

## APPLYING MATERIALS OF AN EFL WRITING COURSEWARE FOR 8<sup>TH</sup> GRADE STUDENTS OF JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

Jumbuh Prabowo  
Teacher Training and Education Faculty, UNTIRTA  
[prabowo.eng@gmail.com](mailto:prabowo.eng@gmail.com)

### Abstract

*To fulfill the demand of the advance of Information Technology, this present study involved multimedia for writing courseware. This study examined teacher's and students' responses to the use of interactive multimedia. The participants of this were one immersion class of 8th grade students and an English teacher of a junior high school in Purwokerto, Central Java. These students were selected purposively. There were two instruments used in this study: questionnaire and observational sheet. It can be concluded that regarding to the teacher's and students' responses to the use of interactive multimedia, it is found out that both teacher and the students responded positively. They were interested in the courseware because this multimedia was different from those used in class.*

Keywords: *Courseware, information technology, media, multimedia*

### INTRODUCTION

The advance of Information Technology (IT) has caused the development of the ways of learning in recent years. One important application of information technology is the use of multimedia, which has become a common way of learning. It can be seen through the use of computer as a learning tool in a class. In the area of English writing, the most common use of the computer technology is to mediate communication through E-mail, chat, or MUDS and MOOS (Sokolik, 2001 cited in Ting, 2003). By employing the notions of negotiation of meaning from second language acquisition, the goal of students' writing is having students engage in real communication through the computer.

Some researchers (Sweller, 1999; Moreno & Mayer, 1999; Mayer, 2001) found that the computer is a helpful tool; nevertheless, there are still some other aspects that computers can provide to facilitate students' writing. The area of how to use the computer to help learners develop and elaborate their specified cognitive representation for their foreign language writing is still under explored.

These problems may relate to the way of learning led by textbooks. Kitao (1997) says that students learn what is presented in the textbook, and the way the textbooks present material is the way students learn it. The educational philosophy of the textbook will influence the class and the learning process. Therefore, in many cases, materials are the center of instruction and one of the most important influences on what goes on in the classroom. In other words, there is a special link among teachers, students, and textbooks.

However the use of textbook as a supplementary material still causes some obstacles. This is in the line with Madjid's statement (2002: 1) that since textbook publishing is a multi-million industry, and very often is influenced by non-pedagogical and educational factors (e.g. political and financial consideration), it is, to a great extent, hard to cater for ideal criteria a textbook should have. A strong reaction directed to the textbook is given by Nunan (in Madjid, 2002: 2). He says, "... textbooks, especially course books, represent a problem and in extreme cases are examples of educational failure." In line this point of view, Nunan (in Madjid, 2002: 2) claims that the selection of particular core volume signals an executive educational decision in which there is considerable professional, financial, and even political investment.

The problem can be overcome by involving the use of information technology. The use of IT can help English teachers to produce multimedia materials to facilitate their students in their writing processes. Computer based multimedia has also the ability to ease the transition by helping students communicate their thoughts, not only through words, but also through music, pictures, colors, and the non-linearity that text on paper does not allow (Carlin, 2001). Related to the function of computer in education, computer-based multimedia can function as courseware. Courseware is defined as software and data used in computer-based training (Encarta Dictionary Tools, 2006 cited in Hendrayanti 2006). Therefore, EFL Writing courseware is software designed to use as a media in the teaching and learning of EFL writing. The teaching and learning are designed and packaged in computer-based multimedia software.

### *Formulation of the Problem*

There are many ways in teaching writing. However, in the reality, there are many teachers who have not been able to select and choose the suitable way. As a result, most of students get difficulty in learning English. Referring to the background above, the researcher formulates the problem as follow: What are teacher's and students' responses to the use of interactive multimedia?

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

### *Principles of Materials Development*

Developing materials play a role in determining the goals for the materials, the focus of the materials themselves and the activities within them. Brown (1995, cited in Hendrayanti 2006) explains that there are phases in developing materials, i.e. developing, teaching or field testing, and evaluating the materials. The development phase is preceded by examination of the existing curriculum, students' needs, goals and objectives of the materials, and students' level of proficiency. The teaching or field testing includes piloting the materials, discussing the effectiveness, and revising the materials. The evaluation phase includes reviewing the materials

to find whether they match with the students' needs, the goals and objectives.

Richards (2005) explains that in planning materials for teaching of writing for example, the material developer could start from any of a number of views of the nature of writing or of texts. Further, he asserts that alternatively the material developer might start from a genre or text-based view of written language in which texts such as reports, business letters, or academic articles are seen to reflect their use in particular contexts. Or the writer could begin from a process perspective in which written texts are seen to reflect the cognitive and composing processes that go into their creation, such as prewriting, planning, drafting, composing, reviewing, revising, and editing. Thus, considering a number of factor, including teacher, learner, and contextual variables, as Kitao (1997) said, are important factors in order to have effective instructional materials in language teaching. He gives more explanation that teacher factors include the teacher's language proficiency, training and experience, cultural background, and preferred teaching style. Learner factors include learner's learning style preferences, their language learning needs, interests, and motivations. Contextual factors include the school culture, classroom condition, class size, and availability of teaching resources in situations where the materials will be used.

It seems clear that there is a tight relationship among teachers, students, and textbooks. In many cases, teachers and students rely heavily on textbooks, and textbooks determine the components and methods of learning. They control the content, methods, and procedures of learning. Students learn what is presented in the textbook, and the way the textbook presents material is the way students learn it. As a consequence, the textbook will influence the class and the learning process. Therefore, materials are the center of instruction and one of the most important influences on what goes on in the classroom.

### *The Teaching of Writing*

Connecting to the focus of this research, it is important to pay close attention to the processes of the teaching of writing. This implies that the discussion should start from the definition of writing believed in this study to the basic foundation for the writing materials development processes.

Nunan (2003: 88) defines writing a series of contrast: (a) it is both a physical and a mental act; (b) its purpose is both to express and impress; and (c) it is both a process and a product. This means that writing is a form of communication and a process of transferring ideas into a product of writing; translating our thought into language. Through writing we are able to share ideas, arouse feeling, persuade, and convince other people. Detailed process of writing is presented in the following section.

*Writing Process*

Harmer (2001: 257) states that there are a number of different approaches of writing skills both in and outside the classroom. Two of them are product and process approaches. This present study emphasizes on process approach.

## 1) Writing as a Process

A process-oriented approach to teaching writing is an idea that began to flourish 30 years ago, as a result of extensive research on first-language writing (Reyes, cited by Montague, 1995 in Kim, 2005). Further, Nunan (1999: 272) asserts process approaches focus on the steps involved in drafting and redrafting a piece of work. He adds that proponents process writing recognize and accept the reality that there will never be the perfect text, but that one can get closer to perfection through producing, reflecting on, discussing, and reworking successive drafts of a text.

It is in the line with Shih's statement (1986) in Brown (2001: 335). He states that process approaches do most of the following: (1) focus on the process of writing that leads to the final written product, (2) help student writers to understand their own composing process, (3) help them to build repertoires of strategies for prewriting, drafting, and rewriting, (4) give students time to write and rewrite, (5) place central importance on the process of revision, (6) let students discover what they want to say as they write, (7) give student feedback throughout the composing process (not just on the final product) as they attempt to bring their expression closer to closer to intention, (8) encourage feedback from both the instructor and peers, and (10) include individual conferences between teacher and student during the process of composition.

It seems clear that in processing writing needs some certain steps to produce a good writing. It also needs paying attention to the various stages that any piece of writing goes through. For instance, before putting into language, writer should figure out the meaning. Brown (2001: 336) states that writing is a two-step process. First, figure out your meaning. Then, put it into language. Next, figure out what you want to say; don't start writing till you do; make a plan; use an outline; begin writing only afterward.

## 2) Stages of Writing Process

There are many models of writing process. During this process, students should undertake certain procedures or an interrelated set of recursive stages. The stages can be seen from the following: (1) Prewriting. Prewriting includes using strategies to generate, plan, and organize ideas for specific purposes which can be done by: (a) Text-based task, (b) Writing

from texts, e.g., reading journal, (c) Brainstorming, mapping, cubing, etc., and (d) Free-writing or zero drafting, (2) Planning & drafting. Drafting incorporates prewriting activities to create a first draft containing necessary elements for a specific purpose. This can be carried out by: (a) allowing for extensive writing for discovery both in class and out, (b) encouraging students to plan as they go along and to understand the evolving purposes of their writing, (c) continuing to supply content and theme based input in the way of reading, discussions, etc., to supplement students' emerging ideas and plans, and (d) allowing enough time in the drafting and planning phase for students to exchange ideas, share their plans, and elicit new information for further development of a schema for the writing task, (3) Rewriting & revising. Revising includes evaluating and refining the rough draft for clarity and effectiveness which can be achieved by: (a) situating the writing task in a transactional space; give students practice envisioning the audience, getting a clear picture of who the reader will be, how the reader's expectations will have to be met, (b) providing students with practice incorporating peer and expert feedback into their evolving drafts, and (c) continuing to supply content and theme based input in the way of readings, discussion, etc., to supplement students' emerging ideas and plans, (4) Feedback, incubation, & revision which can be done by: (a) demonstrating productive and supportive ways in which students can respond to the writing of their peers, (b) conducting peer response session in a safe environment in which students act as a readers, not as evaluators, (c) emphasizing the benefits of reading and responding to the work of others; point out that the greatest contribution of peer feedback may not be to the expert's work, but to the reader's, (d) demonstrating procedures and technique for evaluating peer and expert feedback, and for applying that information to the students' changing drafts, and (e) building in time for incubation between iterations of steps in the process, (5) Editing & polishing. Editing includes proofreading and correcting the draft for conventions which can be done by building time into the teaching sequence for peer, teacher, and self-editing of mature, developed pieces of writing, and (6) Publishing. Publishing includes formatting and presenting a final product for the intended audience. It is intended to provide opportunities for students' final products to be distributed, shared, and appreciated by others (Ferris and Hedgcock, 1998: 67).

It is clear that from those models can be used as a trigger to activate students in writing. Because the various stages offered by those models may well involve discussion, research, language study, and a considerable amount of interaction between teacher and students and between students themselves.

*The Use of Narratives in Writing*

In terms writing in narrative, Derewianka and others (1990, cited in Kim, 2005) have identified four stages, named the Curriculum Cycle, through which a particular text type can be made explicit to students. The four stages of the Curriculum Cycle are: 1. Building Knowledge of Field, 2. Modeling the text type, 3. Joint construction, and 4. Independent construction of text (Richardson, 1994; Gibbons, 2002; Hyland, 2003, National Education Department, 2004)

During the beginning stages, direct instruction is crucial, as the learner gradually assimilates the task demands and procedures for constructing the genre effectively. The teacher takes an interventionist role, ensuring that students are able to understand and reproduce the typical rhetorical patterns they need to express their meanings (Hyland, 2003). The focus is on the form and function of the particular text type, and on illustrating the process of writing a text, considering both the content and the language (Gibbons, 2002). Before reaching later stages, students have developed considerable background knowledge about the subject, are aware of linguistic features of the text type, and have jointly (with a teacher) constructed a similar text.

*1) Building Knowledge of Field*

Before ordering students to start writing, it seems to be a good step to build knowledge for students. In this case, teacher should explain what type of text which is going to be taught.

Related to the narrative text, Derewianka (2004: 40) states that the basic purpose of Narratives is to entertain, i.e. to gain and hold the reader's interest in a story. But Narratives may also seek to teach or inform, to embody the writer's reflections on experience, and – perhaps most important – to nourish and extend the reader's imagination. Thus, the type of Narratives is various. Derewianka declares that there are many types of Narratives. They are typically imaginary but can be factual. They include fairy stories, mysteries, science fiction, romances, horror stories, etc.

The next step is organization. The focus of the text is on a sequence of actions. It usually begins with an orientation, where the writer attempts to sketch in or create the possible world of this particular story. Derewianka (2004) adds that in Narratives, the reader is introduced to the main character(s) and possibly some minor characters. Some indication is generally given of where the action is located and when it is taking place. The second step of organization is complication where problem arises. Then the last one is resolution.

*2) Modeling*

As shown in The Teaching Learning Cycle in figure 1.2., one of the interactions in classroom is devoted to modeling the text. During this phase, the teacher strongly directs

the interaction, introducing the learners to model texts belonging to the target genre in the context they have been exploring (Feez in John, 2002: 66). Furthermore, he states that learner's attention is drawn to the structure and language features of the models. This is the stage in which second language learners learn the grammar of the target language, but in the context of purposeful language use.

In this case, teacher may introduce the features of a text directly to the students. Here, the students need to become familiar with its purpose and features through immersion in the genre and by exploring sample texts. This can be done by (1) introducing a model of the genre to the class, (2) choosing or composing a text which is similar to the one to be written later as a joint construction by the class, and (3) discussing the purposes for which the type of text are used in the society (Derewianka, 2004: 7).

### *3) Joint Construction*

Before children write independent texts, it is useful for them to participate in the group writing of a text in the chosen genre. A text may be jointly constructed by the whole class, by a small group, or by a teacher and child during conferencing. The teacher begins to let pass responsibility to the learners as the learner's expanding. The following are the steps of conducting in joint construction which can be followed: (1) researching the topic, (2) pooling information, (3) revising structure, (4) jointly constructing a text, and (5) assessing the children's progress.

### *4) Independent Construction*

Having read and examined specimen texts in the chosen genre, and having had the experience of jointly constructing a similar text, many children may now choose to write their own texts on a related topic. The following are the points which can be considered in independent construction: (1) each child chooses a topic, (2) the children write their drafts, referring to models, (3) each child consults with teacher or peer(s), receiving comments on what he or she achieved and suggestions for changes to help the text achieve its purpose more effectively, (4) teacher may find that conferencing about drafts reveals a need for more modeling and joint construction, and (5) editing and publishing the children's texts are optional final steps, (Derewianka, 2004).

### *Computer-Based Multimedia*

As it has been mentioned previous, information age has changed educational world. It can be seen through the way of using media. One of them is applying multimedia as a new

media to increase education development. Dealing with this case, the following discussions are: the Implication of Multimedia, Consideration of Using Multimedia as Classroom Instruction, Teaching Writing and Multimedia, Mayer's Cognitive Theory of Multimedia Learning, and Sweller's Cognitive Load Theory.

### 1) The Implication of Multimedia

Duber (2006) declares that multimedia is media that uses multiple forms of information content and information processing (e.g. text, audio, graphics, animation, video, interactivity) to inform or entertain the (user) audience. Multimedia also refers to the use of (but not limited to) electronic media to store and experience multimedia content.

This is also supported by Davidson-Shivers et al. (2002). They say that multimedia is a method of information organization that includes the use of text, graphics, sounds, and video in any combination that inherently facilitates learner control (Becker & Dwyer, 1994; Jonassen, 1986; Tsai, 1988-89).

Seeing this fact, educators can take advantage of digital multimedia in several ways. They can integrate commercially available educational software packages or multimedia presentations they have created into lessons or they can have students develop their own multimedia representations.

### 2) Consideration of using Multimedia as Classroom Instruction

Related to above explanation, applying multimedia as a teaching aid is challenging and interesting. However, before implementing multimedia technology into educational instruction, consideration must be given into how multimedia technology will be used in the context of the thematic unit and how its use will be assessed in order to evaluate student participation.

Altschuld (1995 cited in Carter, 1999) states that from a program evaluation perspective, depicting the nature of the context for computer use, how the technology interacts with context, and the processing strategies of students would be important aspects of the evaluation of computers in relation to science assessment. It may mean that teachers should think about the significant for determining the implications for multimedia technology as an effective tool in science education.

### 3) Teaching Writing and Multimedia

The web-based education Commission (WEBC cited in Campbell, 2001) found



that the web is a medium today's kid expect to use for expression and communication. Meanwhile, Nunan (1999: 272) declares that without doubt, a major impetus to writing pedagogy has come in recent years with the rapid growth of word processors, as well as the use of the internet as a means of communication. He adds that process writing really became feasible with the development of word processing.

On the other hand, Ferris and Hedgcock (1998: 265) state that even though computers cannot teach novice writers how to think, plan, or revise nor can they magically transform inexperienced writers into proficient ones or replace teachers in giving instruction and feedback, computers can make many facets of the writing process easier, making writing more enjoyable, improving student attitudes, and lowering anxieties about writing, especially those of basic and ESL writers.

According to Jonassen (1998 cited in Carlin, 2001) multimedia can support writing in a number of ways. It can help students deepen conceptual understandings. It can engage their prior knowledge and help them form mental images. It can also provide tools for composing and publishing.

Writing using computer is also backed up by Harmer (2001). He declares that there are many good reasons for using computer for writing. They are: (1) A word-processing package removes the problem of poor handwriting that some students suffer from, (2) A word-processing package allows the competent user to edit his or her material at great speed and with great facility, (3) Spellcheckers can ease the task of achieving correct spelling, (4) If students are working in group, a screen computer can sometimes be far more visible to the whole group than a piece of paper might be. He strengthens his statement that a computer screen frequently allows students to see their writing more objectively.

#### 4) Plass' Model of Interface Design

Concerning with the importance of designing interface in learning through multimedia software, this section is concerned with criteria for the design of the user interface of foreign language multimedia software.

Dealing with the model of interface design, Plass (1988) proposes the definition based on a cognitive approach. He defines interface design as the process of selecting interface elements and features based on their ability to deliver support for the cognitive processes involved in the instructional activities facilitated by the application. Based on this new definition, he proposes a three-step model for interface design which is inspired by Clark and Sugrue's model of media selection and by the contextualized approach

described in Wallace and Anderson (1993). The steps are: 1) select the instructional activity that supports cognitive processes of the competence or skill to be developed, 2) select the attributes of the feature, and 3) select the design feature.

## **METHODOLOGY**

This research was conducted in one junior high school in Purwokerto, Central Java. This school has conducted a partial immersion education. It also has a computer lesson as one of the compulsory subjects which requires the students to work in the computer laboratory. There were two partial immersion classes, each consisted of 20 students.

Purposively, this present study selected students of partial immersion from eighth grade. There were two reasons in this selection. First, these students had been taught English differently from other classes. They had learned English not only in English subject but also in math, chemistry, and physics for one year in the seventh grade. Second, these students had been trained to operate a computer and write using a computer while they were in the seventh grade. As a result, they had been familiar with operating and writing using a computer.

Thus, it is expected that students' experience in learning writing in previous level and students' ability in operating computer can be combined to help them to learn writing through computer-based multimedia.

### *Research Instruments*

This study takes questionnaire and observation as data collection technique. The questionnaire is to be completed by students aimed at obtaining on students' responses on the subject of the courseware. The latter, observation, was conducted to gather data on how teacher holds his English class, particularly the writing class, and how students participated in that class. As a result, the observations were directed to both students and the English teacher.

The observational data was recorded in two kinds of field notes. The first field note was used to record teacher's techniques in teaching narrative texts. The second field note was used to record the students' participation during the class.

## **FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

The following are the discussion and interpretation. The questionnaire was completed by 20 students. The questions were jotted down in Bahasa Indonesia. It was intended to be easily understood by the students. The questions were grouped into six categories. The first classification was the writing purpose. It contained four questions related to the purpose of writing. The questions had three alternative answers. They were "always", "sometimes", and

“never”.

The first question guided the students to tell whether their teacher explained the purpose of the writing lesson. The data found that 90% of students answered “always” as their choice. It means that the teacher always explained the purpose of the writing lesson before he taught in the class session. Only 10 % said that their teacher sometimes explained the type of text to be discussed.

The second, third, and fourth questions were intended to reveal whether the students understood the purpose of writing based on the genres of narrative, descriptive, and recount. The result showed that 13 out of 20 students (65%) sometimes understood the purpose of writing the narrative genre. There were only 7 students (35%) always understood the purpose of this type of text. Meanwhile, 80% of students always understood the purpose of writing the descriptive genre, while 20% of students stated that they sometimes understood. There were 50% of students always understood, 45% of students sometimes understood, and 5% or only 1 student “never” understood the purpose of writing in recount genre.

The second category dealt with text types. It consisted of three questions where the options were “descriptive”, “narrative”, and “recount”. These questions were in numbers 5, 6, and 7. Related to the answer of number 5, 85% of students told that descriptive type was their favorite text which they wanted to learn further, whereas type of narrative was in the second rank. It got 10%. It means that there were just two students who wanted to learn this type of text. In the recount text, there was 1 student (5%) who chose question number 5. Concerning to the sixth question, there were eleven students (55%) who got difficulty in learning narrative text, whereas 45% of students stated that they got difficulty in learning recount genre. Related to the type of text, as stated in question number 7, there were 10 students (50%) who declared that the most interesting text type they would like to learn was narrative text. 40% of students claimed that they were eager to learn recount text, and only 10% of students who desired to study descriptive text.

In question number 8, students were asked to choose one of the themes of story. The question number 8 revealed the outdoor activities done by students. These activities concerns text type they would practice out of the class. It offered three choices. They were telling about past event, describing something, and telling something had happened. The result showed that around 55% of students chose describing something, while 30% of students preferred to the topic dealt with something which had happened, and 15% of students wished to learn how to write something about past event.

The third category was the topic of writing. There were seven topics which were offered to the students. However, only four topics they chose to be learned. The topic of Flora and fauna

and travel got the same percentage. They got 20% each, whereas topic of friendship and recreation got 30%.

The fourth category dealt with difficulty they got while they were writing. The first difficulty, as found in number 10, concerned punctuation. The findings show that 55% (11 students) stated that they never got problem dealing with punctuation. 7 students (35%) said that they sometimes felt something trouble with punctuation, while 10% of students declared that they always got problem in putting punctuation. Referring to question number 11, it checked whether students understood what they wrote, or whether they wrote based on the type of text they have chosen. The data show that 18 students (90%) answered “always” for understanding the content of the writing, while 10% of students declared that they “sometimes” understood to the result of writing. Meanwhile 40% of students said that they “always” wrote based on the genre which had been chosen, and 60% of students uttered that they “sometimes” wrote out of the chosen genre.

The fifth category was efforts for overcoming the difficulties in the fourth category. There were six questions in this section. According to the question number 12, 75% of students “sometimes” looked up the dictionary if they did not understand certain words. 25% of students “always” checked on the dictionary if they did not recognize a certain word. There was another way obtained from students how to overcome the difficulty. 5% of students “always” asked to the teacher, and 95% of students “sometimes” asked to the teacher in terms of difficult words. The students sometimes ignored the difficult word as seen in the question number 14. In the reality, 85% students never ignored the difficult words they found on the way of learning process. They tried to find the meaning of those words. This trial can be seen in the question number 15. The data showed that 25% of students “always” opened their book, 65% of students “sometimes” looked up their books, and 10% of students “never” asked for help. Even if students got difficulties in terms of grammar or punctuation as proposed in number 16, 65% of students sometimes asked to their friends, and 35% of students always asked to their friends. In contrast, the question number 17 found that 70% of students ignored or never paid attention the difficulty in terms of grammar and punctuation, and 30% of students sometimes asked to their friends.

The last category dealt with working with computer. To know whether the students used to work with computer, this category proposed eight questions (number 18 to 20). The question number 18 asked whether students had computer in their home. The data showed that 17 students (85%) had computer. The rest was three students or 15 % of students who did not have computer in their home. The question number 19 dealt with students’ preference in computer lesson. 20 students (100%) preferred to conduct a computer lesson in a computer laboratory.

The question number 20 was using computer in their spare time. The data showed that all students did not use their spare time to practice operating computer in their class. The question number 21 asked whether students can operate basic programs of computer. As a consequence of having computer, 18 students (90%) were able to operate a computer with the basic programs. Only 2 students declared that they could not operate computer even though only basic programs. The next result showed that 65% students once used software as media in learning English. 35% of students told that they never used software to help them in learning English. 100% of students stated that they used computer to some tasks. However when they were asked whether they used computer to play a game, data shows that 85% of students used computer to play a game, while 15% of students did not play a game. The last question related to accessing internet. The data found that 80% of students used a computer to access internet. The rest students, 20% of students did not use computer as one of a means of getting information from all over the world.

The following sections deal with the responses toward the courseware and the effectiveness of the courseware. The responses toward the courseware are based on the students' and teacher's responses and observation. Meanwhile the evaluation to the effectiveness is based on the pre-test and post-test which is discussed in section 4.3.

#### *Students' Responses*

This stage involved 20 students as the participants. This was the same amount of students when conducted need analysis. The aim of collecting data on this stage was to reveal the courseware weaknesses. The data were got through a questionnaire completed by 20 students. The questions were divided into 7 categories. They were material, design, text, exercise, ease for use, mode of instruction, and feedback.

In terms of category of material, the result shows that 19 students (95%) stated that the explanation about type of writing in narrative was clear. Then, 75% of students said that the steps of writing in narrative are understandable. It means that 15 students can follow those steps. When they were asked about the parts of writing in narrative, 90% of students declared that it was clear and easy to find the parts of text. To strengthen students' building knowledge of writing in narrative, they were given the model of narrative text. 90% of students said that the model was easy to be understood.

The second category was design. 17 students (85%) stated that the screen was no confusing. It means that they easily followed the instructions. The next part of this category still dealt with screen. More than 50 % of students stated that the appearance of the screen was interesting, clear and easy to be understood. All students agreed with the pictures showed on the

screen. 20% of students gave good response toward pictures available on the screen. They said that those pictures related to texts showed in courseware.

The third category dealt with text. 80% of students declared that texts available on the story were interesting. Besides, those texts could add their knowledge about how to write in narrative text. They (70% of students) also stated that the texts were not too difficult. Generally, 15 students (75%) could catch the content of the text they read. It could be understood, because the text was neither too long nor too short. Most of them suggested that to maximize the text in order to be good in performance, the style and the font of letter should be changed. The students added that the screen should be colorful. It was intended to make the texts more comfortable to be read.

The fourth category was dealing with exercise. In terms of doing exercises presented in this activity, most of students were able to finish all activities offered. For example, for point 18, 100% of students finished exercise in interactive test. 95% of students finished exercise in case 1 for number 20. Those indicated that the exercises were not something burdened them. This condition was supported by their statements where they felt the exercises were not too difficult. For example case number 19, only 2 students (10%) declared that they got difficulties when they did exercise. For the complete result, see appendix 10

The fifth category was ease for use. There were two items in this category. Those items related to the use of the developed software. The first item showed that all students could easily use this software. They (20 students) stated that they could easily operate the program. For example, they could log in and log out any time and whenever they wanted.

The next category was mode of instruction. It contained two items. The first item related to the instruction to read the model of narrative text. For this case, all students (20 students) answered that the instruction was clear enough. It meant that they did not get any serious problem in terms of instruction. The second item was the instruction in every exercise. Relating to this case, there was only 1 student (5%) who stated that the instruction was not clear. It means that 95% of students stated that they did not get difficulties when they read the instruction in every exercise.

The last category was dealing with feedback. It consisted of one item. The item told about the result of the exercises. The data showed that 75% of students told that the result of exercises which could be met in every session helped them to check their skill in writing narrative.

Thus, generally, it can be concluded that most of students had very positive response toward the application of multimedia in learning writing.

#### 4.3. Teacher's Responses

Material, as the first category, contained four items. Those items told about explanation,

steps, parts, and models of writing in narrative text. In terms of explanation, teacher said that it was clear enough in explaining the form of narrative writing. Then, the teacher declared that the steps of writing in narrative were also understandable. Concerning about parts of narrative text and the model, he stated that they were clear enough to be understood. It may mean that the parts of text and the model were easy to be followed.

The second category was texts. Teacher said that the texts were interesting. Further, he added that those texts increased students' knowledge in terms of writing in narrative. In his opinion, the texts were not too difficult. As a result, students could catch the content of the texts they read. In addition, teacher stated that the texts were neither long nor short. However, in order to make this courseware more interesting, he advised to add live pictures in every story.

The third was exercise category. Related to exercises available in this courseware, he judged that those exercise started from the easiest to the most difficult. He argued that the exercises could be used to support students' ability in writing narrative. So, he believed that by doing them, the students' ability in writing narrative would be better.

The fourth category was ease for use. In this case, teacher declared that he could easily use this software. He could log in and log out whenever he wished.

The last category was feedback. The result of the exercises which could be found in every the end of the topic, could be used to check students' ability.

In this part, the teacher also gave good response when he run teaching writing using this media. It was very helpful for conducting teaching learning process.

#### 4.4. Observation

The observations had been conducted for four times. The first observation started at 10.00 a.m. and finished 11.20 a.m. In this session, teacher explained how to use the courseware. It started from opening the program through entering one of the main menus. The first topic they visited was how to write in narrative. Teacher explained how to use simple past tense. Then, he ordered students to see and do activities by clicking each of them. The students seemed enthusiastic to do those exercises.

The second observation started at 09.15 and finished at 10.40. In this time, teacher explained about relational and action verbs. It was done because those verbs have relationship with narrative stories. In this case, he explained the difference between relational and action verb. He also described how to use them. After explaining those verbs, he ordered students to click narrative text available in this courseware. He asked students to find characters, characteristics and relational and action verbs in that story. Then, teacher asked students to do interactive tests. The students enthusiastically did those tests.

The third observation was held at 11.45 to 13.00. In this session, teacher presented how to

learn simple sentence. Teacher asked students to click simple sentence and read it. After reading the definition of simple sentence, he ordered students to write five simple sentences based on their experience. They wrote on available worksheet on computer.

The last observation was at 11.30 to 13.00. This time, teacher gave compound and complex sentence materials. He explained the definition of compound and complex sentence. Next, he ordered students to find out the compound and complex sentences on a text. Then, the students were asked to rewrite.

Through those observations, it can be seen that the students gave very positive response when they worked with computer. It can be proven when they started writing, they were very enthusiastic to produce some ideas in the form of writing text.

## CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Having known the result of teacher's and students' responses, generally it can be concluded that they responded positively toward the use of interactive multimedia. They could use the multimedia constructively because this media contained interactive activities. Moreover, the courseware was designed interestingly and interactively by considering the materials, design, texts, exercise, easy for use, mode of instruction, and feedback.

By considering the limitations and weaknesses of this present study, it is suggested that this courseware can be used as a contribution to the teaching and learning of English in junior high school, especially to the 8th grade students. It is also suggested that teachers can use this courseware to provide promoting self-directed learning. Because of the position of the courseware as a multimedia in learning process, not only teachers can use it as additional material in conducting their English class but also students may use the courseware individually both at school and at home.

## REFERENCES

- Brown, H. Douglas. 2001. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy* (2nd Edition). NY: Pearson Education
- Brown, James Dean. 1995. *The Elements of Language Curriculum: A Systematic Approach to Program Development*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publisher
- Carlin, Shannon M. 2001. Teaching Writing Strategies through Multimedia Authorship. Retrieved from <http://www.acsu.buffalo.edu/~scarlin/carlin.pdf>. Accessed on 20 January 2007.
- Carter, Brannon. 1999. Effective Integration of Multimedia Technology into Scientific Thematic Units. The University of Alabama in Huntsville. Available at: <http://crystal.uah.edu/~carter/papers/multimed.htm>. Accessed on 13 January 2007.



- Davidson-Shivers, Gayle V., Nowlin, Barry., and Lanouette, Michael. 2002. Do multimedia lesson structure and learning styles influence undergraduate writing performance?. *College Student Journal*. Retrieved from [http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\\_m0FCR/is\\_136/ai\\_85007764](http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0FCR/is_136/ai_85007764). Accessed on 25 January 2007.
- Departemen Pendidikan Nasional. 2003. *Kurikulum 2004: Standar Kompetensi Mata Pelajaran Bahasa Inggris SMP dan Madrasah Tsanawiyah*. Jakarta: Pusat Kurikulum, Balitbang Depdiknas
- Derewianka, Beverly. 2000. *Exploring How the Texts Work*. Sidney: McPherson's Printing Group
- Duber, Jim. 2006. Computer Assisted Language Learning. Retrieved from [http://writing.colostate.edu/teaching\\_guide.cfm](http://writing.colostate.edu/teaching_guide.cfm). Accessed on 3 February 2007.
- Feez, Susan. 2002. 'Heritage and Innovation in Second Language Education'. In John, A.M. (Ed.). *Genre in the classroom: Multiple perspectives*. London: San Diego State University.
- Feez, Susan and Joice Helen. 2000. *Writing Skills: Narrative & Non-Fiction Text Type*. Australia: Phoenic Education Pty Ltd
- Ferris, Dana & Hedgcock, John S. 1998. *Teaching ESL Composition: Purpose, Process, and Practice*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Harmer, J. 2001. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. London: Pearson Education Limited,
- Heaton, J.B. 1988. *Writing English Language Test*. London: Longman Group UK Limited
- Hendrayanti, Retno. 2006. *Developing Materials of an EFL Reading Courseware Prototype for 8th Grade Students of Junior High School*. Unpublished Thesis at the English Education Department, School of Postgraduate Studies, Indonesia University of Education
- Kim, Yanghe & Kim, Jiyoung. 2005. *Teaching Korean University Writing Class: Balancing the Process and the Genre Approach*. University of Illinois
- Kitao, Kenji. 1997. *Selecting and Developing Teaching/Learning Materials*. Retrieved from <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Kitao-Materials.html>. Accessed on 5 February 2007.
- Madjid, Alaudin. 2002. *EFL Textbook Evaluation: A Study of Senior high school English textbooks by State and non-state run publishers*. Unpublished Thesis at the English Education Department, School of Postgraduate Studies, Indonesia University of Education
- Mayer, R. E. 1999. Designing instruction for constructivist learning. In C. M. Reigeluth, (Eds.), In C. M. Reigeluth, (Ed), *Instructional-design theories and models: A new paradigm of instructional theory*, Volume II. pp,141-160. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Mayer, R.E. 2001. *Multimedia learning*. Cambridge. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mayer, Richard E. & Moreno Roxana. 2003. Nine Ways to Reduce Cognitive Load in

Multimedia Learning. *Educational Psychologist*, 38(1), 43-52. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. Mayer\_Moreno\_2003.pdf. Accessed on 13 February 2007.

Moreno, R. & Mayer, R. E. (1999). Cognitive principles of multimedia learning: The role of modality and contiguity. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 91, 358-368.

Nunan, David. 1989. *Understanding Language Classroom*. Prentice Hall International (UK) Ltd.

\_\_\_\_\_1999. *Second Language Teaching and Learning*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publisher

\_\_\_\_\_2003. *Practical English Language Teaching*. NY: McGraw-Hill

Plass, Jan,L. 1998. Design and Evaluation of the User Interactive of foreign Language Multimedia Software: A Cognitive Approach. *Language Learning & Technology*, Vol. 2 No.1. University of New Mexico.

Richards, Jack C. 2005. Materials Development and Research – Making the Connection. Paper presented at *a colloquium on research and materials development*, at the TESOL Convention, San Antonio

Sugiyono. 2005. *Statistika untuk Penelitian*. Bandung: CV Alfabeta

Sugiyono and Wibowo, Edi. 2004. *Statistika untuk Penelitian*. Bandung: Alfabeta

Sweller J. 1999. Cognitive Load Theory. Retrieved from <http://tip.psychology.org/sweller.html>  
Accessed on 20 February 2007

Ting, Yu Liang. 2003. The Design of Computer Multimedia Material for English Language Learning. *Oriental Institute of Technology*. Retrieved from <http://www.iis.sinica.edu.tw/Conference/ROCLING04/camera-ready/P36952.pdf>  
Accessed on 20 February 2007.