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Abstract: The objective of the study was to find whether there was a significant difference between the students taught using authentic materials and the students taught using non-authentic materials on the students’ writing score. The quasi-experimental design was applied in this study. The population was all the tenth year students at MAN Model Palangka Raya. The samples were determined using purposive sampling. The samples were XA as the experiment group and XB as the control group. The collected data were obtained from test and documentation. The main data were analyzed using t-test formula and SPSS 17.0. The results showed that the mean of pre-test score in experiment group was 59.76 and the mean of post-test score was 72.9. The value difference of both means was 13.14. The mean of pre-test score in control group was 53.8 and the mean of post-test score was 58. The value difference of both means was 4.2. It means that teaching writing procedural text using authentic materials was more effective than teaching writing procedural text using non-authentic materials because the authentic materials taught was appropriate with the level of students’ ability in this study.
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Materials are the most important component of teaching learning process. As Nunan (1988:98) states that materials are in fact, an essential element within curriculum and do more than simply lubricate the wheels of learning. There are no materials, there will be no education. Logically if the materials are not contextual, the students will not be able to use them in their real life. They will get confused to apply the materials and therefore, it is needed a research to find the effective materials to teach English.

Many English teachers used textbooks to teach. The textbooks were appreciated and used by many teachers, because using them saved time in preparing materials for teaching. Ur in Demircan (2004:4) also states that they provide a clear framework of the subjects with its objectives and syllabus; activities, tasks and exercises, interesting and support and guidance to the teacher and give autonomy to the learners. On the other hand, they should not be strictly followed since they are in adequate in many cases, routine and dull; may destroy teachers’ creativity and initiative, may prevent students’ searching skill; may not address students’ need, interest, levels and learning styles and may not exemplify the natural uses of the language clearly. The materials in textbooks were inauthentic because the materials had
been edited by the author. Since textbooks were found insufficient in many ways in presenting language, a new concept “authentic materials” had been established. Based on the fact, the writer was very interested to teach students using authentic materials.

At the pre-observation the writer asked the English teacher of the tenth year of MAN Model Palangka Raya about the source of materials which she used to use to teach writing. She said that she used materials from textbook. In other words she did not use authentic materials to teach writing. As the previous page, the writer had mentioned the disadvantage of materials from textbook. It also meant the students would not get more benefit from their learning, if they remained to learn inauthentic materials. Based on the pre-observation, the writer tried to teach students using different materials, namely authentic materials.

Without question, the main goal of most modern language teaching is to enable learners to function outside the classroom, using language to achieve goals such the as communicating, working, pursuing education. To relate what the students learnt in class with the use in real life is needed to use authentic materials, because these materials are really closed with the students’ real life. Research had found that students learn most effectively when instructional materials reflect and incorporate students’ prior experiences (Jacobson, et al., 2003:13).

In addition, Kilickaya (2004) concludes that authentic materials enable learners to interact with the real language and content rather than the form. Learners feel that they are learning a target language as it is used outside the classroom. Considering this, it might not be wrong to say that at any level authentic materials should be used to complete the gap between the competency and performance of the language learners, which was a common problem among the nonnative speakers.

Using authentic materials, the learning become meaningful for students. As Mursell & Nasution (1995:20) states that the success of learning depends on the meaning of what is learned. The material is meaningful as far as it is real and beneficial for students. Authentic materials are meaningful because these materials can bridge the gap between the classroom and the outside world. So, students can know the use of what they learn in real life context. Furthermore, meaningful learning used authentic materials can make students understand and remember the materials within a long time. As Brown (2001:57) states that the principle of meaningful learning will lead toward better long term retention than rote learning.

Using authentic materials will not cause students stressed as far as the chosen authentic material is appropriate with the level of students and closed with their life. As Silberman (2006:27) states that learning needs nearness with the material that will be learned, before it is understood. Authentic materials when inputted to the L2 learner in the target language through song, text or a game are most likely a bit beyond what the learner already knows in the language (Pinsonneault, 2008); therefore, it focused on the using of text in this study.

Learning texts would include writing activity. In the academic context, it was
saddening that many students perceived yet writing as a daunting task. It was undeniably true that writing was the most difficult skill to acquire, certainly more so then speaking. Unlike speaking, writing was not an innate, biologically endowed ability; it had to be learned. It, of course, means that for someone to be able to write, they had to be taught. Furthermore, to master the writing skills, students had to learn vocabulary and grammar as the basic components of writing, and also learn communicating their idea through written text.

In this study, it tried to make writing as the interesting activity by using authentic materials in teaching procedural text, so it would decrease students’ stress in writing. Krashen in Pinsonneault (2008) states that a student learns best when he or she is not enduring a lot of stress. Authentic materials had been argued to improve ESL students’ communication skills and to increase learners’ motivation, involvement, and interest to learn the target language. Peacock’s (2009) research suggests that authentic materials have positive effects on “increasing students” level of on-task behavior, concentration and involvement in the target activity more than artificial materials.

Procedural text has social function, it means the text told instruction how to make or use something. Certainly, the text is very important in real life context, because we are certain doing something based on an instruction. Stasz, et al. in Jacobson, et al. (n.d.) have documented that student writing based on their own lives has been associated with increases in writing skills. Learning to write procedural text by using authentic materials, students could improve their vocabulary and also studied grammar from the interesting text, authentic material. The important one, students could practice to write recipes and instructions which most of them were very needed in daily life.

In English syllabus for Senior High School, there are some forms of text that are taught for the tenth year students, they are descriptive, narrative, recount, procedure, news item, they includes in Basic Competence for Senior High School or Islamic Senior High School, that is expressing the meaning and rhetoric steps of essay written text in the form of procedure text accurately, fluently and grammatically in a daily life context and accessing the science (Depdiknas, 2006). Although there are some forms of text taught for Islamic Senior High School, the writer more focused to the material of procedural text. The indicator that had to be achieved was the students were able to write procedure texts.

Based on the above explanation, the problem of the study is that, “Is there any significant difference between the students taught using authentic materials and the students taught using non-authentic materials on the students’ writing score of the tenth year students at MAN Model Palangka Raya?”

The scope of the study was only done to investigate the effectiveness of a material, especially the effect of using authentic materials in teaching writing. The authentic materials that would be taught are recipes and instruction manuals as authentic procedural texts. The limitation of the study was the result of the study could not be generalized to all schools. It was limited to the tenth year students at MAN Model Palangka Raya.
The results of the study would be expected for the theoretical and practical contribution. Theoretically, this study was a proof whether authentic materials could be used as the effective materials in teaching writing procedural text or not, especially on the students’ writing score. Meanwhile, practically, this study was the way to improve the students’ writing score of the tenth year students at MAN Model Palangka Raya, as one of the alternative or even the main materials could be taught by English teachers in teaching writing and as contribution for those who wanted to use authentic materials as the main materials in teaching learning process.

METHOD

This study was conducted using experimental design. As Sugiyono (2007) states that the experimental method is a method that used to investigate the effect of certain treatment to the other variable in a controlled condition. The quasi-experimental design was applied.

There would be two groups in this design; they were experiment group and control group. To compare both groups in term of writing score, a pretest-posttest control group design would be used. As Krathwohl in Demircan (2004:34) states that “the strongest chains of reasoning can be carried out through the experimental design.” The would be given a pretest to both groups to measure the writing score of the students before the treatment was given.

As the treatment, the experimental group would be taught using the authentic materials while the control group would be taught using non-authentic materials. At the end of treatment, posttest would be given to both groups to measure the writing score of the students.

The population of this study was all tenth year students at MAN Model Palangka Raya. The number of population was 223. Population is a general area consists of; certain quantity and characteristic of the object/subject to be studied then took a conclusion (Sugiyono, 2007:117). To take the sample, then purposive sampling is done by taking the subject not based on strata random or area but based on certain purpose in this study. It was classified into the experimental group and control group by taking two classes, such as XA as experiment group and XB as control group which the students had same average score in English. The number of students of XA was 30. The number of students of XB was 30. To get the data it was used tests.

To collect the data, it was implemented some procedures as follows: Determining two classes from the population into experiment group and control group, giving a pre-test to both groups, teaching the experiment group by using authentic materials, teaching the control group by using non-authentic materials, giving a post-test to both groups, scoring to get the main data from both groups, analyzing the data that had been gotten from pre-test and post-test, and concluding based on the problem of this study.

FINDINGS

The pre-test scores were obtained before treatment in experiment group. Based on the pre-test score of experiment group, the average score of content was 18.66, it could be classified in 21-17, so the
students’ ability was fair. The average score of organization was 12.38, it could be classified in 13-10, so the students’ ability was fair. The average score of vocabulary was 11.58, it could be classified in 13-10, so the students’ ability was fair. The average score of Grammar was 13.65, it could be classified in 17-11, so the students’ ability was fair. The average score of spelling was 3, it could be classified as fair. Based on the result of mean score, it was known that the mean of pre-test score in Experiment group was 59.76. It was used to measure the degree of score after teaching writing procedural text by using authentic materials.

Meanwhile, based on the pre-test score of control group, the average score of content was 16.9 or 17, it could be classified in 21-17, so the students’ ability was fair. The average score of organization was 11.38, it could be classified in 13-10, so the students’ ability was fair. The average score of vocabulary was 11.03, it could be classified in 13-10, so the students’ ability was fair. The average score of Grammar was 11.73, it could be classified in 17-11, so the students’ ability was fair. The average score of spelling was 3, it could be classified as fair. Based on the calculation, it was known that the mean of pre-test score in control group was 53.8.

If it was compared with the mean of pre-test in experiment group that was 59.76, there was difference of value that was 5.96. Based on the result of pre-test comparison, there was difference on writing score between the experiment group and the control group. Although there was difference, the writer determined the balance of the means of both groups based on Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimal MAN Model Palangka Raya. Based on the means of both groups they were failing in writing score in pre-test.

The post-test scores were obtained after the treatment in experiment group. Based on the post-test score of experiment group, the average score of content was 22.7, it could be classified in 26-22, so the students’ ability was good. The average score of organization was 15.05, it could be classified in 17-14, so the students’ ability was good. The average score of vocabulary was 14.35, it could be classified in 17-14, so the students’ ability was good. The average score of Grammar was 17.63 or 18, it could be classified in 21-18, so the students’ ability was good. The average score of spelling was 3.58 or 4, it could be classified as good. Based on the calculation, it was known that the mean of post-test score in experiment group was 72.9. If it was compared with the mean of pre-test score in the same group that was 59.76, there was increasing of score about 13.14.

Meanwhile, the post-test scores in control group were obtained. Based on the post-test score of control group, the average score of content was 19.90 or 20; it could be classified in 21-17, so the students’ ability was fair. The average score of organization was 13.13, it could be classified in 13-10, so the students’ ability was fair. The average score of vocabulary was 12.58, it could be classified in 13-10, so the students’ ability was fair. The average score of Grammar was 14.82, it could be classified in 17-11, so the students’ ability was fair. The average score of spelling was 3.13, it could be classified as fair. Based on the calculation, it was known that mean of post-test score in control group was 58.
If the mean of post-test score was compared with the mean of pretest score in the same group that was 53.8. There was increasing of score about 4.2. If the mean of post-test in control group, 58 was compared with the mean of post-test in experiment group, 72.9, the mean of post-test score in experiment group was higher than the mean of post-test score in control group. Since the mean of experiment group 72.9 > 65, it could be concluded the group was masterful in writing score, whereas, since the mean of control group 58 < 65, it could be concluded the group was failing in writing score. So, the experiment group was masterful in post-test score.

To examine the hypothesis, it was used \( t_{test} \). Based on the hypothesis test, the value of \( t_{test} \) from the test result calculation for \( t_{test} (t_o) \) was 4.33. Based on the level of significance 0.05 (5%) with df or db = (N1 + N2 - 2) = 30 + 30 - 2 = 58, \( t_{table} \) was 2.00. Since \( t_{test} (t_o) \geq t_{table} = 4.33 \geq 2.00 \) or \( t_o \) was higher than \( t_{table} \), so \( Ho \) was rejected. It meant there was a significant difference between the students taught using authentic materials and the students taught using non-authentic materials on the students’ writing score of the tenth year students at MAN Model Palangka Raya.

Meanwhile, the result of T-test using SPSS 17.0, T-test result could be showed that was 4.386 with the 5 % level of significance, df was 58, so it was gotten that \( t_{table} \) was 2.00. Since 4.386 > 2.00, it meant \( Ha \) was accepted; there was a significant difference between the students taught using authentic materials and the students taught using non-authentic materials on the students’ writing score of the tenth year students at MAN Model Palangka Raya. Finally, the result of \( t_{test} \) using SPSS 17.0, the result of manual \( t_{test} \) was same with the result of SPSS 17.0-\( t_{test} \). The comparison of the manual \( T_{test} \) result with the SPSS 17.0-\( T_{test} \) result is shown in Table 1.

### Table 1. The Comparison of the Manual \( T_{test} \) Result with the SPSS 17.0-\( T_{test} \) Result

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Types of Calculation</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error Difference</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>( T_{test} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Manual Calculation</td>
<td>Experiment Group</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>8.431</td>
<td>1.567</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>16.46</td>
<td>3.059</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SPSS Calculation</td>
<td>Experiment Group</td>
<td>73.100</td>
<td>8.64770</td>
<td>1.57885</td>
<td>14.9000</td>
<td>3.39701</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>58.200</td>
<td>16.47443</td>
<td>3.00781</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION**

The result of analysis showed that there was a significant difference between the students taught using authentic materials and the students taught using non-authentic materials on the students’ writing score of the tenth year students at MAN Model Palangka Raya. The students
who were taught using authentic materials reached high score than those who were taught using non-authentic materials ($X_1 = 72.9$ and $X_2 = 58$). Meanwhile, after the data was calculated using $t_{\text{test}}$, it was found that the value of $t_{\text{test}}$ was higher than $t_{\text{table}}$ at 5% level of significance ($t_{\text{test}} = 4.33 > t_{\text{table}} = 2.00$) and SPSS 17.0 ($t_{\text{test}} = 4.386 > t_{\text{table}} = 2.00$).

This finding indicated that the alternative hypothesis stating that there was a significant difference between the students taught using authentic materials and the students taught using non-authentic materials on the students’ writing score of the tenth year students at MAN Model Palangka Raya was accepted. On the contrary, the null hypothesis stating that there was no significant difference between the students taught using authentic materials and the students taught using non-authentic materials on the students’ writing score of the tenth year students at MAN Model Palangka Raya was rejected. Although alternative hypothesis was accepted, the effect of nonrandomized samples may influence the result of the study.

This statistical finding supported theory from Stasz, Schwartz, Weeden and D’Annunzio that student writing based on their own lives has been associated with increases in writing skills (Jacobson, et al., n.d.). Students learnt authentic procedural texts which the texts based on their own lives, so the students’ writing score increased. It could be proved from the means of experiment group in pre-test and post-test score ($M_1 = 59.76$ and $M_2 = 72.9$).

The research finding supported that there was a significant difference between the students taught using authentic materials and the students taught using non-authentic materials on the students’ writing score of the tenth year students at MAN Model Palangka Raya. The using of authentic materials were proved increasing students’ writing score in writing procedural text. It could be seen from the difference of the students’ score of experiment group and control group.

In short, it showed that teaching writing procedural text using authentic materials was more effective than teaching writing procedural text using non-authentic materials on the students’ writing score of the tenth year students at MAN Model Palangka Raya.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the result of analysis and hypothesis test, it could be concluded that there was a significant difference between the students taught using authentic materials and the students taught using non-authentic materials on the students’ writing score of the tenth year students at MAN Model Palangka Raya. Teaching writing procedural text using authentic materials was more effective than teaching writing procedural text using non-authentic materials because the authentic materials taught was appropriate with the level of students in this study. The students’ difficulties in writing procedural text were in determining the appropriate action verbs and making imperative sentences. After the writer taught them, most students could solve their problem.

Therefore, some suggestion would be proposed. First, English teachers should use authentic materials to increase English skills of students and bridge the gap between what the students learn in class with the use in real life. The
authentic materials are used not only for teaching writing but also for teaching the other skills in English subject. To do so, it should be begun with need assessment to identify students’ need and goal. Also, it should be chosen and used the appropriate materials in teaching writing which must be appropriate with the level of students’ ability. Second, the students should learn more to write procedural texts, especially in determining the appropriate action verbs and making imperative sentences. They should be accustomed to look for unknown words in English dictionary. Finally, the other researchers can investigate research about authentic materials more, so that there will be new inventions in English teaching.

REFERENCES