttest in control class (65,5). It also was proved by the t-counted value (3,76) is higher than the t-table (2.02). Therefore, the hypothesis of this research is accepted. It showed that the score of experimental class after the treatment applying Fact-Reason-Elaboration-Shift (FRESH) techniqueis better than the score of control class. In conclusion, through Fact-Reason-Elaboration Shift (FRESH) technique can be used to help the students to improve and to master their writing skill, particularly in writing descriptive text.

Acknowledgment

The researcher expresses her highest gratitude to the Almighty Allah SWT for blessing, love, opportunity, health, and mercy so that the writer could finish this article. In arranging this article, a lot of people have provided motivation, advice, support, and even remark that had helped the researcher. In this valuable chance, the researcher aims to express her gratitude and appreciation to the following people :. Abdul Kamaruddin, S.Pd, M.Ed., Ph.D., Afrillia anggreni, M.Pd and Dr. Nur Sehang Thamrin, S.Pd., M.Ed. as the researcher's academic advisor, for their help, instruction, guidance, time, and support in correcting and helping her finished her research, Her beloved parents, Mr. Andi Azis Pangeran and Mrs. Suriani for their love, care and support which following her in every step of her life, especially during the process of her research.

References

Arikunto, S. (2006). ProsedurPenelitianSuatuPendekatanPraktik. Jakarta: RinekaCipta

Celce-Murcia, Marianne and Larsen-Freeman, Diane. (1999). The grammar Book. USA: Heinle and Heinle

Cohen, L.,Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (2000). Research Method in Education (Fifth ed.). London and New York: Taylor and Francis e-Library

Cohen, L,Manion, L.and Morrison, K. (2007). Research Methods in Education (Sixth ed.). New York: 270 Madison Avenue

Dornyei, Z. (2003). Questionnaires in Second Language Research. London: lawrenceerlbaum associates publishers. New Jersey

Faisal. (2010). Penerapan FRESH' UntukMengembangkan Paragraph DescriptifBagi Guru LBPP LIA Purwekerto. Purwokerto

Harmer, J. (2007). The Practice English Language Teaching (Fourth Edition). New York: Pearson Longman.

Hatch, E and Farhady, H. (1982). Research Design and Statistic for Applied Linguistics. Los Angeles. New Houry Publisher Inc. University of California.

Lannon, J. M. (1994). Technical Writing, Sixth Edition. New York: Harper Collins College.

Oshima, A., & Hogue, A. (1999). Writing Academic English. Addison Wesley Longman.

Richards, J. C., &Renandya, W. A. (2002).Methodology in Language Teaching: An anthology of Current Practice. United States of America: Cambridge University Press. New York.

Suwandinata, K. (2013), The effectiveness of FRESH Technique to Teach Descriptive Paragraph. Journal of Education Learning. Muhammadiyah University of Purwokerto. Vol7 (4) pp. 239-248

Thornbury, S. (1999). How to Teach Grammar. England: Longmen.

Weigle, C.S. (2009). Assessing Writing. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Wulandari, Y. (2013), Improving Students' Competence in Writing Descriptive Texts Through "Fresh" Technique. Journal of Education Learning. Muhammadiayah University of Purwokerto. Vol2 (1)pp. 2301-7554