

The Effectiveness of 6-3-5 Brainwriting Strategy in Teaching Writing Skill

Masagus Sulaiman¹, Sri Yuliani², Sausan Qathrunnada³

¹ Universitas Muhammadiyah Palembang, Indonesia

² Universitas Muhammadiyah Palembang, Indonesia

³ Universitas Muhammadiyah Palembang, Indonesia

Corresponding Email: mrshu.ok@gmail.com

Abstract. The primary aim of this research is to evaluate the effectiveness of the 6-3-5 brainwriting methodology in instructing writing proficiency to students in the eighth grade at SMP Negeri 21 Palembang. A genuine experimental study approach was employed by the researchers, utilising a sample size of 64 students. The researchers employed pretests and posttests as tools for data collection. The present study employed paired and independent sample t-tests, as well as additional t-tests, for the purpose of data analysis. The findings from the paired t-test analysis indicated that the experimental group obtained an average score of 70.94 on the pretest, while the control group obtained a baseline score of 39.69. On the posttest, the experimental group achieved an average score of 84.53, whereas the control group exhibited an average score of 45.94. The identified discrepancies suggest that there is a substantial disparity in the mean scores of the two groups; the experimental group exhibits superior scores when compared to the control group's pretest-posttest results. In addition, the t-value produced by the independent sample t-test was 0.000, which is less than the predetermined level of significance of 0.05. This finding indicates that the 6-3-5 brainwriting technique effectively guided learners through the process of constructing recount narratives.

Keywords: 6-3-5 brainwriting strategy, recount text, teaching, writing skill

Introduction

Writing is the process of producing and conveying thoughts through written word. It resembles a communication process when a reader receives a message via a traditional graphic system. (Irawan, Suadiyatno, Haerazi, & Hidayatullah, 2020). It is the process by which individuals express their thoughts and feelings in observable ways that are clear to both themselves and other people. (Hidayati, 2018; Indrilla, 2018; Dalman, 2015). Writing is the act of recording thoughts and feelings as they come to mind, and it is undeniable that writing is one of the four critical and sophisticated communication abilities. As the building blocks of writing, students must understand grammar, spelling, content, sentence structure, vocabulary, and sentence structure. Boyle, Ramsay, and Struan, 2019; Annisa, Fauzia, and Leni, 2018).

Writing is one language skill that calls for both productive and active abilities. The goal of writing skills is to promote language use for the purpose of expressing one's ideas and emotions. 2018; Herdi & Abbas). Utami, Pabbajah, and Juhansar (2018) assert that proficient utilisation of writing mechanics, including capitalization, punctuation, and grammatical accuracy, as well as appropriate word selection, is critical for educators to attain the goals of written communication. However, Bartan (2017) posits that writing is a skill that can be acquired by both non-native and native speakers. Proficiency in writing is greatly esteemed in both institutions and schools.

However, Chan (2019) asserts that composition assignments are given by teachers to their students starting in elementary school and continuing through college. Since every student has a unique way of understanding what they are learning, teachers' abilities are crucial in the evaluation process when it comes to teaching and learning writing. Because of this, a lot of professors have found that students' lack of confidence and enthusiasm is usually the primary reason why they don't start writing. Choi and Lee (2018).

Actually, there could be a number of reasons why students choose not to write. They believe they have nothing to say or have never written much in their own tongue. According to Sitorus & Sipayung (2018), students' writing abilities remain low; they lack sufficient knowledge

Article info:

<https://doi.org/10.52760/ijerd.v3i2.42>

Received 24th December 2023; Received in revised form 20th January 2024; Accepted 20th February 2024

Published by Corolla Education Centre Foundation on behalf of International Journal of Education Research and Development. This is an open access article under the CC BY-SA license

of vocabulary, idea organisation, and grammar; also, they make incorrect word placement and organisation decisions while generating phrases inside sentences or paragraphs. Furthermore, Yundayani (2018) notes that many EFL students find writing difficult since they are not exposed to actual language outside of the classroom, particularly when producing recount texts. A recount text is a text written in sequence that narrates a number of incidents pertaining to earlier encounters. It is written down to narrate stories of past experiences and amuse people by recounting old happenings. Adnan and Mediska, (2019). Students must understand and become proficient in the generic structures found in recount texts, including reorientation, events, and orientation. Telling the reader who was involved, what happened, where it happened, and when it happened is the focus of orientation. Along with details about the scene setting and context, it gives the reader the background knowledge they need to comprehend the text. Events, however, have been arranged chronologically and in accordance with the primary events that took place in the text's narrative. Reorientation is associated with the statement-closing process, which comprises the concluding paragraph and elaboration. It can be classified into three categories: imaginative, factual, and personal. (Husna & Multazim, 2019; Fisher, 2016)

Per the information from The World's Most Literate Nations (WMLN) 2016 that was referenced in (Totoh, 2020). up terms of literacy and literate behaviour, Indonesia came up at number 60 out of 61. Studies have been done to look into the writing difficulties faced by Indonesian EFL students. Rahmatunisa (2014) looked into the difficulties Indonesian EFL students were having composing argumentative essays. According to a different study by Jaelani (2016), a lot of EFL students are less engaged in writing since they find it difficult to communicate their views due to their limited vocabulary. It is partly because teachers' inventiveness in the classroom is still lacking, and the methods they employ to pique students' interest in learning are uninteresting and ineffective.

In order to determine whether or not the eighth grade students at SMP Negeri 21 Palembang had writing difficulties, the researchers conducted interviews with an English teacher and the students. Subsequently, the researchers learned that the majority of students struggled with writing because they lacked vocabulary, which made it difficult for them to begin composing or expressing their ideas in writing. It was in keeping with Rahmatika (2019), who claims that writing is similar to the process of building ideas into paragraphs or texts and that teachers' inventiveness is necessary to address students' writing difficulties. Possessing a high degree of creative thinking is being able to arrange and produce fresh concepts while learning. Additionally, Khikmah (2019) highlights the need of creativity in developing high-quality literature. An acceptable or effective solution is required to address this issue and boost teaching creativity. The 6-3-5 brain writing was one of them. According to Litcanu, Prostean, Oros, and Mnerie (2015), brainwriting is a substitute technique for brainstorming. 6-3-5 brainwriting is very helpful when working with a group of people who wouldn't likely provide many ideas in an open-ended brainstorming session. A group creative process used in product development, design, writing, marketing, and advertising is called 6-3-5 brainwriting. Another name for it is the 6-3-5 approach.

According to Michalko (2007), the teacher employs the brain writing method in their writing approach. The process bears resemblance to that of brainstorming. The 6-3-5 brainwriting technique is straightforward: participants are instructed to transcribe their thoughts into paper for a duration of five minutes on a certain subject or matter, rather than verbally expressing their views. Following this, allocate each participant's paper to the individual situated on their right side. Subsequently, inspire the subsequent reader to expound upon or produce novel concepts derived from the aforementioned notions. Collect the sheets and promptly submit them for immediate deliberation. Through the process of written communication, this technique facilitates the generation and sharing of ideas across groups. The group consists of six students who exhibit a high level of imagination. While the remaining individuals engage in reading and generate their own ideas, a single member of the group promptly transcribes their three ideas within a span of five minutes. The references cited are Agustina and Friatin (2019), Sari and Fitrawati (2018), and Brokop & Persal (2010). The 6-3-5 brain writing technique is highly effective in enhancing children's writing skills by enabling them

to express their ideas on paper. The findings and rationale presented suggest that additional research is necessary to substantiate the efficacy of the 6-3-5 brainwriting technique in enhancing writing proficiency, specifically in the context of recount narratives.

Material and Method

The study employed an actual experimental research design that aligns with the principles of quantitative research. Syahri, Sulaiman, and Susanti (2017) claim that a genuine experimental design is characterised by the random selection of the sample and the inclusion of both experimental and control groups or classes in the study. The study involved the participation of 64 eighth-grade students from SMP Negeri 21 Palembang, who were selected as samples or participants. The researchers employed a cluster random sampling strategy to choose and obtain the participants. The allocation of students employed as samples or participants in this study was managed by a distinct organisation. This study involved the allocation of 32 students to the experimental group or class, while an equivalent number of 32 students were allocated to the control group or class. The researchers employed experimental research approaches to gather data in order to investigate the correlation between the variables. The research employed two distinct types of variables, specifically independently and dependently. The study focused on the writing achievements of students in recount texts as the dependent variable, while the brainwriting of students with a score of 6-3-5 was considered the independent variable.

In order to gather data, the researchers administered a pretest and a posttest to the students. The examination design consisted of essays pertaining to personal texts derived from the recount materials. The researchers devised two subjects, namely "My Last New Year's Eve" and "My Last Holiday During Semester Break," for the pretest and posttest. The participants in these experiments consisted of the experimental group and the control group. The pretest was administered at the commencement of the therapy session, while the posttest was administered subsequent to the treatment. Both the experimental group and the control group underwent pretests administered by the researchers in this study. Following this, the investigators utilised the 6-3-5 brainwriting technique to provide writing instruction to the students in the experimental group, who were not assigned to the control group. After this, a posttest was administered to both the experimental and control groups by the researchers. After completing data collection, the researchers conducted statistical analysis using t-tests, specifically the paired t-test and independent sample t-test. The primary objective of this research endeavour was to assess the efficacy of 6-3-5 brainwriting as an instructional method for writing, as well as to identify any significant disparities that may have existed between students who were exposed to this technique and those who were not.

Results and Discussion

Results

The pretest involved the participation of thirty-two students from the control group. This study aimed to evaluate the memory text writing skills of students in the control group by the administration of a pretest. Based on the pretest results, one student achieved the highest score of 55 and the lowest score of 25. Table 1 was presented to enhance clarity.

**Table 1 .
The Statistics Data of Pretest in Control Group**

N	Valid	32
	Missing	0
Mean		39.69
Std. Error of Mean		1.618
Median		40.00
Mode		40
Std. Deviation		9.153
Variance		83.770

Range	30
Minimum	25
Maximum	55
Sum	1270

The pretest findings for the Control group are displayed in Table 1, which shows a mean score of 39.69, a median score of 40,00, and a mode score of 40. The data set's standard deviation was computed as 9.153. Four students achieved a maximum score of 55, and three students achieved a minimum score of 25. Furthermore, a posttest was provided to the control group in the present study by the researchers. Table 2 has been shown to enhance clarity.

Table 2.
The Statistics Data of Posttest in Control Group

N	Valid	32
	Missing	0
Mean		45.94
Std. Error of Mean		1.830
Median		47.50
Mode		50
Std. Deviation		10.352
Variance		107.157
Range		40
Minimum		25
Maximum		65
Sum		1470

The posttest results for the control group were presented in Table 2, indicating a mean score of 45.94, a median score of 47.50, and a mode score of 50. According to the data, the standard deviation was calculated to be 10,352. The highest score achieved by one student was 65, while the lowest score recorded by two students was 25. Nevertheless, the researchers administered a pretest and posttest to 32 students in the experimental class. The pretest was performed before to the treatment, and Table 3 was provided for the purpose of enhancing clarity.

Table 3.
The Statistics Data of Pretest in Experimental Group

N	Valid	32
	Missing	0
Mean		70.94
Std. Error of Mean		1.546
Median		70.00
Mode		70
Std. Deviation		8.747
Variance		76.512
Range		30
Minimum		55
Maximum		85
Sum		2270

Table 3 displays the pretest results for the experimental group, indicating a mean of 70.94, a median of 40,00, and a mode of 70. The standard deviation was 8.747. Four students achieved a maximum score of 85, while two students achieved a minimum score of 55. Furthermore, the posttest was administered subsequent to the treatment and had a total of thirty-two students. Table 4 was explicitly described.

Table 4.

The Statistics Data of Posttest in Experimental Group

N	Valid	32
	Missing	0
Mean		84.53
Std. Error of Mean		1.372
Median		85.00
Mode		85
Std. Deviation		7.763
Variance		60.257
Range		25
Minimum		70
Maximum		95
m		
Sum		2705

The posttest findings for the experimental group were presented in Table 4, indicating a mean score of 84.53, a median score of 85.00, and a mode score of 85. Six students achieved a maximum score of 95, while three students achieved the lowest score of 70. The average value was 7,763. Furthermore, the researchers utilised a paired t-test to investigate any statistical disparities in the average scores between the pretest and posttest between the experimental and control groups. The exposition of Table 5 was lucid and devoid of any ambiguity.

Table 5.

The Result of Paired Sample Test of Pretest in Control and Experimental Classes

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Pretest_Control	39.69	32	9.153	1.618
	Pretest_Experiment	70.94	32	8.747	1.546

Table 5 displays the pretest mean result for the control group. The mean standard error of 1.618 and a standard deviation of 9.153 are associated with this score. The mean score of the experimental group on the pre-test was 1.546, and it increased to 70.94 on the post-test, with an accompanying standard deviation of 8.747. The alternative hypothesis (H) was accepted in place of the null hypothesis (Ho) due to the statistically significant differences in scores that were observed between the control and experimental groups. In addition, the posttest results for both the experimental and control cohorts were calculated by the researchers. The explanation presented in Table 6 was comprehensive.

Table 6.

The Result of Paired Sample Test of Posttest of Control and

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Posttest_Control	45.94	32	10.352	1.830
	Posttest_Experiment	84.53	32	7.763	1.372

As shown in Table 6, the average posttest score of the control group was 45.94, with a standard deviation of 10.352. The average score of the control group on the pretest was 1.830. The pretests administered to the experimental group exhibited the subsequent attributes: an average score of 84.53, a mean standard error of 1.372, and a standard deviation of 7.763. Significant disparities in scores between the experimental and control groups led to the acceptance of the alternative hypothesis (Ha) and the rejection of the null hypothesis (Ho). In order to ascertain the potential benefits of 6-3-5 brainwriting, the researchers obtained posttest scores for both the experimental and control groups using an independent straightforward t-test. The explanation of Table 7 was comprehensive.

Table 7

Independent Sample T-Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances			T-Test for Equality of Means					
	F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	2.932	.092	16.873	62	.000	-38.594	2.287	4.850	-34.022
Variances Not assumed			-16.873	57.488	.000	-38.594	2.287	4.804	-34.014

As indicated in Table 7, the significance level that was obtained was 0.000. Based on the obtained p-value of 0.000, which falls below the predetermined significance level of 0.05 (alpha), it can be concluded that the differences in writing posttest scores between the two groups are statistically significant. The results of this study suggest that students in the experimental group demonstrated a greater degree of proficiency in writing abilities in comparison to the control group. Furthermore, the effectiveness of the 6-3-5 brainwriting method as a writing instruction technique was substantiated by empirical evidence.

Discussion

The ability of writing is the fundamental of learning English for EFL students and it becomes the teacher's concern when teaching EFL in the classroom. This must be supported with an effective writing strategy as 6-3-5 brain writing, since it highlights teacher's creativity that can improve students' writing skills. (Khikmah, 2019). This kind of strategy is regarded as group work strategy that involves group's ideas in terms of marketing, advertising, design, writing, and product development. (Litcanu, Prosteian, Oros & Mnerie, 2015).

An English teacher can use this straightforward and efficient method, which consists of letting students speak out about whatever comes to mind, then asking them to write it down on paper for five minutes on a given topic or issue. The next person to read the ideas should either build on them or come up with new ones. Subsequently, the instructor directs each participant to transfer their paper to the individual situated behind them. Subsequently, the teacher gathers the worksheets and displays them for deliberation. Michael Ko, in the year 2007.

The results of the research suggest that students assigned to the experimental group, who were instructed in the 6-3-5 brain writing technique, demonstrated a higher level of academic success than those in the control group. The experimental group comprised 32 students, and their mean pretest scores were 70.94. A minimum score of 60 was recorded, with a maximum score of 85. In addition, the average posttest score was 84.53, ranging from a maximum of 95 to a minimum of 70. The mean pre-test score of the 32 individuals comprising the control group was 39.69. A minimum score of 25 was documented, with a maximum score of 55.. The results of the posttest indicated that the average score was 45.94, with the greatest score recorded at 65 and the lowest score at 25. These findings indicate that students who were taught writing utilising the 6-3-5 braintwisting method achieved higher academic performance compared to those who did not get such instruction.

Furthermore, it is worth noting that the mean posttest score for the experimental group was 84.53, while it was 45.94 for the control group. Concerning the instruction of writing, the

research revealed that the 6-3-5 brainwriting method yielded superior results for students' learning compared to the conventional approach. Two-tailed significance of the data in this investigation was determined utilising the independent sample T-Test. The significance value obtained was 0.000, which signifies that it is equal to or less than 0.05. As a result, it was determined that there is a significant difference in the writing proficiency of H_a students before and after receiving instruction in writing usage, whereas there is no such difference in the writing proficiency of H_o students before and after receiving instruction in writing using the 6-3-5 brainwriting approach. Consequently, H_o was deemed invalid. A statistically significant discrepancy can be deduced in the writing achievement test scores of the students enrolled in the experimental class, as evidenced by the differences between the pretest and posttest scores ($p < 0.05$, $p < 0.001$). The 6-3-5 brainwriting method was considered to be acceptable.

The findings acquired by the researchers in this specific instance validated the conclusions posited in Ayundari's 2021 study, which asserted that the 6-3-5 brainwriting technique enhances writing capabilities in an effective manner. There was a minimal disparity observed in the posttest results between the experimental group and the control group. Specifically, the alpha value of 0.05 was assigned to the p-value in the researchers' study, which signifies a level of significance of 0.000. In contrast, the p-value obtained from Ayundari's research was 0.05 (alpha), which corresponds to a significance level of 0.032. The results of the analysis indicate that the null hypothesis (H_o) was denied, leading to the acceptance of the alternative hypothesis (H). Based on the findings of these two studies, it is logical to conclude that 6-3-5 brainwriting has a substantial impact on the development of writing skills.

Conclusion

In this research, the researchers concluded that 6-3-5 brainwriting strategy was effective and had significant impact on students' recount texts writing skill achievements. By examining the T-test results and means, which were reported in the research's results and discussion, it was demonstrated that the experimental group of 32 students had mean pretest scores of 70.94, with 85 being the highest and 60 being the lowest. Furthermore, the average score on the posttest was 84.53, with 95 being the best and 70 being the lowest. The control group consisted of 32 students, with an average pretest score of 39.69. The documented minimum score was 25, while the documented maximum score was 55. Based on the results obtained from the posttest, the highest possible score achieved was 65, while the lowest possible score achieved was 25. An average point total of 45.94 was accumulated. The findings derived from the independent sample T-test offered further support for the notion that the experimental group exhibited superior posttest scores in comparison to the control group. This difference was observed at a significance level of 0.0001, which is less than the predetermined alpha level of 0.05. The findings indicate that eighth-grade students at SMP Negeri 21 Palembang acquired proficiency in composing recount texts through the implementation of the 6-3-5 brainwriting methodology.

Acknowledgement

We would like to express our gratitude to University of Muhammadiyah, lecturers, and students, for all the support, motivate, facilities to finish this research.

References

- Abbas., & Herdi, H. (2018). Solving the students' problems in writing argumentative essay through collaborative writing strategy. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 7(1), 105-114.
- Agustina, W., & Friatin, Y. L. (2019). Students's voice: applying brainwriting inwriting recount text. *Jurnal Wahana Pendidikan*, 6(2), 10-16.

- Annisa, F. I., Fauzia, R. S., & Leni, M. (2018). Students' ability in writing an analytical exposition text at English Department of Universitas Negeri Padang. *Journal of English Language Teaching* 7(1), 170-176.
- Ayundari, P. (2021). *The Influence of using brainwriting 6-3-5 Techniques towards students' writing ability in descriptive text at the tenth grade SMK Ma'arif Sukoharjo in the academic year of 2020/2021. Tarbiyah and Teacher Training Faculty State of Islamic University Studies of Raden Intan Lampung*. Retrieved from <http://repository.radenintan.ac.id/16589/>
- Bartan, O.S. (2017). The effect of reading short stories in improving foreign language writing skill. *The Reading Matrix: An Internation Online Journal* 17(1), 59-74.
- Boyle, J., Ramsay, S., & Struan, A. (2019). The academic writing skills programme: A model for technology-enhanced, blended delivery of an academic writing programme. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice* 16(4). 1-14.
- Brokop, F., & Persall, B. (2010). *Writing strategies for learners who are deaf*. Edmonton: NorQuest Collage.
- Chan, J. Y. H. (2019). The choice of English pronunciation goals: different views, experiences and concerns of students, teachers and professionals. *Asian Englishes*, 21(3), 264-284. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2018.1482436>
- Choi, E., & Lee, J. (2018). EFL teachers' self-efficacy and teaching practices. *ELT Journal*, 72(2), 175-186. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccx046>
- Dalman. (2015). The challenges of teaching English language: The relationship between study and teaching. *International Journal of Linguistic*, 7(1), 102-110.
- Fisher, A. S. H. (2016). Students' reading techniques difficulties in recount text. *Journal of English and Education*, 4(2), 1-12.
- Haerazi., Irawan, A., Suadiyatno, T., & Hidayatullah, H. (2020). Triggering preservice teachers' writing skills through genre-based instructional model viewed from creativity. *International Journal of Evaluation and Study in Education (IJERE)*, 9(1), 234-244. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v9i1.203945>
- Hidayati, K. H. (2018). Teaching writing to EFL learners: An investigation of challenges confronted by Indonesian teachers. *Langkawi: Journal of the Association for Arabic and English*, 4(1), 21-31. <http://dx.doi.org/10.31332/lkw.v4i1.772>
- Husna, A., & Multazim, A. (2019). Students' difficulties in writing recount text at inclusion classes. *LET: Linguistics, Literature and English Teaching Journal*, 9(1), 52-76.
- Indrilla, N. (2018). The effectiveness of scientific approach and contextual in teaching and learning approach in teaching writing. *Lingua Cultura*, 12(4), 405-413. <https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v12i4.4452>
- Jaelani, S. R. (2016). Treating of content-based instruction to teach writing viewed from EFL learners' creativity. *English Language Teaching*, 10(11), 156-161.
- Khikmah. (2019). Teachers' creativity in designing learning activities: Sustaining students' motivation. *English Review: Journal of English education*, 7(2), 85-92.
- Litcanu, M., Prostean, O., Oros, C., & Mnerie, A.V. (2015). Brain-writing vs. Brain storming case study for power engineering education. *Procedia social and behavior science*, 387-390.
- Mediska, G., & Adnan, A. (2019). Improving student's speaking by using cocktail party technique in teaching recount text for senior high school students. *Journal of English Language Teaching* 8 (2), 296-304.
- Michalko, M. (2007). *Permainan Berpikir (Thinkertoys)*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Rahmatika. (2019). The effectiveness of student teams achievement division to teach writing viewed from students' creativity. *International Journal of Language Education*, 3(1), 46-54.
- Rahmatunisa, W. (2014). Problems faced by Indonesian EFL learners in writing argumentative essay, *Journal of English Education*, 3(1).
- Sari, E.K., & Fitrawati. (2018). Using 6-3-5 brainwriting in helping senior high school students in writing process. *Journal of English Language Teaching* 7 (3), 531-537.

- Sitorus, G.S., & Sipayung, K. (2018). An error analysis of using phrases in writing recount text at tenth grade in SMA Parulian 2 Medan. *Celt: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching & Literature*, 18(1), 74.
- Syahri, I., Sulaiman, M., & Susanti, R. (2017). *Metodelogi Penelitian Pendidikan Bahasa* (1st ed). Roemah Sufie, Palembang.
- Totoh, A. (2020). *Bagaimana kemampuan literasi kita?* Kumparan. Retrieved from <https://kumparan.com/asep-totoh/bagaimana-kemampuan-literasi-kita-1u4VWDQ38jX>.
- Utami, M., Pabbajah., & Juhansar, J. (2018) The implementation of jumbled sentences toward students' skill in writing report text, *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 7(1), 115-124.
- Yundayani. (2018). Present situation analysis: Students' early characteristics in writing for academic purposes. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 6(2), 119-126.

