INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY: APPLIED BUSINESS AND EDUCATION RESEARCH
2023, Vol. 4, No. 9, 3264 – 3285
http://dx.doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.04.09.17

Research Article

The Effect of Pictures in Writing Narrative Text of Students of Junior High

Mungkap Mangapul Siahaan*, Asima Rohana Sinaga, Jumaria Sirait, Ega Putri Sani Sibarani, Sunggul Pasaribu

Lecturer of English Education Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, University of HKBP Nommensen Pematangsiantar, Pematangsiantar, Indonesia

Article history:
Submission May 2023
Revised September 2023
Accepted September 2023

**Corresponding author:*
E-mail:
mungkapsiahaan@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study aims to investigate whether or not there is an effect of Picture Teaching Model in teaching narrative text for the ninth grades students of SMPN 2 Pematangsiantar. The method used in the research is a true experimental design method. In the method, the researcher used two classes as one control class and one experimental class. The experimental class was taught with a treatment as Picture Teaching Model and the control class was taught with a conventional model. The sampling was selected by random sampling, as class 〖IX〗^5 as control class consisted of 32 students and class 〖IX〗^7 as experimental class consists of 32 students. The means of experimental group was higher that that the control group (20.75 – 14.53 = 2.87), the two means of both experimental and control group was different. If this difference can show that t-test is greater than t-table, that it is significant. The value of t-test has higher than t-table 6.98>2.00. It means that there is a significances after Picture Teaching Model is used to teach writing narrative text. Based on calculation of t-test is (6.98) is higher than t-table at the level of significance (2.00). If the result of t-test is higher than t-table (6.98>2.00), the null hypothesis (H0) is rejected and alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted. The results state that there is an influence of Picture Teaching Model in Narrative text learning in class IX of SMPN 2 Pematangsiantar.

Keywords: *Picture Teaching Model, Narrative, Writing*

Introduction

As an international language, English is one of the primary languages to master in Indonesia, and this is to be a compulsory subject in schools and university. In English lesson, every student must be competence in each skill of English language as: listening, speaking, reading and writing (Gilmartin & Esterhuizen, 2020). And to support their language competence, the components as vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, teaching media, teaching strategies, teaching methods and curriculum

How to cite:
Siahaan, M. M., Sinaga, A. R., Sirait, J., Sibarani, E. P. S., & Pasaribu, S. (2023). The Effect of Pictures in Writing Narrative Text of Students of Junior High. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*. *4*(9), 3264 – 3285. doi: 10.11594/ijmaber.04.09.17

are modified appropriately (Thuong & Phusawisot, 2020). In writing, there are role in conveying messages which shows different characteristics from speaking one. These could be seen from arrangement Topic Sentence, Thesis Statement, Supporting Sentence and Concluding Sentence (Siahaan & Sianturi, 2021). As a matter of fact, it may not be easy for beginners to write English particularly for the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners including the Indonesian junior high school students (Miller et al., 2018b). In addition, from all the language competence, writing has the lowest impact in their language development. In accordance with Gan (in Larsen-Freeman & DeCarrico, 2019), the problems that may be commonly encountered by students are inadequate vocabularies, complicated structure, inappropriate meaning and lack of language curriculum development (Khair et al., 2021).

Related to the observation data of an internship program to SMP Negeri 2 Pematangsiantar, the annual academic report of SMP Negeri 2 Pematangsiantar showed that there are problems of students interest and motivation in studying English which is effected to the lower achievement index of their English competences and scores statistic (Favero & Cesar, 2022). The partnership between the school and the University of HKBP Nommensen Pematangsiantar is arranged in a Memorandum of Understanding and this is to be a legal rule to do an education program (Haerazi et al., 2020). This school is one of the partners of the University in order to enhance the success of education quality in the town; the University presence provides consultation, collaboration, reflection, innovation, research and growth professionally (Putri & Refnaldi, 2020).

According to the research results of Siswo Sukarno (in Miller et al., 2018) which is title "Picture and picture models to increase interest and achievement in learning English in writing recount texts", it shows that there is an increase of students interest as well as their achievement in learning English writing (Yusuf et al., 2018). The learning achievement in pre-cycle conditions of students who completed in cycle 1 was 50% became 74.19% and increased to 80.65% in cycle 2. Whereas, 5 out of 10 students interviewed stated that the picture and picture method aroused the students interest in learning English language. The picture and picture method is effective in generating interest in learning English especially in writing recount text (Spencer & Petersen, 2018). The difference between Siswo's research and this research is the instrument or learning used to determine the effect of Picture Teaching Model in teaching narrative text for the ninth grades students of SMPN 2 Pematangsiantar (Jesson et al., 2018b). The presence of an English teacher is not just conveying material of the lesson but as a facilitator, organizer and coach to bring the lesson interesting, joy, happiness and professionalism so that the lesson learning outcome improved (Siahaan, Mungkap Mangapul et al., 2021), (Sugiyanto, 2010). And Picture Teaching Model in teaching narrative text is a learning strategy (Suprijono, 2009), therefore the research focus to analyze the application of picture teaching model and find out the influence to the students interest and motivation in learning narrative text (Jesson et al., 2018a).

Method

The method and procedure of the research are consist of research design, subject of research, the population and sample, instrument for collecting data, technique of collecting data, technique of analyzing data (Graham, 2020). The method used in the research is a true experimental design method (Ismayanti & Kholiq, 2020). In the method, the researcher used two classes as one control class and one experimental class (Ramadhan et al., 2020). The experimental class was taught with a treatment as Picture Teaching Model and the control class was taught with a conventional model (Gustanti & Ayu, 2021). The sampling was selected by random sampling, as class ⟦IX⟧^5 as control class consisted of 32 students and class ⟦IX⟧^7 as experimental class consists of 32 students (Bai & Guo, 2021).

Table 1. The Table of the Research Design

	Group	Test I	Treatment	Test II
A	Experimental	Pre-test	Using Picture	Post-test
B	Control	Pre-test	Conventional Technique	Post-test

According to Arikunto (2010:148), population is defined as all members of any well-defined class of people, events, or objects. The population is the ninth grade students of SMP Negeri 2 Pematangsiantar. This research was conducted at SMP Negeri 2 Pematangsiantar. It is located in Jln. Kartini Pematangsiantar. The experimental and control class of the research were selected randomly. The school has grade VII a mountof 12 classes and totally consist of 340 students, grade VIII has 12 classes and totally consist 320 and grade IX has 12 classes also and totally consist of 324 students.

The Instrument of Collecting Data

To know the effectiveness of teaching writing narrative text by using picture, the writer gave a written test to the students. The students were tested by given the explaining in the attempt to know the result of teaching writing narrative text by using Picture. To collect the data, the writer asked the student to write (a fable story) a narrative text by seeing the picture and the fable story that had been shown in the generic structure.

Scoring The Test

Based on Heaton (in Angelina, 2020) stated that there are component analytic scale for evaluating writing. They are: content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics (in Afriyuninda & Oktaviani, 2021). The test is scored by using Heaton's theory as follows:

Content

The scoring of the content depends on the students capability to write their ideas and information in the form of logical sentences (Nofrika, 2019). The criterion of scoring content are given below:

Table 2. The Criterion of the content Scoring

Score	Criteria
	Excelent To Very Good
27-30	Knowledge Able, Substantive,Through Development Of Thesis And Relevant To Assigned Topic.
	Good To Average
22-26	Some Knowledge Of Subject, Adequate, Range, Limited Development Of Thesis, Mostly Relevant To Topic But Lacks Detail.
Score	**Criteria**
	Fair To Poor
17-21	Limited Knowledge Of Subject, Inadequate Topic.
	Very Poor
13-16	Does Not Show Knowledge Of Subject, Non-Substantive, Not Pertinent, Or Not Enough To Evaluate.

Organization

The organization refers to the ability of students in writing their ideas and information. The topic and the supporting sentences are clearly stated (Permatasari, 2013). The criteria of scoring organization are given below:

Table 3. The Criterion of the Organization

Score	Criteria
	Excelent To Very Good
18-20	Fluent Expression, Ideas Clearly Stated/Supported, Succinct, Well Organized, Logical Sequencing, Cohesive.
	Good To Average
14-17	Somewhat Choopy, Loosely Organized But Main Ideas Stand Out, Limited Support, Logacal But Incomplete Sequencing.
SCORE	**Criteria**
	Fair To Poor
10-13	Non-Fluent, Ideas Confused Or Disconnected, Lacks Logical Sequencing And Development.
	Very Poor
7-9	Does not communicative, non-organization, or not enough to evaluate.

Vocabulary

Vocabulary refers to the students ability in using words, idiom to express the ideas logically, use the synonym, antonym, prefix, and suffix exactly (Nabila, 2022). The criteria of scoring vocabulary are given below:

Table 4. The Criterion of the Vocabulary

Score	Criteria
	EXCELENT TO VERY GOOD
18-20	Sophisticated range, effective word/idiom choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register.
	GOOD TO AVERAGE
14-17	Adequate range, accasional errors of word/idiom from, choise, usage but meaning not obscured
Score	**Criteria**
	FAIR TO POOR
10-13	Limited range, frequent errors of word/idiom form, choice usage, meaning confused or observed.
	VERY POOR
7-9	Essentially translation, little knowledge of English vocabulary, idioms, word form, or not enough to evaluate

Language Use

Language use refers to the ability to use agreement in the sentence and some other words such as nouns, adjective, verbs. The criteria of scoring language use are given below:

Table 5. The Criterion of the Language Use

Score	Criteria
22-25	EXCELENT TO VERY GOOD Effective complex construction, few errors of agreement tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, preposition.
Score	**Criteria**
	GOOD TO AVERAGE
18-21	Effective but simple construction, minor problems in complex construction, several errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions but meaning seldom obscured.

Score	Criteria
	FAIR TO POOr
11-17	Major problems in simple/complex construction, frequent errors of negation, agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions of fragments, deletions, meaning confused or obscured.
	VERY POOR
5-10	Virtually no mastery of sentence construction rules, dominated by errors, does not communicative, or not enough to evaluate.

Mechanic

Mechanics refers to the ability of the students in using appropriately; using functions correctly, paragraph and the text can be read correctly. The criteria of scoring mechanics are given below:

Table 6. The Criterion of the Mechanics

Score	Criteria
	Excelent To Very Good
5	Demonstrates Mastery Of Conventions, Few Errors Of Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization, Paragraphing.
	Good To Average
4	Occasional Errors Of Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization, Paragraphing, But Meaning Not Obscured.
	Fair To Poor
3	Frequent Errors Of Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization, Paragraphing, Poor Handwriting, Meaning Confused Or Obscured.
	Very Poor
2	No Mastery Of Conventions, Dominated By Errors Of Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization, Paragraphing, Handwriting Illegible Or Not Enough To Valuate.

Table 7. Test specification of writing narrative text

Aspects		Criteria		Total Point
1.	Content	Coherence and Unity of the paragraphs. Coherence = 15 Unity = 15		30
2.	Organization	Identification and Description: Introducing the participants, place, and time, or information about what, who, where, or when, written in a letter. Identification = 10 Description = 10		20
3.	Vocabulary	- Appropriate words - Idiom	10 10	20
4.	Language Use	- Tenses (Present Tense) - Pronoun/noun - Adverb - Adjective - Action Verb	5 5 5 5 5	25
5.	Mechanics	Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization		5
Total Score				100

The Validation of Test

Test validations consist of the establishment of validity and reliability. This two factors should be fulfilled a test before it is used to device the data in research (Pitarch, 2020). The establishment and procedure of each aspect is discussed in the following parts.

The Validity of Test

The writer assumed that the test is valid for the purpose of the test has sufficient evidence that complete with ability to be tested. In relation to the research, the test is to measure the students' vocabulary based on the test.

The Reliability of Test

Reliability is one the characteristics of a good test. Reliability refers to the consistency of the measurement. Arikunto (2011:93), to obtain the reliability of the test, the writer uses the formula of Spearman-Brown that is:

$$r_{11} = \frac{2 r_{1/2\,1/2}}{(1 + r_{1/2\,1/2})}$$

Note:

r_{11} : coefficient reliability

$r_{1/2}$: scores correlation

The value of the reliability is as the following:

The Technique of Analysis Data

There are two groups of data, those of experimental and control. The technique of analyzing the data, are:

Mean

After analyze the data, the researcher must find out the highest score and the lowest score, after that find out the mean from experimental group and control group, with uses formula as follow:

$\mathbf{M} = \frac{x}{n}$ **and** $\mathbf{M} = \frac{y}{n}$

Note:

n: The number of subject

x: Calculation the scores pre-test

y: Calculation the scores post-test

Median

After analyzed the data from the mean, the researcher find out the median. In experimental group, the median of pre-test, is lowest mean, and the median of post-test,is highest the mean. In control group, the median of pre-test and post-test must highest mean.

Standard Deviation

After getting mean, the researcher an alyzes standard deviation experimental group and control group, with uses the formula below:

$$SD = \frac{1}{N}\sqrt{N.\sum X^2 - \left(\sum X\right)^2}$$

After the getting mean and standard deviation of each group, the writer analyzes the data by using t-test formula. To analyze data, The T-Test formula use as follow (Arikunto, 2010:354):

$$\boldsymbol{T - Test} = \frac{\boldsymbol{M_x - M_y}}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\sum \boldsymbol{x^2} + \sum \boldsymbol{y^2}}{\boldsymbol{N_x + N_y - 2}}\right)\left(\frac{\boldsymbol{1}}{\boldsymbol{N_x}} + \frac{\boldsymbol{1}}{\boldsymbol{N_y}}\right)}}$$

Note :

M_x : Mean of Experimental group

M_y : Mean of Control group

X : standard Deviation of Experimental group

Y : standard Deviation of Control group

N_x : Total number samples of experimental group

N_y : Total number of Control group

Result and Discussion

This chapter exposes the nature of data processing. The analysis is based on Arikunto (2010) theory that can be used to analyze the data.

Table 8. The Result of the Pre-Test and Post-Test in Experimental Group (IX^7)

No.	Names of Students	With Using Picture	
		Pre-Test (X)	Post-Test (Y)
1.	Adi Saragih	50	70

No.	Names of Students	With Using Picture	
		Pre-Test (X)	Post-Test (Y)
2.	Ananda	58	78
3.	Anggi Situmeang	60	80
4.	Destary Marpaung	55	70
5.	Dewi Sihombing	60	82
6.	Elsa Simanjuntak	55	78
7.	Evolenta Ambarita	50	70
8.	Fadillah Siregar	55	73
9.	Gabriel S	60	85
10.	Grace Okta S	58	80
11.	Hazazi A. Z	55	76
12.	Junjunan Sianturi	58	78
13.	Krishna Pardamean	65	85
14.	Kristian Saragih	55	78
15.	Laura Sibarani	70	90
16.	Linson Haloho	57	75
17.	Marta Batubara	58	80
18.	Mona Sinaga	40	70
19.	Noel Tamba	54	75
20.	Palentino Pardede	48	68
21.	Putra Damanik	62	83
22.	Ricki Siahaan	58	78
23.	Rio Tambunanp	60	70
24.	Rivaldo P	55	78
25.	Riwaldi Damanik	58	74
26.	Sonia Pasaribu	60	85
27.	Sri Widia	52	70
28.	Sukma Cipta	55	75
29.	Wandari Purba	48	70
30.	Winda Lestari	50	72
31.	Yohannes Zega	52	74
32.	Yusleli Siagian	50	75
	N=32	**∑X=1781**	**∑Y=2445**

Mean of Experimental Group (IX^7)
Mean of Pre-Test :
Mean of Post-Test :

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

$M = \frac{\sum Y}{N}$

$=\frac{1781}{32}$

$= \frac{2445}{32}$

= 55,65

= 76,40

Based on the data above, after the data is analyzed, it shows that the mean (M) in pre-test is 55.65 and the median is 55. The highest score is 70 and the lowest score is 40. Based on the data above, after the data is analyzed, it shows that the mean (M) in Post-test is 76.40 and the median is 77. The highest score is 90 and the lowest score is 68.

The Level of the Students' Scores in Experimental Group in Pre-Test

N = 32
∑X = 1781
$\sum(X)^2$ = 100109
Mean = 55.65
Standard Deviation (SD)

$$SD = \frac{1}{N}\sqrt{\left\{\left(N\sum X^2\right)-\left(\sum X\right)^2\right\}}$$

$$SD = \frac{1}{32}\sqrt{(32\,x100109) - (1781)^2}$$

$$SD = \frac{1}{32}\sqrt{3203488 - 3171961}$$

$$SD = \frac{1}{32}\sqrt{31527}$$

$$SD = \frac{1}{32}(177.55)$$

SD = 5.54

So, the level of the students' scores in pre-test in experimental group
Mean ( ) = 55.65
Standard of deviation (SD) = 5.54

Table 9. Level of Scores

Level of Scores	The Criteria
High	$\bar{x}$ + S
	55.65 + 5.54
	61.19
Median	$\bar{x}$ - S ↔ $\bar{x}$ + S
	55.65 – 5.54 ↔ 55.65 + 5.54
	50.11 ↔ 61.19
Low	$\bar{x}$ - S
	55.65 – 5.54
	50.11

Table 10. Classification of the students' scores in pre-test.

Level of Scores	The Criteria	Number of Students	%
High	More than 61.19	3	9%
Median	Between 50.11– 61.19	21	66%
Low	Under 50.11	8	25%

The Level of the Students' Scores in Experimental Group in Post-Test

N = 32
∑Y = 2445
∑(Y)² = 187757
Mean = 76.40
Standard Deviation (SD)

$$SD = \frac{1}{N}\sqrt{\left\{\left(N\sum X^2\right) - \left(\sum X\right)^2\right\}}$$

$$SD = \frac{1}{32}\sqrt{(32\,x187757) - (2445)^2}$$

$$SD = \frac{1}{32}\sqrt{6008224 - 5978025}$$

$$SD = \frac{1}{32}\sqrt{30199}$$

$$SD = \frac{1}{32}(173.77)$$

SD = 5.43

So, the level of the students' scores in post-test in experimental group
Mean ( ) = 76.40
Standard of deviation (SD) = 5.43

Table 11. Level of Scores

Level of Scores	The Criteria
High	$\bar{x}$ + S
	76.40 + 5.43
	81.83
Median	$\bar{x}$ - S ↔ $\bar{x}$ + S
	76.40 – 5.43 ↔ 76.40 + 5.43
	70.97 ↔ 81.83

Level of Scores	The Criteria
Low	$\overline{x}$ - S
	76.40 – 5.43
	70.97

Table 12. Classification of the students' scores in post-test

Level of Scores	The Criteria	Number of Students	%
High	More than 83.51	4	12%
Median	Between 70.87 ↔ 83.51	20	63%
Low	Under 70.87	8	25%

Testing the Validity of the Test in Experimental Group

The test was valid for the purpose of the test has sufficient evidence that correlate with ability to be tested for the test, it was calculated by using the formula as follows:

Table 13. The Result of the Pre-Test and Post-Test in Experimental Group

No	Names of Students	With Using Picture				
		Pre-Test (X)	Post-Test (Y)	X^2	Y^2	XY
1.	Adi Saragih	50	70	2500	4900	3500
2.	Ananda	58	78	3364	6084	4524
3.	Anggi Situmeang	60	80	3600	6400	4800
4.	Destary Marpaung	55	70	3025	4900	3850
5.	Dewi Sihombing	60	82	3600	6724	4920
6.	Elsa Simanjuntak	55	78	3025	6084	4290
7.	Evolenta Ambarita	50	70	2500	4900	3500
8.	Fadillah Siregar	55	73	3025	5329	4015
9.	Gabriel S	60	85	3600	7225	5100
10.	Grace Okta S	58	80	3364	6400	4640
11.	Hazazi A. Z	55	76	3025	5776	4180
12.	Junjunan Sianturi	58	78	3364	6084	4524
13.	Krishna Pardamean	65	85	4225	7225	5525
14.	Kristian Saragih	55	78	3025	6084	4290
15.	Laura Sibarani	70	90	4900	8100	6300
16.	Linson Haloho	57	75	3249	5625	4275
17.	Marta Batubara	58	80	3364	6400	4640
18.	Mona Sinaga	40	70	1600	4900	2800
19.	Noel Tamba	54	75	2916	5625	4050
20.	Palentino Pardede	48	68	2304	4624	3264
21.	Putra Damanik	62	83	3844	6889	5146
22.	Ricki Siahaan	58	78	3364	6084	4524
23.	Rio Tambunan	60	70	3600	4900	4200
24.	Rivaldo P	55	78	3025	6084	4290
25.	Riwaldi Damanik	58	74	3364	5476	4292
26.	Sonia Pasaribu	60	85	3600	7225	5100
27.	Sri Widia	52	70	2704	4900	3640
28.	Sukma Cipta	55	75	3025	5625	4125
29.	Wandari Purba	48	70	2304	4900	3360
30.	Winda Lestari	50	72	2500	5184	3600
31.	Yohannes Zega	52	74	2704	5476	3848

No	Names of Students	With Using Picture				
		Pre-Test (X)	Post-Test (Y)	X^2	Y^2	XY
32.	Yusleli Siagian	50	75	2500	5625	3750
	N=32	**∑X= 1781**	**∑Y= 2445**	**∑X²= 100109**	**∑Y²= 187757**	**∑XY= 136862**

$$r_{xy} = \frac{N\sum XY - \left(\sum X\right)\left(\sum Y\right)}{\sqrt{\left\{N\sum X^2 - \left(\sum X\right)^2\right\}\left\{N\sum Y^2 - \left(\sum Y\right)^2\right\}}}$$ r_{xy} = the validity of the test (experimental group)

N = number of student
∑XY = total of students score
∑X = total of students score in pre-test
∑Y = total of students score in post-test
∑X² = total of students score in pre-test
∑Y² = total of students score in post-test

The validity of the test (experimental group):

N = 32
∑XY = 136862
∑X = 1781
∑Y = 2445
∑X² = 100109
∑Y² = 187757

$$r_{xy} = \frac{N\sum XY - \left(\sum X\right)\left(\sum Y\right)}{\sqrt{\left\{N\sum X^2 - \left(\sum X\right)^2\right\}\left\{N\sum Y^2 - \left(\sum Y\right)^2\right\}}}$$

$$= \frac{(32.136862) - (1781.2445)}{\sqrt{\left\{(32.100109) - (1781)^2\right\}\left\{(32.187757) - (2445)^2\right\}}}$$

$$= \frac{4379584 - 4354545}{\sqrt{(3203488 - 3171961)(6008224 - 5978025)}} = \frac{25039}{\sqrt{(31527)(30199)}}$$

$$= \frac{25039}{\sqrt{952083873}}$$

$$= \frac{25039}{30855.85}$$

= 0.81

The criteria of validity is as the following:
$0.91 < r_{xy} < 1.00$ = very high
$0.71 < r_{xy} < 0.90$ = high
$0.41 < r_{xy} < 0.70$ = fair
$0.0 < r_{xy} < 0.40$ = low
Based the formula, the writer finds the coefficient (r_{xy}) was 0.81, it means (0.71 < 0.81 < 0.90) that belongs to high and the test was valid.

Testing Reliability of the Test in Experimental Group

Then calculation of the reliability of the test was analyzed by using the Spearman-Brown formula as follows:

$$r_{11} = \frac{2\, r_{1/2\,1/2}}{(1 + r_{1/2\,1/2})}$$

$$= \frac{2\,x\,0.81}{(1 + 0.81)}$$

$$= \frac{1.62}{1.81}$$

= 0.89.

Based the calculation of reliability, it claims that the reliability of items classified as follows:

0.00 – 0.04 : the reliability is low
0.41 – 0.70 : the reliability is significant
0.71 – 0.90 : the reliability is high
0.91 – 1.00 : the reliability is very high

The reliability of the test was 0.89 and it means that the reliability is high.

The Effect of Without Using Picture

Data of the Pre-Test and Post-Test in Control Group

Table 14. The Result of the Pre-Test and Post-Test in Control Group (IX^5)

No.	Names of Students	Without using Picture	
		Pre-Test (X)	Post-Test (Y)
1.	Adisyah Damanik	53	62
2.	Andreas Siahaan	55	65
3.	Andres Purba	58	68
4.	Angelia Simbolon	60	80
5.	Antoni L	50	64
6.	Armando Sirait	60	78
7.	Bernando T	58	73
8.	Cintami Silaen	54	65
9.	David Simanjuntak	58	68
10.	David Siregar	50	68
11.	Enola Simanjuntak	60	80
12.	Ester Pasaribu	55	70
13.	Fani Nainggolan	53	64
14.	Gabriella Pardede	47	64
15.	Irvan Oloan	45	68
16.	Jonatan Sihombing	50	68
17.	Master Pardede	58	65
18.	Naomi Sitompul	58	70
19.	Rahel Manullang	55	75
20.	Realita Pasaribu	48	64
21.	Rizky Sinaga	40	55
22.	Roni Siahaan	45	58
23.	Rucci Napitupulu	53	65
24.	Rulita Sinurat	56	65

No.	Names of Students	Without using Picture	
		Pre-Test (X)	Post-Test (Y)
25.	Rumiris S	40	58
26.	Sarah Simanjuntak	58	70
27.	Sisko Silalahi	56	70
28.	TessyaSimanjuntak	50	66
29.	Tina Silalahi	50	68
30.	Tri Artha Tarigan	45	58
31.	Viona Damanik	58	74
32.	Yaldika Sinaga	55	70
	N=32	**∑X= 1691**	**∑Y= 2156**

Mean of Control Group (IX^5)

Mean of Pre-Test :

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

$$= \frac{1691}{32}$$

$$= 52{,}84$$

Mean of Post-Test :

$$M = \frac{\sum Y}{N}$$

$$= \frac{2156}{32}$$

$$= 67{,}37$$

Based on the data above, after the data is analyzed, it shows that the mean (M) in pre-test is 52.84 and the median is 54.5. The highest score is 60 and the lowest score is 40 (Cayari, 2018). Based on the data above, after the data is analyzed, it shows that the mean (M) in Post-test is 67.37 and the median is 66. The highest score is 80 and the lowest score is 55.

The Level of the Students' Scores in Control Group in Pre-Test

N = 32
∑X = 1691
∑(X)² = 90351
Mean = 52.84
Standard Deviation (SD)

$$SD = \frac{1}{N}\sqrt{\left\{\left(N\sum X^2\right) - \left(\sum X\right)^2\right\}}$$

$$SD = \frac{1}{32}\sqrt{(32\,x90351) - (1691)^2}$$

$$SD = \frac{1}{32}\sqrt{2891232 - 2859481}$$

$$SD = \frac{1}{32}\sqrt{31751}$$

$$SD = \frac{1}{32}(178.18)$$

SD = 5.56

So, the level of the students' scores in pre-test in control group:
Mean ( ) = 52.84
Standard of deviation (SD) = 5

Table 15. Standard

Level of Scores	The Criteria
High	$\bar{x}$ + S
	52.84 + 5.56
	58.4
Median	$\bar{x}$ - S ↔ $\bar{x}$ + S
	52.84 – 5.56 ↔ 52.84 + 5.56
	47.28 ↔ 58.4
Low	$\bar{x}$ - S
	52.84 – 5.56
	47.28

Table 16. Classification of the students' scores in pre-test

Level of scores	The criteria	Number of students	%
High	More than 58.4	3	9%
Median	Between 47.28-58.4	23	72%
Low	Under 47.28	6	19%

The Level of the Students' Scores in Control Group in Post-Test

N = 32
∑Y = 2156
∑(Y)² = 146384
Mean = 67.37
Standard Deviation (SD)

$$SD = \frac{1}{N}\sqrt{\left\{\left(N\sum X^2\right) - \left(\sum X\right)^2\right\}}$$

$$SD = \frac{1}{32}\sqrt{(32\,x146384) - (2156)^2}$$

$$SD = \frac{1}{32}\sqrt{4684288 - 4648336}$$

$$SD = \frac{1}{32}\sqrt{35952}$$

$$SD = \frac{1}{32}(189.61)$$

SD = 5,92
So, the level of the students' scores in post-test in control group
Mean ( ) = 66.56
Standard of deviation(SD) = 5.92
Table 17. The Criteria

Level of Scores	The Criteria
High	$\bar{x}$ + S
	66.56 + 5.92
	72.48
Median	$\bar{x}$ - S ↔ $\bar{x}$ + S
	66.56 – 5.92 ↔ 66.56 + 5.92

Low	60.64 ↔ 72.48 $\bar{x}$ - S 66.56 – 5.92 60.64

Table 18. Classification of the students' scores in post-test

Level of scores	The criteria	Number of students	%
High	More than 72.48	6	19%
Median	Between 60.64↔ 72.48	22	69%
Low	Under 60.64	4	12%

Testing the Validity of the Test in Control Group

The test was valid for the purpose of the test has sufficient evidence that correlate with ability to be tested. For the test, it was calculated by using the formula as follows:

Table 19. The Calculation of the Validity Test in Control Group

No	Names of Students	Without Using Picture				
		Pre-Test (X)	Post-Test (Y)	X^2	Y^2	XY
1.	Adisyah Damanik	53	62	2809	3844	3286
2.	Andreas Siahaan	55	65	3025	4225	3575
3.	Andres Purba	58	68	3364	4624	3944
4.	Angelia Simbolon	60	80	3600	6400	4800
5.	Antoni L	50	64	2500	4096	3200
6.	Armando Sirait	60	78	3600	6084	4680
7.	Bernando T	58	73	3364	5329	4234
8.	Cintami Silaen	54	65	2916	4225	3510
9.	David Simanjuntak	58	68	3364	4624	3944
10.	David Siregar	50	68	2500	4624	3400
11.	Enola Simanjuntak	60	80	3600	6400	4800
12.	Ester Pasaribu	55	70	3025	4900	3850
13.	Fani Nainggolan	53	64	2809	4096	3392
14.	Gabriella Pardede	47	64	2209	4096	3008
15.	Irvan Oloan	45	68	2025	4624	3060
16.	Jonatan Sihombing	50	68	2500	4624	3400
17.	Master Pardede	58	65	3364	4225	3770
18.	Naomi Sitompul	58	70	3364	4900	4060
19.	Rahel Manullang	55	75	3025	5625	4125
20.	Realita Pasaribu	48	64	2304	4096	3072
21.	Rizky Sinaga	40	55	1600	3025	2200
22.	Roni Siahaan	45	58	2025	3364	2610
23.	Rucci Napitupulu	53	65	2809	4225	3445
24.	Rulita Sinurat	56	65	3136	4225	3640
25.	Rumiris S	40	58	1600	3364	2320
26.	Sarah Simanjuntak	58	70	3364	4900	4060
27.	Sisko Silalahi	56	70	3136	4900	3920
28.	Tessya Simanjuntak	50	66	2500	4356	3300
29.	Tina Silalahi	50	68	2500	4624	3400
30.	Tri Artha Tarigan	45	58	2025	3364	2610
31.	Viona Damanik	58	74	3364	5476	4292

No	Names of Students	Without Using Picture				
		Pre-Test (X)	Post-Test (Y)	X^2	Y^2	XY
32.	Yaldika Sinaga	55	70	3025	4900	3850
	N=32	**∑X= 1691**	**∑Y= 2156**	**∑X² = 90351**	**∑Y²= 146384**	**∑XY= 114757**

$$r_{xy} = \frac{N\sum XY - \left(\sum X\right)\left(\sum Y\right)}{\sqrt{\left\{N\sum X^2 - \left(\sum X\right)^2\right\}\left\{N\sum Y^2 - \left(\sum Y\right)^2\right\}}}$$ r_{xy} = the validity of the test (control group)

N = number of students
∑XY = total of students score
∑X = total of students score in pre-test
∑Y = total of students score in post-test
∑X² = total of students score in pre-test
∑Y² = total of students score in post-test

The validity of the test (control group):
N = 32
∑XY = 114757
∑X = 1691
∑Y = 2156
∑X² = 90351
∑Y² = 146384

$$r_{xy} = \frac{N\sum XY - \left(\sum X\right)\left(\sum Y\right)}{\sqrt{\left\{N\sum X^2 - \left(\sum X\right)^2\right\}\left\{N\sum Y^2 - \left(\sum Y\right)^2\right\}}}$$

$$= \frac{(32.114757) - (1691.2156)}{\sqrt{\left\{(32.90351) - (1691)^2\right\}\left\{(32.146384) - (2156)^2\right\}}}$$

$$= \frac{3672224 - 3645796}{\sqrt{(2891232 - 2859481)(4684288 - 4648336)}}$$

$$= \frac{26428}{\sqrt{(31751)(35952)}}$$

$$= \frac{26428}{\sqrt{1141511952}}$$

$$= \frac{26428}{33786.26}$$

= 0.78

The criteria of validity is as the following:
$0.91 < r_{xy} < 1.00$ = very high
$0.71 < r_{xy} < 0.90$ = high
$0.41 < r_{xy} < 0.70$ = fair
$0.0 < r_{xy} < 0.40$ = low

Based the formula, the writer finds the coefficient (r_{xy}) was 0.78, it means (0.71 < 0.78 < 0.90) that belongs to high and the test was valid.

Testing Reliability of the Test in Control Group

Then calculation of the reliability of the test was analyzed by using the Spearman-Brown formula as follows:

$$r_{11} = \frac{2\, r_{1/2\,1/2}}{(1 + r_{1/2\,1/2})}$$

$$= \frac{2\,x\,0.78}{(1 + 0.78)}$$

$$= \frac{1.56}{1.78}$$

$$= 0.87$$

Based the calculation of reliability, it claims that the reliability of items classified as follows:

0.00 – 0.04 : the reliability is low
0.41 – 0.70 : the reliability is significant
0.71 – 0.90 : the reliability is high
0.91 – 1.00 : the reliability is very high

The reliability of the test was 0.87 and it means that the reliability is high.

Testing Hypothesis

To find out whether the using of picture teaching method affected the students in teaching writing narrative text, the data had been calculated by using T-test formula as follows:

T-test in Experimental Group

Table 20. T-test in Experimental Group

No.	Names of Students	With Using Picture			
		Pre-Test (X)	Post-Test (Y)	(d)	(d^2)
1.	Adi Saragih	50	70	20	400
2.	Ananda	58	78	20	400
3.	Anggi Situmeang	60	80	20	400
4.	Destary Marpaung	55	70	15	225
5.	Dewi Sihombing	60	82	22	484
6.	Elsa Simanjuntak	55	78	23	529
7.	Evolenta Ambarita	50	70	20	400
8.	Fadillah Siregar	55	73	18	324
9.	Gabriel S	60	85	25	625
10.	Grace Okta S	58	80	22	484
11.	Hazazi A. Z	55	76	21	441
12.	Junjunan Sianturi	58	78	20	400
13.	Krishna Pardamean	65	85	20	400
14.	Kristian Saragih	55	78	23	529
15.	Laura Sibarani	70	90	20	400
16.	Martha Batubara	58	80	22	484
17.	Marta Batubara	58	80	22	484
18.	Mona Sinaga	40	70	30	900
19.	Noel Tamba	54	75	21	441

No.	Names of Students	With Using Picture			
		Pre-Test (X)	Post-Test (Y)	(d)	(d^2)
20.	Palentino Pardede	48	68	20	400
21.	Putra Damanik	62	83	21	441
22.	Ricki Siahaan	58	78	20	400
23.	Rio Tambunan	60	70	10	100
24.	Rivaldo P	55	78	23	529
25.	Riwaldi Damanik	58	74	16	256
26.	Sonia Pasaribu	60	85	25	625
27.	Sri Widia	52	70	18	324
28.	Sukma Cipta	55	75	20	400
29.	Wandari Purba	48	70	22	484
30.	Winda Lestari	50	72	22	484
31.	Yohannes Zega	52	74	22	484
32.	Yusleli Siagian	50	75	25	625
	N=32	**∑X=1781**	**∑Y=2445**	**∑d=664**	**∑d²=14142**

$$M_x = \frac{d}{N}$$

$$= \frac{664}{32}$$

= 20.75

$$\sum x^2 = \sum dx^2 - \frac{(\sum d)^2}{N}$$

$$= 14142 - \frac{(664)^2}{32}$$

$$= 14142 - \frac{440896}{32}$$

= 14142 – 13778 = 364

T-test in Control Group

Table 21. T-test in Control Group

No.	Names of Students	Without using Picture			
		Pre-Test (X)	Post-Test (Y)	(d)	(d^2)
1.	Adisyah Damanik	53	62	9	81
2.	Andreas Siahaan	55	65	10	100
3.	Andres Purba	58	68	10	100
4.	Angelia Simbolon	60	80	20	400
5.	Antoni L	50	64	14	196
6.	Armando Sirait	60	78	18	324
7.	Bernando T	58	73	15	225
8.	Cintami Silaen	54	65	11	121
9.	David Simanjuntak	58	68	10	100
10.	David Siregar	50	68	18	324

No.	Names of Students	Without using Picture			
		Pre-Test (X)	Post-Test (Y)	(d)	(d^2)
11.	Enola Simanjuntak	60	80	20	400
12.	Ester Pasaribu	55	70	15	225
13.	Fani Nainggolan	53	64	11	121
14.	Gabriella Pardede	47	64	17	289
15.	Irvan Oloan	45	68	23	529
16.	Jonatan Sihombing	50	68	18	324
17.	Master Pardede	58	65	7	49
18.	Naomi Sitompul	58	70	12	144
19.	Rahel Manullang	55	75	20	400
20.	Realita Pasaribu	48	64	16	256
21.	Rizky Sinaga	40	55	15	225
22.	Roni Siahaan	45	58	13	169
23.	Rucci Napitupulu	53	65	12	144
24.	Rulita Sinurat	56	65	9	81
25.	Rumiris S	40	58	18	324
27.	Sisko Silalahi	56	70	14	196
28.	Tessya Simanjuntak	50	66	16	256
29.	Tina Silalahi	50	68	18	324
30.	Tri Artha Tarigan	45	58	13	169
31.	Viona Damanik	58	74	16	256
32.	Yaldika Sinaga	55	70	15	225
	N=32	**∑X= 1691**	**∑Y= 2156**	**∑d=465**	**∑d²=7221**

$$M_x = \frac{d}{N}$$

$$= \frac{465}{32}$$

= 14.53

$$\sum x^2 = \sum dx^2 - \frac{(\sum d)^2}{N}$$

$$= 7221 - \frac{(465)^2}{32}$$

$$= 7221 - \frac{216225}{32}$$

= 7221 – 6757.03
= 463.97

The means of experimental group was higher that that the control group (20.75 – 14.53 = 2.87), the two means of both experimental and control group was different. If this difference can show that t-test is greater than t-table, that it is significant.
The test formula was applied as follows:

Mx = 20.75	$\sum x^2 = 364$	Nx = 32
My = 14.53	$\sum y^2 = 463.97$	Ny = 32

$$t = \frac{Mx - My}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{x^2 + y^2}{N_x + N_y - 2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{N_x} + \frac{1}{N_y}\right)}}$$

$$= \frac{20.75 - 14.53}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{364 + 463.97}{32 + 32 - 2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{32} + \frac{1}{32}\right)}}$$

$$= \frac{6.22}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{827.97}{62}\right)\left(\frac{2}{32}\right)}}$$

$$= \frac{6.22}{\sqrt{(13.35)(0.06)}}$$

$$= \frac{6.22}{\sqrt{0.80}}$$

$$= \frac{6.22}{0.89}$$

t-test = 6.98

After gaining the result of t-test = 6.98 the writer calculated the degree of freedom (df) with the formula as follows:

df = (Nx + Ny – 2)
= 32 + 32 – 2
= 62

After adapting the data into t-test formula, it was obtained that t-observed was 6.98. In certain of degree of freedom (df) of this research was obtained from (Nx + Ny – 2) = (32 + 32 – 2) = 62

The value of t-test has higher than t-table **6.98>2.00**. It means that there is a significance increase after picture teaching method is used to teach writing narrative text.nBased on calculation of t-test is (6.98) is higher than t-table at the level of significance (2.00). It means that the use of picture teaching method is more significant in teaching writing narrative text at grade IX students of SMP Negeri 2 Pematangsiantar. If the result of t-test is higher than t-table **(6.98>2.00)**, the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected and alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted. It means that there is a significance difference between variable X and variable Y.

The Research Findings

Based on the work of the analyzing on the thesis, there are several discoveries whice are actually found by the writer. There are as the following:

1. With using the picture, the students can be easy to writing a narrative text. It was obtained the students who were taught by using picture got higher score in post-test of writing narrative text than the students who were taught without using picture.
2. After analyzing the data, the writer find out that the students' problem in writing a narrative text in the grammar.
3. The use of picter teaching method has an effect in teaching writing narrative text at grade IX students of SMP Negeri 2 Pematangsiantar. The result of analyzing the data, the score of t-test is higher than t-table (6.98

> 2.00). It means that $t_{test} > t_{table}$, where t-table is 2.00 and t-test is 6.98, so t-test is higher than t-table.

Discussion

A picture may inspire pupils to study, and pictures are crucial for making instructions understandable and engaging. A picture can convey a concept, provide information, and improve the effectiveness of a presentation or lesson (Sandra, 2018). When kids are studying English, pictures can be utilized to inspire them to express their ideas and grab their attention so they will write about what they saw in the picture. The study's illustrations are made up of powerful images that are utilized for education based on proven methods for achieving the goals of employing illustrations when teaching how to write narrative texts. In that they allow for the employment of a common vocabulary and similar language forms, pictures are helpful as well. She claimed that the image vividly recreated the outside world in the classroom (Liunokas, 2020).

From descriptive analysis, the writer finds out the mean of the control group is 67,37 and the mean in experimental group is 76,40 After the wtiter analyzed the date, the writer got the data into t-test formula, it was obtained that t-observed was 6.98. In certain of degree of freedom (df) of this research was obtained from (Nx + Ny – 2) = (32 + 32 – 2) = 62 The value of t-test has higher than t-table **6.98>2.00**. It means that there is a significance increase after picture teaching method is used to teach writing narrative text (Anabel & Simanjuntak, 2022).

Based on calculation of t-test is (6.98) is higher than t-table at the level of significance (2.00). It means that the use of picture teaching method is more significant in teaching writing narrative text at grade IX students of SMP Negeri 2 Pematangsiantar. If the result of t-test is higher than t-table **(6.98>2.00)**, the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected and alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted. It means that there is a significance difference between variable X and variable Y. It may be concluded from the discussion of the analysis of the results above that utilizing pictures to teach writing a narrative text is successful enough. The tables above show that there are noticeable changes when utilizing pictures to teach writing narrative texts. It means that educating students to write narrative texts has a big impact on how well they can write by using pictures. (Siahaan & Sianturi, 2021). So, according to Sujarwo (2020), teaching writing a narrative text with pictures is more effective in improving student scores than teaching writing a narrative text without pictures.

The ability to compose a narrative prose smoothly is a requirement for SMP Negeri 2 Pematangsiantar students. In order to achieve the aim, particularly in writing competence, the instructor should be able to expand and improve their approach of teaching English. Using pictures to teach writing is one of the instructors' methods. (Kardiansyah & Salam, 2020).

Such the writer does in this thesis, the writer found out the effect of using picture teaching method in teaching writing narrative text at grade IX students of SMP Negeri 2 Pematangsiantar. After finishing the research, the writer found out that the effect of method is more effective than without using picture teaching method in teaching writing narrative text.

Conclusion

Based on the data analysis it is found out that the t-count is greater than t-table. It is therefore understood that the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted and the null hypothesis is rejected. In this words, it is proved that the use of picture significantly affects the students' ability in writing narrative text at grade nine students in SMP Negeri 2 Pematangsiantar. Picture Teaching can be used to practice their writing narrative text because picture helps the students to gather details through a creative draft and makes the writing process become easier and enjoyable.

References

Afriyuninda, E., & Oktaviani, L. (2021). The Use Of English Songs To Improve English Students'listening Skills. *Journal Of English Language Teaching And Learning*, *2*(2), 80–85. Https://Doi.Org/10.33365/Jeltl.V2i2.1442

Anabel, T. W. V., & Simanjuntak, D. C. (2022). Obtaining Preferences From A Hybrid Learning System To Promote English-Speaking Ability Through Focus Group Discussion. *Journal Of Languages And Language Teaching*, *10*(2), 118. Https://Doi.Org/10.33394/Jollt.V10i2.4994

Angelina, P. (2020). The Strengths And Drawbacks Of Lyricstraining Implementation In Basic Listening Course. *Eltr Journal*, *4*(2), 117–124. Https://Doi.Org/10.37147/Eltr.V4i2.69

Bai, B., & Guo, W. (2021). Motivation And Self-Regulated Strategy Use: Relationships To Primary School Students' English Writing In Hong Kong. *Language Teaching Research*, *25*(3), 378–399. Https://Doi.Org/10.1177/1362168819859921

Cayari, C. (2018). Connecting Music Education And Virtual Performance Practices From Youtube. *Music Education Research*, *20*(3), 360–376.

Favero, T. G., & Cesar, C. E. (2022). Using The Study Cycle Model To Support Better Student Learning: A Faculty Guide. *Advances In Physiology Education*, *46*(4), 735–741. Https://Doi.Org/10.1152/Advan.00168.2022

Gilmartin, J., & Esterhuizen, P. (2020). Shifting Pedagogical Priorities In Facilitating Mixed Methods Research Including Postgraduate Student's Reflections. *Gstf Journal Of Nursing And Health Care (Jnhc)*, *5*(1).

Graham, S. (2020). The Sciences Of Reading And Writing Must Become More Fully Integrated. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *55*(S1), S35–S44. Https://Doi.Org/10.1002/Rrq.332

Gustanti, Y., & Ayu, M. (2021). The Correlation Between Cognitive Reading Strategies And Students' English Proficiency Test Score. *Journal Of English Language Teaching And Learning*, *2*(2), 95–100. Https://Doi.Org/10.33365/Jeltl.V2i2.1452

Haerazi, H., Irawan, L. A., Suadiyatno, T., & Hidayatullah, H. (2020). Triggering Preservice Teachers' Writing Skills Through Genre-Based Instructional Model Viewed From Creativity. *International Journal Of Evaluation And Research In Education*, *9*(1), 234–244. Http://Ijere.Iaescore.Com/

Ismayanti, E., & Kholiq, A. (2020). An Analysis Of Students' Difficulties In Writing Descriptive Text. *E-Link Journal*, *7*(1), 10. Https://Doi.Org/10.30736/Ej.V7i1.260

Jesson, R., Mcnaughton, S., Rosedale, N., Zhu, T., & Cockle, V. (2018a). A Mixed-Methods Study To Identify Effective Practices In The Teaching Of Writing In A Digital Learning Environment In Low Income Schools. *Computers & Education*, *119*, 14–30. Https://Doi.Org/10.1016/J.Compedu.2017.12.005

Jesson, R., Mcnaughton, S., Rosedale, N., Zhu, T., & Cockle, V. (2018b). A Mixed-Methods Study To Identify Effective Practices In The Teaching Of Writing In A Digital Learning Environment In Low Income Schools. *Computers & Education*, *119*(2), 14–30. Https://Doi.Org/10.1016/J.Compedu.2017.12.005

Kardiansyah, M. Y., & Salam, A. (2020). The Translator's Strategy As A Cultural Mediator In Translating Indonesian Novel Into English. *Proceedings Of The 4th International Conference On Language, Literature, Culture, And Education (Icollite 2020)*, 413–418. Https://Doi.Org/10.2991/Assehr.K.201215.065

Khair, U., Rihan K, E., & Misnawati, M. (2021). Indonesian Language Teaching In Elementary School. *Linguistics And Culture Review*, *6*(S2), 172–184. Https://Doi.Org/10.21744/Lingcure.V6ns2.1974

Larsen-Freeman, D., & Decarrico, J. (2019). Grammar. In *An Introduction To Applied Linguistics* (Pp. 19–34). Routledge.

Liunokas, Y. (2020). Assessing Students' Ability In Writing Argumentative Essay At Sman 1 Soe Kab. Timur Tengah Selatan Ntt. *Ideas: Journal On English Language Teaching And Learning, Linguistics And*

Literature, *8*(1), 184–196. Https://Doi.Org/10.24256/Ideas.V8i1.1344

Miller, D. M., Scott, C. E., & Mctigue, E. M. (2018a). Writing In The Secondary-Level Disciplines: A Systematic Review Of Context, Cognition, And Content. *Educational Psychology Review*, *30*, 83–120.

Miller, D. M., Scott, C. E., & Mctigue, E. M. (2018b). Writing In The Secondary-Level Disciplines: A Systematic Review Of Context, Cognition, And Content. *Educational Psychology Review*, *30*(1), 83–120. Https://Doi.Org/10.1007/S10648-016-9393-Z

Nabila, N. (2022). *The Use Of Lyricstraining Website To Enhance Students' Listening Ability: A Pre-Experimental Study At 7th Grade Of Islamic Junior High School In Indonesia*. Uin Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung. Http://Digilib.Uinsgd.Ac.Id/Id/Eprint/58536

Nofrika, I. (2019). Efl Students' Voices: The Role Of Youtube In Developing English Competences. *Journal Of Foreign Languange Teaching And Learning*, *4*(1), 69. Https://Doi.Org/10.18196/Ftl.4138

Permatasari, V. M. H. (2013). Improving Students' Listening Skills Through Podcasts At Smp Bopkri 1, Yogyakarta Grade Viii, Class A In The Academic Year Of 2012/2013. *Unpublished Thesis. Yogyakarta: English Education Department Language And Art Faculty, Yogyakarta State University*.

Pitarch, R. C. (2020). Enhancing Listening Skills And Learning Specific Language With Transcription Activities Using Lyricstraining. *Estudios De Lingüística Aplicada Iv*, 69.

Putri, A., & Refnaldi, R. (2020). The Correlation Between Students' Vocabulary Mastery And Speaking Ability At Grade 8 Of Junior High School. *Journal Of English Language Teaching*, *9*(1), 43–55. Https://Doi.Org/10.24036/Jelt.V9i1.107809

Ramadhan, S., Indriyani, V., Asri, Y., & Sukma, E. (2020). Design Of Learning Modules Writing Narrative Text Based On Project Based Learning (Pjbl) By Using Mobile Devices. *Journal Of Physics: Conference Series*, *1471*(1), 012029. Https://Doi.Org/10.1088/1742-6596/1471/1/012029

Sandra, R. A. (2018). From English To Indonesia: Translation Problems And Strategies Of Efl Student Teachers-A Literature Review. *International Journal Of Language Teaching And Education*, *2*(1), 13–18.

Siahaan, M. M., & Sianturi, C. L. (2021). Pengaruh Metode Quantum Teaching Dalam Menciptakan Pembelajaran Yang Aktif Dan Menyenangkan Pada Anak Sekolah Dasar. *Jurnal Basicedu*, *5*(5), 3985–3998. Https://Doi.Org/10.31004/Basicedu.V5i5.1465

Spencer, T. D., & Petersen, D. B. (2018). Bridging Oral And Written Language: An Oral Narrative Language Intervention Study With Writing Outcomes. *Language, Speech, And Hearing Services In Schools*, *49*(3), 569–581. Https://Doi.Org/10.1044/2018_Lshss-17-0030

Sujarwo, S. (2020). Students' Perceptions Of Using Machine Translation Tools In The Efl Classroom. *Al-Lisan*, *6*(2), 230–241. Https://Doi.Org/10.30603/Al.V6i2.1333

Thuong, T. T., & Phusawisot, P. (2020). *The Integration Of Process Writing And Genre-Based Approach In Enhancing Thai Students' Narrative Writing Ability At University Level*. Mahasarakham University. Http://202.28.34.124/Dspace/Handle123456789/1268

Yusuf, Q., Yusuf, Y. Q., Erdiana, N., & Pratama, A. R. (2018). Engaging With Edmodo To Teach English Writing Of Narrative Texts To Efl Students. *Problems Of Education In The 21st Century*, *76*(3), 333.