Developing Maritime Thematic Expressions on English Reading Materials Used In Indonesia: Junior High School Context
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Abstract: Indonesia is a maritime country with the largest islands in the world covering more than seventeen thousands islands. This wealth should be wisely explored for all their advantages. Also, all parties should take responsibility to inherit values embedded in the wealth. This study is a Research and Development focusing at developing English worksheet materials in the theme of Maritime Thematic Expressions. Specifically, it aimed at identifying initial contents of the English worksheet, describing the development of worksheet materials and justifying contents of worksheet materials in facilitating the students’ needs in reading English materials. The flow of this R&D refers to Sugiono’s model that includes analyzing data, collecting data, designing materials, validating material, revising the material, piloting products, revising the material, piloting materials, revising the material and material development. The development of this material adjusted to the needs of syllabus and national strategic issues in maritime that were coined with students of Junior High School Terbuka Pekanbaru. The worksheet development has been revised and validated by some experts of curriculum and linguistics. This material has also been piloted by the English teacher to determine of the students’ ability in comprehending the materials. Based on the results of this development, it can be concluded that the materials development were relevant with the standard competence and basic competence in syllabus of the students’ reading skill in Junior High School Terbuka Pekanbaru.
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1. Introductions

  Teaching English Reading for students at schools requires authentic materials (Thakur, 2015) so that they will see the relevance between materials studied at school and issues discussed outside of it. As Indonesian government, currently, soars theme related to maritime, it is therefore important for teachers to consider this as a theme that is also studied by students at school, specifically Junior High School. It is teacher role to determine best teaching material for improving students’ archipelagic awareness. Worksheet, as a teaching material used in Junior High Schol Terbuka Pekanbaru, might be a tool to be developed to raise the students’ awareness in maritime issues. The development English materials should also consider the need of curriculum as the teacher’s guideline. In the syllabus, it is stated that students should be able to identify information orally, read loudly and respond to short functional text clearly. Moreover, the material should cover instruction, greeting card, list of item and announcement. In fact, it was found that announcement, and instruction materials were not included.

  Furthermore, the worksheet was circulated practically and presented instantly without having detailed explanation of its basic concept. Moreover, the worksheet has limited task for reading skill at each chapter. It might consequence to students’ low achievement in reading, as Suyitno (2007) highlighted that worksheet has crucial influences in learning process and support students’ development [4].
The development of English materials, like worksheet, also refers to cognitive level of Bloom’s Taxonomy in the level of Understanding. It requires information and concepts that the students should be able to compare, describe, discuss, and restate activities in learning.

2. Method

This study is an R&D to develop a product, namely English worksheet. It is to cover the students’ awareness toward national strategic issues in maritime. In developing material, this research combined the ADDIE’s and Sugiono’s model. It included of analyzing the potential problem, collecting the data, identifying the worksheet material, designing and developing worksheet material, validating worksheet material, revising the worksheet material, piloting product, revision worksheet material, validating worksheet material, revising worksheet material, piloting product, revising worksheet material, developing worksheet material. In the step, the researchers conducted two times validation and piloting product, namely worksheet material as data source. The researchers also used focus group discussion as instrument of this research. In analyzing the data, the researchers did pra-planning, identifying the product, identifying the content, identifying the social condition and strategy. While analyzing the data, the researchers conducted intensive discussion with the experts to get their judgments.

3. Finding and Discussion

In the description of initial contents, there were two materials that were not covered in the worksheet materials and they were not supported by some tasks that as stated in the syllabus. It can be seen on the table below:

| No | Materials   | Contents                                      | Task |
|----|-------------|-----------------------------------------------|------|
| 1  | Announcement| Have not included in the worksheet book       | 5    |
| 2  | Instruction | Have not included in the worksheet book       | 15   |
| 3  | Greeting card| Definition                                    | 5    |
|    |             | Function                                       |      |
|    |             | Kinds of the greeting card                    | 15   |
| 4  | Shopping List| Have not discussed                            | 5    |

Based on the table above, the students’ worksheet covered four materials; they were instruction, greeting card, list items and announcement. However, it was found that announcement and instruction material were not included. In greeting card material, its presentation did not cover discussion of generic structure and kinds of tenses properly. Meanwhile, in shopping list materials, it presented procedure text without discussing the meaning and function of the materials. To add, the task material presented has limited and innovative questions. The contents of material worksheet presented not more than three essays (15 items) and fifteen multiple-choices for each task. To cover this limitation, the researchers developed the materials that are expected to cover the students’ awareness and achievement in national strategic issues in maritime and learning objectives. The steps of development in the following chart:
In the stages of developing materials above, the researchers developed material more clearly referring to some weaknesses found in the worksheet material. In the first stage, the researchers analyzed the students’ awareness in maritime expressions. In this step, the researchers found that they were lack of maritime expressions. According to the teacher’s claim that the materials were never promoted in the class. Moreover, the teacher only took some related materials from other sources to cover the weakness of materials. Based on the teacher explanation above, in the second stage, the researchers checked the syllabus and worksheet material. At this stage, the researchers found that the syllabus covered four materials that might facilitate the required materials. The material covered announcement, greeting card, instruction and list items. However, there were only two materials included in the worksheet materials. The materials which were not included were announcement and instruction.

In the third stage, the researchers checked the materials and tasks in the worksheet. The researchers found that the worksheet material was circulated practically and presented instantly without any detail explanation of basic concept. Moreover, the worksheet material had some limited tasks for each material. It might consequence to the students’ optimum achievement. Based on the weakness of the students’ worksheet material above, the researchers developed the worksheet material by following standard competence and basic competence in the syllabus. The researchers designed the materials by arranging each material to be quite simple and easily understood by the students. Considering of the students’ achievements, the researchers presented some tasks that included 20 innovative questions in the essay and multiple-choice instrument form. Furthermore, the researchers provided the materials for the validators to get some suggestion of the developing materials. In this validation, the researchers got some suggestions from validator to identify, add and correct the material into better level. The suggestion included useful expression in maritime, minor materials on tenses, transaction vocabularies, innovative question and word choices. After identifying the error above, the researchers re-checked, revised, and re-added the material into the expected level. After revising (checked, added and corrected) the material, the researchers returned the material to the validator for getting an approved to apply the material in the class.
In the seventh stage, the researchers gave the material to the teacher in order to pilot the product. The teacher applied the materials consisting of definitions, functions and etc. The teacher also gave one worksheet that consisted of 10 multiple choices. As the result, there were some weaknesses of the materials. In the revision of the materials, the teacher explained that the students felt difficult to finish the task because the material had difficult level so that the students did not understand very well to finish the task. This result indicated that the materials needed some revision. Before conducting the second trial product, the researchers revised and explained the result of first piloting product to the validators to develop the materials in the second product. Furthermore, the researchers designed a new material by following the learning objective in the syllabus and level of taxonomy bloom, that the expected reading materials were categorized into understanding level. After making a new product for the second piloting product, the researchers validated the last material. In this stage, the validators suggested to use high frequency vocabulary, good distractors of multiple choice items, appropriate tenses and better word choices. Following some suggestions above, the researchers revised and returned the materials to the validator to get an approved in applying the materials as the last piloting product.

In the second piloting product, the teacher applied the material in the class as similar with the step in the first piloting product. The teacher explained the material and continued providing the task to the students. As a result in the second piloting product, the students were able to improve their vocabularies comprehension on maritime theme. Based on the teacher explanation, the students were able to improve their comprehension because the materials used were categorized into high frequency vocabularies in the maritime theme and the level of the task was moderate so that they understood very well in the learning process. The teacher suggested that the material should be developed into the second product materials. Continuing the teacher’s suggestion above, the researchers discussed it with the validators to have some feedbacks before taking further development on the material. Further, the researchers described the materials development as shown in table 2. The development highlighted the constraints of the materials and tasks of the worksheet. The developing materials consisted of material explanation that was equipped with the tasks. The result of material development can be seen below:

Table 2. The Materials Development

| No | Materials      | Contents                                  | Task            | Multiple Choice |
|----|----------------|-------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 1  | Announcement   | – Definition                               | 20 Items        | 20 Items        |
|    |                | – Function                                 |                 |                 |
|    |                | – Kinds of announcement                    |                 |                 |
|    |                | – Generic structure                        |                 |                 |
|    |                | – Examples                                 |                 |                 |
|    |                | – Tasks                                    |                 |                 |
| 2  | Instruction    | – Definition                               | 20 Items        | 20 Items        |
|    |                | – Function                                 |                 |                 |
|    |                | – Generic structure                        |                 |                 |
|    |                | – Examples                                 |                 |                 |
|    |                | – Tasks                                    |                 |                 |
| 3  | Greeting card  | – Definition                               | 20 Items        | 20 Items        |
|    |                | – Function                                 |                 |                 |
|    |                | – Kinds of Greeting Card                  |                 |                 |
|    |                | – Generic structure                        |                 |                 |
|    |                | – Examples                                 |                 |                 |
|    |                | – Tasks                                    |                 |                 |
| 4  | Shopping List  | – Definition                               | 20 Items        | 20 Items        |
|    |                | – Function                                 |                 |                 |
|    |                | – Generic structure                        |                 |                 |
|    |                | – Examples                                 |                 |                 |
|    |                | – Tasks                                    |                 |                 |

Based on the table above, the product results was equipped with the tasks organized based on the findings of curriculum needs in learning English. This development product consisted of the definition, function, generic structure, and lexical grammatical by considering some factors like quite
frequent vocabularies to facilitate and improve students' ability in comprehending the material easily. Moreover, the researchers also presented some tasks consisted of 20 multiple-choices and 20 essays for each material to support the students' reading ability. Furthermore, the materials were being validated by some experts before it was applied by the teacher in the class. It helped the researchers to ensure the product's conformity of the syllabus and to find the weakness of the new material before piloting product. The result of validation can be seen below:

**Table 3. Result of Validating Product**

| No | Materials          | Results                                      |
|----|--------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| 1  | Announcement       | - The task was difficult level               |
|    |                    | - Grammar was not good                       |
|    |                    | - Many passive sentences                     |
| 2  | Greeting Card      | - Tenses should be appropriated              |
|    |                    | - Grammar was not good                       |
|    |                    | - High vocabulary                            |
|    |                    | - Word choice was not good                   |
|    |                    | - Choose high frequency                      |
|    |                    | - The task was not innovative                |
|    |                    | - Check spelling                             |
|    |                    | - The task did not have good destructor      |
| 3  | List of Items      | - Tenses should be appropriated              |
|    |                    | - Grammar was not good                       |
|    |                    | - Many passive sentences                     |
|    |                    | - The task was not innovative                |
|    |                    | - The task did not have good destructor      |
| 4  | Instruction        | - Word Choice was not good                   |

Based on the table above, the researchers found there were some suggestions from validators to review, add and correct the material into most suitable material. The materials that should be reviewed were announcement, greeting card, shopping list and instruction. The review included the task was level of difficulty and some grammatical errors, the use of numerous passive sentences, high frequency vocabularies, word choices was not good, the need of innovative and various materials and some inappropriate distractors on multiple choice questions. Considering the review above, the researchers revised, re-checked and re-added the material into most suitable level. After revising (checking, adding and correcting) the material, the researchers returned the material to the validator to get an approved in order to apply the material in the class. Below is the table of the last validation:

**Table 4. Draft of Revision**

| NO | Activities   | Command and Discussion                  |
|----|--------------|-----------------------------------------|
| 1  | Greeting Cards | 1. The theme : Greeting Card   |
|    |               | 2. The lesson plan: Good              |
|    |               | 3. Content suitability:               |
|    |               | - Good                                |
| 2  | List of Items | 1. The theme : Shopping List           |
|    |               | 2. The lesson plan: Good              |
|    |               | 3. Content suitability:               |
|    |               | - Good                                |
| 3  | Instruction  | 1. The theme : Instruction             |
|    |               | 2. The lesson plan: Good              |
|    |               | 3. Content suitability:               |
|    |               | - Good                                |
| 4  | Announcement | 1. The theme : Announcement            |
|    |               | 2. The lesson plan: Good              |
|    |               | 3. Content suitability:               |
|    |               | - Good                                |
Based on the result of the revision draft above, the experts argued that the material development was suitable and could be given to the teacher to apply in the class as trial product. The results of this research presented the answer of the third formulation of the research: how is piloting a model result relevant to the syllabus and user’s needs. In this research, the researchers piloted the product two times. In the first piloting product, the material was used by the teacher to assess students in classroom quiz. The teacher gave a sheet of the task consisted of 10 multiple choices created by the researchers that has been validated by validators. As the result of the first piloting product, the researchers found the material was quite difficult for students accomplish. In the analysis, it showed that the average of the students’ score was 66.7 or lower than passing score determined by the school, 72. This result indicated that the material needed some revisions and better development. Furthermore, the researchers conducted focus group discussion with the English teacher. As the result, the teacher explained that the material was quite difficult level required appropriate frequency vocabularies so that the students would get the better advantages of the development.

Before conducting the second piloting products, the researchers revised the result of the first trial product by explaining the results of focus group discussion to get some suggestions from the validator to develop the materials in the second piloting product. In the second piloting product, the teacher applied the new material that followed the learning objective in the syllabus and level of taxonomy bloom as similar with the step in the first trial product. The teacher explained the material and continued to provide the task for students. As the result of the second piloting product, the teacher gave another quiz to assess students’ comprehension on the materials. It was found that the average of students’ score was 83.5, which is higher than the passing score. According to the teacher’s statement, this result was achieved for the reason of better and appropriate materials with moderate frequency vocabularies and the level of the task was relatively easy understood by students. Based on the result of the second piloting product above, the teacher gave some response of the result in the focus group discussion, the teacher argued that the material could be accepted and understood by the students easily.

Moreover, the teacher argued that the material had good level because her students did not feel difficult when finishing the task. Finally, the teacher concluded that the material development had supported learning objective in the syllabus and level of taxonomy bloom, since the students were categorized into understanding level. Based on the teacher’s response above, the researchers concluded that the final materials had been already appropriate for the needs of curriculum with moderate level of difficulty for students. It has suitable with the purpose of R&D by Mulyatiningsih (2012:202) that the research aimed to make a new product empirically. This result was also supported by the previous research by Noor (2014) that the students can improve their average score by new product and have the feel of suitability with the new product. Although the material gave improvement, the material still adapted curriculum KTSP and should have an update for curriculum 2013. The material developed, also, only covered one skill and discussed four materials of the functional text. It means that the materials should be supported by other sources of the worksheets to cover the students’ skill and to make more innovative tasks needed by the students in learning English.

4. Conclusion

Based on the data analysis, the researchers described some conclusions as follows:

1) The students’ worksheet book has not covered the material that stated in the syllabus. It was found that announcement, and instruction materials are not included. Furthermore, the worksheet was circulated practically and presented instantly without accompanied by detailed explanation of basic concept.
2) The material development is designed by following the standard competence, basic competence and learning objective in the syllabus also following the level of taxonomy bloom, that the students were categorized into understanding level.

3) The material development reaches the average score is 83.5. It means that the students can improve their reading comprehension by using these materials.
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