

## Articles

## Implementing language learning strategies for writing descriptive text in an open area at a senior high school

Julianty <sup>a\*</sup>, Andi Asrifan<sup>b</sup>, Prodhan Mahbub Ibna Sera<sup>c</sup>, Amitabh Vikram Dwivedi<sup>d</sup>, Muhammad Mujtaba Asad<sup>e</sup><sup>a</sup> English Education Department, Graduate Program, Universitas Negeri Makassar, Makassar, 90221, Indonesia<sup>b</sup> Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidenreng Rappang, Makassar, Indonesia<sup>c</sup> American International University–Bangladesh (AIUB), Dhaka, Bangladesh<sup>d</sup> Shri Mata Vaishno Devi University, Katra, India<sup>e</sup> Sukkur IBA University, Sukkur, Pakistan**Article Information****Keywords:**

Language learning strategies  
 Descriptive text  
 Open area  
 Writing skill

Received 1 June 2022

Received in revised form 3 October 2022

Accepted 26 December 2022

doi: [10.33750/ijhi.v5i4.166](https://doi.org/10.33750/ijhi.v5i4.166)**Abstract**

This research aims to determine the effectiveness of language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area. Also, this research is subject to investigate the significant difference in students' achievement before and after implementing learning strategies in writing using descriptive text in an open area. The researchers applied pre-experimental research with one group pre-test and post-test design and collected the data by giving a pre-test, treatment, and post-test. The research sample was a public senior high school in Tana Toraja regency, South Sulawesi, Indonesia, consisting of thirty students. The research findings showed that the tenth-grade senior high school students had fair to poor scores in a pre-test. After giving treatment, their writing skill in descriptive text significantly increased. The research results showed that implementing language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area is effective. Also, the investigation showed a significant difference in students' achievement before and after being taught using language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area. However, the teacher's responsibility as an instructor is to ensure students understand the topic in writing, particularly when creating descriptive language. To help students comprehend writing better, the teacher should provide some basic writing instruction. Writing descriptive language in an open space helps students learn writing more quickly and easily. To measure their significance for English language education innovation, open area learning methodologies should be investigated further to enhance other abilities like reading or speaking.

© 2022 The Author(s). This is an open access article under Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) license.

**1. Introduction**

English is becoming a popular activity on a large scale. With over a billion students studying English worldwide (McKay, 2012), there are numerous reasons to switch to teaching English as a foreign language. The value of English in Indonesia is widely recognized (Coleman, 2016). As a result,

English teachers play a crucial role in ensuring that all students learn English effectively. A teacher must properly arrange learning techniques and resources for students to learn English easily (De Jong & Harper, 2005). To learn English, students must master four language skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. In this study, the researchers focused on writing abilities. Writing has been a part of the English curriculum for a long time. According to Newton and

\* Corresponding author.

Email: [julianty70@yahoo.com](mailto:julianty70@yahoo.com)

Nation (2020), writing can be usefully supplemented by training in other skills, such as listening, speaking, and reading. With this preparation, words that have been used receptively can now be used productively. Students must develop and improve their writing skills to succeed in today's world of communication.

Teaching students to understand English, especially in writing, requires a variety of factors, such as the instructors' classroom learning techniques or learning methodologies. On the other hand, many teachers have difficulty assisting students in learning English, particularly writing (Firkins et al., 2007). Teachers faced difficulties in resolving these issues. For example, English teachers at Tana Toraja's senior high school had many challenges teaching English, particularly writing. Based on preliminary research findings, the researchers identified three problem areas: First, the students struggled to express themselves in effective phrases or paragraphs. This was because the children's vocabulary was still limited (Rupley & Nichols, 2005). As a result, the students were stumped on how to start writing with the correct terminology. Second, there were many grammatical errors in the students' writing (Bruton, 2009). Some students continued to struggle with proper grammar when writing texts, resulting in unstructured texts that were difficult to continue writing. Third, the students disliked learning English in the classroom. This method simply emphasized the importance of remaining silent in class while assigning students tasks on a module without explanation, making it difficult for students to begin writing. Finally, there was no way to improve a student's originality or imagination.

There were many rules to learn when it came to writing. As a result, the teacher chose a proper method or strategy to help students understand the rules more easily during the teaching-learning process. To address these issues, English instructors thought critically about developing innovative methods for teaching writing that engaged students throughout the learning process. The open area learning method is an excellent or inventive strategy for teaching English writing. According to Ndari et al. (2019), the best setting for experimental learning was in an open area where teachers could promote learning while playing. It is important for children's healthy development and playing promotes cognitive, physical, social, and emotional well-being as a natural and engaging activity. Learning environments can be designed to provide the conditions for children to thrive and develop (Rieber, 2001). As a result, the researchers believed that using an open area for English language learning strategy as an English teaching technique was an excellent or innovative strategy for teaching outside the classroom, in the school, or in the center ground. Because the children learned directly from the school environment, this method was a lot of fun and interesting.

The open area for English language learning provided a variety of challenges and helped students develop various skills and abilities while also making the exercise fun. Students who participated in open area English language learning activities, such as how to lead and navigate, gained and developed leadership skills successfully. One of the objectives was to help students better understand the outdoors

and our surroundings and how easily they could be harmed or destroyed by littering and other forms of pollution. It also aimed to teach students how to survive in the wilderness and adapt to life outside with limited resources. Students who believed they were having fun learned vital survival, leadership, and personal skills.

The researchers chose this strategy for the following reasons: First and foremost, this method was both effective and enjoyable. Because all activities took place outside of the classroom, the open area learning strategy encouraged students to study more and made learning English interesting and enjoyable. This method was extremely beneficial for children who were learning English. It is important for making teaching, learning relevant, and encouraging (Jeffrey & Craft, 2004). Second, this technique was simple to put into action; this strategy was simple to put into action because the location was easy to find. It was only used in the school and the center ground. This method was simple and enjoyable for children who wanted to learn English. As a result, it was excellently used. When using this approach, the researchers did not have to spend much time looking for a place to study because the site was close to the classroom. Third, the method reached the research resources; by employing this strategy, the researchers might be able to avoid designing materials as much as possible because all materials were readily available in the school setting.

Based on the previous studies, the researchers decided to concentrate on implementing a language learning strategy in teaching writing skills in an open area, which was a writing alternative. For this reason, the researchers propose research questions as follows:

- Is language learning strategies in writing descriptive text effective in an open area at senior high school?
- Is there any significant difference in students' achievement before and after implementing learning strategies in writing using descriptive text in an open area?

## 2. Method

### 2.1. Research Design

To do research, the researchers might first devise a technique that is appropriate for the type of study that would be conducted. According to Creswell (2012), undertaking educational research entailed more than just participating in the primary phase of the research process. It also covered the study's planning and writing in one of two broad tracks: quantitative research or qualitative research. The researchers conducted quantitative research in this study. The following are the main features of quantitative research:

- Describing a research topic through a description of trends or a requirement to explain the relationship between variables.
- Providing a significant role for the literature by providing research questions to be answered, explaining the research problem, and generating a requirement for the study's direction (purpose statement and research questions or hypotheses).
- Formulating clear, limited, quantifiable, and observable purpose statements, research questions, and hypotheses.

An experimental research design is used in this study. According to Creswell (2012), an experiment is testing an idea (practice or technique) to see if it impacts a result or dependent variable. Thus, before administering the treatment, the writer gave a pre-test and, subsequently, a post-test of the students' writing skills in an open area. To determine the effect of utilizing an open area and students' motivation when learning English in an open area, the writer compared the students' writing ability and students' motivation before and after treatment. The following is a description of this design:

Table 1. One group pre-test post-test design

Pre-test	Treatment	Post-test
Y1	X	Y2

- Y1: Pretest. The pre-test was the test given to the students before they were treated.
- X: Treatment. For the treatment, the students were taught writing skills by implementing language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area.
- Y2: Post-test. The post-test was the test after treatment for the students, and the researchers gave a similar test to the pre-test.

## 2.2. Respondents of the Study

The participants in this research were the tenth-grade students of one of the public schools in Tana Toraja Regency, South Sulawesi, Indonesia, in the academic year 2020-2021. There were 8 (eight) classes consisting of 255 students in the school. The researchers used a random sampling technique because all subjects had a chance to be chosen. In this case, the researchers took only one class (33 students) to represent the population.

## 2.3. Research Instrument

The instrument of data collection was the method employed by the researchers to get data for the investigation. A good instrument was required to get objective data since if the researchers used an invalid instrument, the researchers obtained invalid data. The researchers used a writing test as the instrument in this study, both done before and after treatment. This study included two tests: a pre-test and a post-test. The pre-test was used to determine the students' prior knowledge, while the post-test was used to determine the students' achievement in creating descriptive text using the provided approach. The researchers administered a writing test, and students were instructed to write a descriptive text about their school. The output of the writing test was measured based on writing rubrics provided by Jacobs (1981).

## 2.4. Procedures for Collecting Data

In collecting data, the researchers used a pre-test before treatment, and the last was a post-test. The researchers collected the data by giving a test to students. The test technique was one of the data-collecting techniques in quantitative research. In collecting the data, the researchers used the following procedures:

- The researchers gave a pre-test to students.

- The researchers applied the treatment six times using by discovery learning method.
- After giving treatment, the researchers gave a post-test to the students.
- The researchers used a writing test in the pre-test about the descriptive text.
- The researchers also used a writing test as the post-test; they asked students to write a descriptive text about their school.
- The teacher analyzed and scored the data by using the following criteria.
- Scoring and classifying the students' skills the following criteria using intra-rater theory (The researchers analyzed and scored the data without involving others).

## 2.5. Techniques of Data Analysis

After collecting the data, the researchers used the result of the test to analyze the data. The researchers calculated the score before and after giving the treatment. The data was obtained through the pre-test and post-test, and the data would be compared from the mean score of the pre-test and post-test. After getting the data, it was analyzed and processed by using IBM SPSS Statistic 25.0.

Data analysis was the process of arranging data sequences, organized into a system, category, and set of the breakdown of the base. The test data were analyzed by calculating the students' improvement in pre-test and post-test. To find out the effectiveness of learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area. The researchers used some statistics and took steps as follows:

- Identified the students' mistakes in writing one by one. The researchers identified the errors related to content, form, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics in writing.
- Classified the scored answer by using a scoring rubric.
- Calculating the mean score of the students.
- The researchers measured the significant difference (t-test) between the students' pre-test and post-test to find out the students' achievement before and after being taught using learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area.

## 3. Results and Discussion

This section answers problem statements in the previous chapter and consists of findings and discussions. The finding describes results from the data collected through writing tests in pre-test and post-test, which are described in graphic, chart, or table form. Then, the discussion contains an explanation of findings that reflect the result of the data. In this discussion, the researchers use their words to explain it.

### 3.1. Results

The data which were analyzed in this research was the result of the test. Firstly, the researchers gave a pre-test. After giving treatment, the researchers gave a post-test to the students. The scores of the students were compared to prove whether there was effectiveness and significant difference between before and after being taught.

After the teaching writing descriptive text process was done, the researchers analyzed the writing data. The

description includes the mean, the percentage of improvement, the standard deviation and the t-test. The research findings show that teaching descriptive text in an open area could improve writing descriptive text in content, form, vocabulary, and grammar and also could increase writing descriptive text in a mechanic. Further interpretation of the data analysis is given below:

3.1.1. The effectiveness of language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area at a secondary school

Students' writing descriptive text using language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area had different in pre-test and post-test. In pre-test, students still less understand content, form, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanic, but after applying language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area, the students more understand content, form, vocabulary, Grammar, and mechanic. Can be seen clearly in the Table 2 and 3:

Table 2. The mean score of pre-tests

		Statistics				
		Content	Form	Vocabulary	Grammar	Mechanic
N	Valid	33	33	33	33	33
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0
	Mean	1.72	1.87	1.84	1.81	1.84

Table 3. The mean score of post-tests

		Statistics				
		Content	Form	Vocabulary	Grammar	Mechanic
N	Valid	33	33	33	33	33
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0
	Mean	2.45	2.87	2.72	2.63	2.48

Tables 2 and 3 show that students' writing descriptive text using language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area had different pre-test and post-test. The mean score of Components of writing skill (Content, Form, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanic) from students in post-test improved after teaching writing descriptive text in terms of components of writing skill by implementing language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area. The mean score of the students in pre-test of content were 1.72 and post-test which to be 2.45. The mean score of the students in pre-test of form were 1.87 and post-test which to be 2.87. The mean score of the students in pre-test of vocabulary were 1.84 and post-test which to be 2.72. The mean score of the students in pre-test of grammar were 1.81 and post-test which to be 2.63. The mean score of the students in pre-test of mechanic were 1.84 and post-test which to be 2.48.

3.1.2. The significant difference in students' achievement before and after implementing language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area

The result of data analysis of the students' writing descriptive text through language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area is tested by using T-test analysis. Comparing the result of pre-test and post-test score, the skill of post-test (after being taught) was getting higher. It means that, the treatment of using Language Learning

Strategies in Writing Descriptive Text in an Open Area in the class was successful.

The result of the data analysis of the students' writing descriptive text through language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area is tested by using T-test analysis. In this case, the researchers used t-test (test of significance) for paired sample test, that is, a test to know the significant difference between the result of students' mean scores in pre-test and post-test the researchers used t-test analysis on the level of significant ( $\alpha$ ) = 0.05. So, it indicates that the students' score of content, form, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanic between pre-test and post-test is significantly different.

3.1.2.1. The result of normality test

The normality data test is intended to determine whether the data distributed was normal or not. The normality test in this research was intended to the test in terms of content, form, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanic. The normality test in this research was using the SPSS 25.0 Software through Kolmogorov-Smirnov.

a. Content

Table 4. Tests of normality in terms of content

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Content_Pre	.305	33	.000	.768	33	.000
Content_Post	.361	33	.000	.635	33	.000

Table 4 shows that based on the output of the normality table, the significance value of the pre-test is 0.000 and the post-test is 0.000. The value is < 0.05, so it can be concluded that the value is significantly different.

b. Form

Table 5. Tests of normality in terms of form

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Form_Pre	.376	33	.000	.718	33	.000
Form_Post	.338	33	.000	.761	33	.000

Table 5 shows that based on the output of the normality table, the significance value of the pre-test is 0.000 and the post-test is 0.000. The value is < 0.05, so it can be concluded that the value is significantly different.

c. Vocabulary

Table 6: Tests of normality in terms of vocabulary

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Vocabulary_Pre	.405	33	.000	.679	33	.000
Vocabulary_Post	.263	33	.000	.783	33	.000

Table 6 shows that based on the output of the normality table, the significance value of the pre-test is 0.000 and the post-test is 0.000. The value is < 0.05, so it can be concluded that the value is significantly different.

d. Grammar

Table 7. Tests of normality in terms of grammar

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>		Shapiro-Wilk			
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Grammar_Pre	.250	33	.000	.796	33	.000
Grammar_Post	.303	33	.000	.748	33	.000

Table 7 shows that based on the normality table's output, the pre-test's significance value is 0.000, and the post-test is 0.000. The value is < 0.05, so it can be concluded that the value is significantly different.

e. Mechanic

Table 8. Tests of Normality in Terms of Mechanic

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>		Shapiro-Wilk			
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Mechanic_Pre	.276	33	.000	.797	33	.000
Mechanic_Post	.334	33	.000	.710	33	.000

Table 10. Paired samples test of content

Pair	Content_Pre-Content_Post	Paired Differences				t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower				Upper
1		-.727	.876	.152	-1.038	-.417	-4.770	32	.000

The table above shows that, based on the Paired Sample Test output table above, it is known that the value of Sig. (2-tailed) is 0.000 < 0.05. It can be concluded that the students score of content between pre-test and post-test is significantly different and surely improved. Seen from the mean is -0.727. The standard deviation is 0.875. The standard error mean is 0,152. Score t is -4.770. In comparison, the score for df is 32. Moreover, the score for significance is 0.000.

Table 12. Paired samples test of Form

Pair	Form_Pre-Form_Post	Paired Differences				T	Df	Sig (2-tailed)	
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Coonfidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower				Upper
1		-1.000	.790	.138	-1.280	-.720	-7.266	32	.000

The table above shows that, based on the Paired Sample Test output table above, it is known that the value of Sig. (2-tailed) is 0.000 < 0.05. It can be concluded that the students score of form between pre-test and Post-test is significantly different and surely improved. Seen from the mean is -1.000. The standard deviation is 0.790. Standard error mean is 0.137. Score t is -7.266. In comparison, score for df is 32. Furthermore, the score for significance is 0.000.

Table 14. Paired sample test of vocabulary

Pair	Vocabulary Pre-Vocabulary_Post	Paired Differences				t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower				Upper
1		-.879	.857	.14923	-1.183	-.575	-5.89	32	.000

Table 8 shows that based on the normality table's output, the pre-test's significance value is 0.000, and the post-test is 0.000. The value is < 0.05, so it can be concluded that the value is significantly different.

3.1.2.2. The result of t-test

Paired sample t-test is a procedure used to compare the average of two variables in one group. This means that this analysis is useful for testing one sample that gets a treatment which will then be compared to the average of the sample between before and after treatment.

a. Content

Table 9. Paired samples statistics of content

Pair	Content_Pre	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
1	Content_Post	1.727	33	.626	.109
		2.454	33	.506	.088

b. Form

Table 11. Paired samples statistics of form

Pair	Form_Pre	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
1	Form_Post	1.8788	33	.54530	.09492
		2.8788	33	.59987	.10442

c. vocabulary

Table 13. Paired samples statistics of vocabulary

Pair	Vocabulary_Pre	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
1	Vocabulary_Post	1.848	33	.507	.088
		2.727	33	.674	.117

The table above shows that, based on the Paired Sample Test output table above, it is known that the value of Sig. (2-tailed) is  $0.000 < 0.05$ . It can be concluded that the students score in Vocabulary between pre-test and Post-test is significantly different and surely improved. Seen from the mean is -0.878. The standard deviation is 0.857. The standard error mean is 0.149. Score t is -5.889. In comparison, the score for df is 32. Furthermore, the score for significance is 0.000.

Table 16. Paired samples test of Grammar

Pair	Grammar_Pre Grammar_Post	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
1		-.81818	.84611	.14729	-1.1182	-.51816	-5.555	32	.000

The table above shows that, based on the Paired Sample Test output table above, it is known that the value of Sig. (2-tailed) is  $0.000 < 0.05$ . It can be concluded that the students' score in Grammar between the pre-test and post-test is significantly different and surely improved. Seen from the mean is -0.818. The standard deviation is 0.846. The standard error mean is 0.147. Score t is -5.555. In comparison, the score for df is 32. Furthermore, the score for significance is 0.000.

Table 18. Paired sample test of mechanic

Pair	Mechanic_Pre Mechanic_Post	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
1		-.636	.962	.167	-0.978	-.295	-3.799	32	.001

The table above shows that, based on the Paired Sample Test output table above, it is known that the value of Sig. (2-tailed) is  $0.001 < 0.05$ . It can be concluded that the students score of Mechanic between pre-test and Post-test is significantly different and surely improved. Seen from the mean is -0.636. Standard deviation is 0.962. The standard error mean is 0.167. Score t is -3.799. In comparison, the score for df is 32. Moreover, the score for significance is 0.001.

### 3.2. Discussion

In this research, the students went out of the classroom to learn. Language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area did not take place away from the school and did not require a long time. Using language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area can help the teaching and learning process run well. Using this strategy, the students got real pictures of the things that would be written to create a descriptive text. The students wrote about their school by directly testing in the class's open area (outdoor). This strategy also made the students to be motivated to develop imagination, thoughts, and ideas in accordance based on the real situation faced by the students in writing descriptive text. It made the students learn and

### d. Grammar

Table 15. Paired samples statistics of Grammar

Pair	Grammar_Pre Grammar_Post	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
1		1.819	33	.769	.134
		2.636	33	.603	.105

### e. Mechanic

Table 17. Paired samples statistics of Mechanic

Pair	Mechanic_Pre Mechanic_Post	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
1		1.848	33	.834	.14513
		2.485	33	.566	.09848

become aware of the real situation. Through the language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area, the students can easily organize their ideas in writing descriptive text. The description of the students' writing descriptive text in terms of content, form, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanic deals with the result of the data explained previously in the findings and the description of the students' writing between pre-test and post-test.

#### 3.2.1. The effectiveness of language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area

##### 3.2.1.1. Students' writing descriptive text in terms of content

The mean score of students in post-test is higher than the pre-test, supports students' content skills. The students' result is significantly different before and after applying language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area.

##### a. Pre-test

Before applying language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area, the students could not make good content in writing descriptive text. The students' text in terms of content in the pre-test did not enough to evaluate, was non-substantive, and did not show knowledge of subject.



## b. Treatment

In the first meeting, the topic was a general description of descriptive text, social function, and the generic structure of the descriptive text. The students were asked to explore their school and list words about it. After that, the students were asked to make a simple descriptive text based on their writing (list of the word). Many of the students consulted the dictionaries. Most of them asked their friends and the researchers. The researchers walked around and asked whether the students had any difficulties. Next, the researchers asked the students who could not revise their composition to write their ungrammatical sentences on the whiteboard. After some students wrote their sentences, other students tried to help the students in revising the mistakes. In the session, all of the students in the class could give inputs to make well-formed sentences. Most of the students' task in terms of content was not enough to evaluate, did not show knowledge of the subject, was non-substantive, and did not evaluate. The researchers explained what content should be in the descriptive text. The content should be knowledgeable, substantive, and relevant to the assigned topic. Most of students asked the researchers to make clear about the content. The students were motivated to correct their mistakes. From the whole class activities, the teaching-learning activities were interesting. Moreover, the students learned a lot about sentence construction and descriptive text.

The topic of the meeting was language features of descriptive text, exactly simple present tense in a nominal sentence. After that, the researchers showed the pattern of nominal sentences and some examples. The researchers asked the students to explore their schools and write any objects they found. Based on the material, the students should make their descriptive text. Next, the researchers checked and explained the students' errors in making descriptive text, such as content errors. Most of the students still lack in producing good content in writing descriptive text.

The topic of the meeting was language features of descriptive text, exactly simple present tense in verbal form. After that, the researchers showed the pattern of verbal sentences and some examples. The researchers shared papers with the students and asked them to find out the verb of the descriptive text. Based on the material, the students should make their descriptive text. Afterward, the researchers asked students to point out the content in the descriptive text. Most of the students' tasks in terms of content did not make enough to be evaluated, did not show knowledge of the subject, non-substantive. The researchers explained how content should be in the descriptive text. The content should be knowledgeable, substantive, and relevant to the assigned topic. At last, the researchers and the students tried to revise the students' tasks, especially in content.

The topic was adjectives for describing appearances. The researchers gave papers about the list of adjectives describing appearances and asked the students to look at their meanings in a dictionary. Afterward, the researchers asked the students to describe their best friend, their parents, or the other person based on their own words. Next, the researchers checked the task and gave some explanations to the students. Most of the students made drafts and revised them. They exchanged their

compositions with the other students in the group, and their friends gave comments. They also compared their compositions with their friends. Then, the students were asked to analyze the content in their writing. After the students analyzed and the researchers explained more about the content, some students understood how content should be in a descriptive text.

The topic was adjectives in describing personal and physical appearances. The researchers gave papers about the list of adjectives describing personal and physical appearances and asked the students to look for their meanings in the dictionary. After that, the researchers gave a game. Next, the researchers asked the students to describe their best friend, their parents, or the other person based on their own words. Next, the researchers checked the task and gave some explanations to the students. Most of the students made drafts and revised them. They exchanged their compositions with the other students in the group, and their friends gave comments. They also compared their compositions with their friends. Some students could make good sentences in the fifth meeting, especially in content.

In the sixth meeting, the researchers repeated and reminded all the material about descriptive text briefly to all of the students. After that, the researchers asked the students about their understanding when they learned descriptive text. Next, the researchers gave the students a task to write a simple description text about *My Best Friend*. Finally, the researchers checked the task and gave an explanation to the students, especially about content, to prepare students to face the post-test. Many students consulted their writing and asked questions about the content. The researchers explained more about the content and gave some examples.

## c. Post-Test

The students' content in writing descriptive text in the post-test is better than in the pre-test. After applying the strategies, it is easy to make a detailed explanation. Development of ideas has been completely developed; their writing has been coherent enough to the topic. As explained before, the writing content must be knowledgeable, substantive, and relevant to the assigned topic. Therefore, it can be concluded that language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area could improve students' writing skills on content.

### 3.2.1.2. Students' writing descriptive text in terms of form

The mean score of students in the pre-test and post-test supports students' writing descriptive text in terms of Form. The students' mean score on the post-test was higher than Pre-test. The student's result is significantly different before and after applying language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area.

#### a. Pre-test

Before applying language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area, the students also had difficulty writing a good form in writing descriptive text. The students' text in terms of form in the pre-test did not sound fluent, the ideas were confused or disconnected, and did not enough to evaluate.

## b. Treatment

In the first meeting, the topic was a general description of descriptive text, social function, and the generic structure of the descriptive text. The students were asked to explore their school and list words about it. After that, the students were asked to make a simple descriptive text based on their writing (list of the word). Many of the students consulted the dictionaries. Most of them asked their friends and the researchers. The researchers walked around and asked whether the students had any difficulties. After that, the researchers explained the form of students' tasks. The students' tasks, especially in terms of form, did not fluent, the ideas were confused or disconnected, and did not enough to be evaluated. The researchers explained how the form should be in the descriptive text. The form should be fluent expressions; the ideas should be clear, should be well organized, and logical sequencing. The students were motivated to correct their mistakes.

The topic of the meeting was language features of descriptive text, exactly simple present tense in a nominal sentence. After that, the researchers showed the pattern of nominal sentences and some examples. The researchers asked the students to explore their schools and write any objects they found. Based on the material, the students should make their descriptive text. Next, the researchers checked and explained the students' errors in making descriptive text, such as form errors. Most of the students still lack in producing good form in writing descriptive text. After the researchers explained how the form should be in a writing task, the students were motivated to produce a descriptive text with good form.

The topic of the meeting was language features of descriptive text, exactly simple present tense in verbal form. After that, the researchers showed the pattern of verbal sentences and some examples. The researchers shared papers with the students and asked them to find out the verb of the descriptive text. Based on the material, the students should make their descriptive text. Afterward, the researchers asked students to point out the form in the descriptive text. Most of the students' tasks in terms of form did not have enough to evaluate, the ideas were confused or disconnected, there was no organization, and there was not enough to evaluate. The researchers explained what form should be in the descriptive text. The form should be fluent in expressions. The ideas should be clear, well-organized, cohesive, and have logical sequencing. At last, the researchers and the students tried to revise the students' tasks, especially in terms of form.

The topic was adjectives for describing appearances. The researchers gave papers about the list of adjectives in describing appearances and asked the students to look at their meanings in a dictionary. Afterward, the researchers asked the students to describe their best friend, their parents, or the other person based on their own words. Next, the researchers checked the task and gave some explanations to the students. Most of the students made drafts and revised them. They exchanged their compositions with the other students in the group, and their friends gave comments. They also compared their compositions with their friends. Then, the students were asked to analyze the form in their writing. After the students

analyzed and the researchers explained more about the form, some of the students understood how the form should be in a descriptive text.

The topic was adjectives in describing personal and physical appearances. The researchers gave papers about the list of adjectives describing personal and physical appearances and asked the students to look for their meanings in the dictionary. After that, the researchers gave a game. Next, the researchers asked the students to describe their best friend, their parents, or the other person based on their own words. Next, the researchers checked the task and gave some explanations to the students. Most of the students made drafts and revised them. They exchanged their compositions with the other students in the group, and their friends gave comments. They also compared their compositions with their friends. Some students could make good sentences in the fifth meeting, especially in form.

In the sixth meeting, the researchers repeated and reminded all the material about descriptive text briefly to all of the students. After that, the researchers asked the one by one the students about their understanding when they learned descriptive text. Next, the researchers gave the students a task to write a simple description text about *My Best Friend*. Finally, the researchers checked the task and explained to the students, especially about form, to prepare students to face the post-test. Many students consulted their writing and asked questions about the form. The researchers explained more about form and gave some examples.

## c. Post-test

The students' form in writing in the post-test is better than in the pre-test. After applying the strategies, they easy to make a detailed explanation. In the post-test, generally fluent expression and the ideas are clearly and supported, well organized, somewhat choppy, and loosely organized, but the main ideas stand out. Therefore, it can be concluded that language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area could improve students' writing skills on the form.

### 3.2.1.3. Students' writing descriptive text in terms of vocabulary

The mean students' scores on the pre-test and post-test provide evidence that students used appropriate vocabulary when writing descriptive text. Compared to the pre-test, the students' post-test mean score was higher. Before and after using language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area, the students' outcomes differed noticeably.

#### a. Pre-test

It was challenging for the students to have a strong vocabulary when writing descriptive text before applying language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area. In the pre-test, the vocabulary used by the students' text was limited, confusing, or obscured, and there was not enough of it to evaluate. As a result, the reader could not make sense of it.

#### b. Treatment

In the first meeting, the topic was general description about descriptive text, social function, and the generic structure of



the descriptive text. The students were asked to explore their school and list words about it. After that, the students were asked to make a simple descriptive text based on their writing (list of the word). Many of the students consulted the dictionaries. Most of them asked their friends and the researchers. The researchers walked around and asked whether the students had any difficulties. After that, the researchers checked the students' vocabulary. Most of the students still lacked in producing vocabulary. The students' vocabulary task was still an error of word, idiom, form, choice, and usage. The meaning was confused or obscured and did not enough to be evaluated. The researchers explained how vocabulary should be in the descriptive text. The vocabulary should be occasional arrows of word/idiom/ form, choice. The meaning should be obscured. The students were motivated in correcting their mistakes.

The topic of the meeting was language features of descriptive text, exactly simple present tense in a nominal sentence. After that, the researchers showed the pattern of nominal sentences and some examples. The researchers asked the students to explore their schools and wrote any objects that they found. Based on the material, the students should make their own descriptive text. Next, the researchers checked and explained the students' error in making descriptive text such as vocabulary errors. Most of the students still lack in producing good word/idiom/choice and vocabulary usage in writing descriptive text.

The topic of the meeting was language features of descriptive text, exactly simple present tense in verbal form. After that, the researchers showed the pattern of verbal sentences and some examples. The researchers shared papers with the students and asked them to find out the verb of the descriptive text. Based on the material, the students should make their descriptive text. Most of the students' task in terms of vocabulary still had little knowledge of English vocabulary, idioms, and words. The researchers explained how vocabulary should be in the descriptive text. The vocabulary should be sophisticated and effective in word, idiom, choice, and usage in a writing task. At last, the researchers and the students tried to revise the students' task, especially vocabulary.

The topic was adjectives for describing appearances. The researchers gave papers about the list of adjectives in describing appearances and asked the students to look at their meanings in the dictionary. Afterward, the researchers asked the students to describe their best friend, their parents, or the other person based on their own words. Next, the researchers checked the task and gave some explanations to the students. Most of the students made drafts and revised them. They exchanged their compositions with the other students in the group, and their friends gave comments. They also compared their compositions with their friends. Then, the students were asked to analyze the vocabulary should be in their writing. After the students analyzed and the researchers explained more about the vocabulary, some students understood how vocabulary should be in a descriptive text.

The topic was adjectives in describing personal and physical appearances. The researchers gave papers about the list of adjectives describing personal and physical

appearances and asked the students to look for their meaning in the dictionary. After that, the researchers gave a game. Next, the researchers asked the students to describe their best friend, their parents, or the other person based on their own words. Next, the researchers checked the task and gave some explanations to the students. Most of the students made drafts and revised them. They exchanged their compositions with the other students in the group, and their friends gave comments. They also compared their compositions with their friends. In the fifth meeting, some students could make a good sentence, especially in terms of vocabulary.

In the sixth meeting, the researchers repeated and reminded all the material about descriptive text briefly to all of the students. After that, the researchers asked them one by one the students about their understanding when they learned descriptive text. Next, the researchers gave the students a task to write a simple description text about *My Best Friend*. Finally, the researchers checked the task and gave an explanation to the students, especially about vocabulary to prepare students to face the post-test. Many of the students consulted their writing and asked some question about vocabulary. The researchers explained more about vocabulary and gave some examples.

#### c. Post-test

The students' vocabulary in writing in the post-test is better than pre-test. However, after using the strategies, making detailed explanations was simple. In the post-test, generally, word from appropriate mastery register, effective word/idiom choice and usage, and the students can begin to order ideas in body as well. Therefore, it can be concluded that language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area could improve the students' writing skills on vocabulary.

#### 3.2.1.4. Students' Writing Descriptive Text in Terms of Grammar

The mean score of students on the Pretest and Post-test supports students' descriptive text writing in terms of Grammar. The students' mean post-test score was higher than their pre-test score. The students' result is significantly different before and after applying language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area.

#### a. Pre-test

The students found writing descriptive text with proper grammar challenging before using language learning strategies. The students' text in terms of Grammar in pre-test is major problem in simple/complex construction, articles, meaning confused or obscured, virtually did not master of sentence construction rule, dominated by errors, and did not enough to evaluate.

#### b. Treatment

In the first meeting, the topic was general description about descriptive text, social function, and generic structure of descriptive text. The students were asked to explore their school and make a list of word about the school. After that, the students were asked to make a simple descriptive text based on their writing (list of word). Many of the students consulted the dictionaries. Most of them asked their friends

and the researchers. The researchers walked around and asked whether the students had any difficulties. Next, the researchers asked the students who could not revise their composition to write their ungrammatical sentences on the whiteboard. After some students wrote their sentences, other students tried to help the students in revising the mistakes. In the session, all of the students in the class could give inputs to make well-formed sentences.

Most of the students in terms of Grammar, did not master of sentence construction rule, they were still dominated by errors, did not communicate, and did not to be evaluated. The researchers explained how Grammar should be in the descriptive text. The Grammar should be effective, complex construction, few errors of agreement/ tense/ number/ word/ articles, and pronouns. Most of students asked the researchers to make clear about the vocabulary. The students were motivated in correcting their mistakes.

The topic of the meeting was language features of descriptive text, exactly simple present tense in nominal sentence. After that, the researchers showed the pattern of nominal sentence and some examples. The researchers asked the students to explore their school and wrote any objects that they found. Based on the material, the students should make their own descriptive text. Next, the researchers checked and explained the students' error in making descriptive text such grammatical errors. Most of the students still lack in producing good Grammar in writing descriptive text.

The topic of the meeting was language features of descriptive text, exactly simple present tense in verbal form. After that, the researchers showed the pattern of verbal sentences and some examples. The researchers shared papers with the students and asked them to find out the verb of the descriptive text. Based on the material, the students should make their descriptive text. Most of the students' tasks in terms of Grammar still did not master sentence construction rules, errors still dominated them, and they still did not have enough to be evaluated. The researchers explained how Grammar should be in descriptive text. The Grammar should be effective and complex in construction, with few errors of agreement/ tense/ number/ word/ order/ articles/ and pronouns. At last, the researchers and the students tried to revise the students' task, especially in terms of Grammar.

The topic was adjectives for describing appearances. The researchers gave papers about the list of adjectives in describing appearances and asked the students to look at their meanings in a dictionary. Afterward, the researchers asked the students to describe their best friend, their parents, or the other person based on their own words. Next, the researchers checked the task and gave some explanations to the students. Most of the students made drafts and revised them. They exchanged their compositions with the other students in the group, and their friends gave comments. They also compared their compositions with their friends. Then, the students were asked to analyze the Grammar in their writing. After the students analyzed and the researchers explained more about the grammar, some students understood how Grammar should be in a descriptive text.

The topic was adjectives in describing personal and physical appearances. The researchers gave papers about the

list of adjectives describing personal and physical appearances and asked the students to look their meaning in the dictionary. After that, the researchers gave a game. Next, the researchers asked the students to describe their best friend, their parents, or the other person based on their own words. Next, the researchers checked the task and gave some explanation to the students. Most of the students made drafts and revised them. They exchanged their compositions with the other students in the group and their friend gave comments. They also compared their compositions with their friends. In the fifth meeting, some students could make a good sentence especially in terms of Grammar.

In the sixth meeting, the researchers repeated and reminded all the material about descriptive text briefly to all of the students. After that, the researchers asked one by one the students about their understanding when they learned descriptive text. Next, the researchers gave the students a task to write a simple description text about *My Best Friend*. Finally, the researchers checked the task and gave explanation to the students, especially about Grammar to prepare students to face the post-test. Many of the students consulted their writing and asked some question about grammar. The researchers explained more about Grammar and gave some examples.

#### c. Post-test

The students' Grammar in writing in the post-test is better than pre-test. After using the strategies, it was simple for them to provide detailed explanations. In post-test, text in terms of grammar is generally a complex construction. Few errors of agreement, tense, word, order/function, articles, and pronouns. Therefore, it can be concluded that language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area could improve the students' writing skills on grammar.

#### 2.2.1.5. *Students' writing descriptive text in terms of mechanic*

The mean score of students on pre-test and post-test supports students' writing descriptive text in mechanics. The students' mean score in post-test was higher than the pre-test. The students' result is significantly different before and after applying language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area.

#### a. Pre-test

Before applying language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area, the students also had difficulty having a good mechanic in writing descriptive text. The students' text in terms of mechanics in pre-test is frequent errors in spelling punctuation, and capitalization and did not enough to evaluate.

#### b. Treatment

In the first meeting, the topic was a general description about descriptive text, social function, and the generic structure of the descriptive text. The students were asked to explore their school and make a list of word about the school. After that, the students were asked to make a simple descriptive text based on their writing (list of word). Many of the students consulted the dictionaries. Most of them asked their friends

and the researchers. The researchers walked around and asked whether the students had any difficulties. Most of the students' tasks in terms of mechanics did not master of conventions. They were dominated by spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and paragraphing errors, and they were not enough to be evaluated. The researchers explained how mechanics should be in the descriptive text. The mechanic should be a master of conventions, with few errors in spelling/ punctuation, capitalization, and paragraphing. Most of students asked the researchers to make clear the mechanic. At last, the students were motivated to correct their mistakes.

The topic of the meeting was language features of descriptive text, exactly simple present tense in a nominal sentence. After that, the researchers showed the pattern of nominal sentence and some examples. The researchers asked the students to explore their school and wrote any objects that they found. Based on the material, the students should make their own descriptive text. Next, the researchers checked and explained the students' errors in making descriptive text in terms of mechanic errors. Most of the students still lack in producing good mechanics in writing descriptive text.

The topic of the meeting was language features of descriptive text, exactly simple present tense in verbal form. After that, the researchers showed the pattern of verbal sentence and some examples. The researchers shared papers to the students and asked to find out the verb of the descriptive text. Based on the material, the students should make their own descriptive text. Most of the students' task in terms of mechanic did not master of conventions, they were still dominated by errors of spelling/ punctuation/ capitalization/ paragraphing/ handwriting illegible/ and did not enough to be evaluated. The researchers explained how mechanic should be in the descriptive text. The mechanic should be master of conventions, few errors of spelling/ punctuation/ capitalization, and paragraphing. At last, the researchers and the students tried to revise the students' task especially in terms of mechanic.

The topic was adjectives for describing appearances. The researchers gave papers about the list of adjectives in describing appearances and asked the students to look at their meaning in the dictionary. Afterward, the researchers asked the students to describe their best friend, their parents, or the other person based on their own words. Next, the researchers checked the task and gave some explanation to the students. Most of the students made drafts and revised them. They exchanged their compositions with the other students in the group and their friend gave comments. They also compared their compositions with their friends. Then, the students were asked to analyze the mechanic in their writing. After the students analyzed and the researchers explained more about the mechanic, some students understood how mechanics should be in a descriptive text.

The topic was adjectives in describing personal and physical appearances. The researchers gave papers about the list of adjectives describing personal and physical appearances and asked the students to look for their meaning in the dictionary. After that, the researchers gave a game. Next, the researchers asked the students to describe their best friend, their parents, or the other person based on their own

words. Next, the researchers checked the task and gave some explanation to the students. Most of the students made drafts and revised them. They exchanged their compositions with the other students in the group and their friends gave comments. They also compared their compositions with their friends. In the fifth meeting, some students could make a good sentence, especially in mechanics.

In the sixth meeting, the researchers repeated and reminded all the material about descriptive text briefly to all of the students. After that, the researchers asked one by one the students about their understanding when they learned descriptive text. Next, the researchers gave the students a task to write a simple description text about *My Best Friend*. Finally, the researchers checked the task and gave explanation to the students, especially about mechanic to prepare students to face the post-test. Many of the students consulted their writing and asked some question about mechanic. The researchers explained more about mechanic and gave some examples.

### c. Post-test

The students' mechanic in writing post-test is better than pre-test. After applying the strategies, they were easily to make detail explanation. In post-test, generally, text in terms of mechanics demonstrates mastery of conventions, few spelling, punctuation, and capitalization errors. Therefore, it can be concluded that language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area could improve the students' writing skill on mechanic.

By testing the effectiveness of the students' content, form, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanic in writing skill, it is concluded that language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area could improve the student's writing skill in terms of content, form, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanic. It could be showed from the students' writing test in pre-test and post-test. In the pre-test, some students struggled to write descriptive text, especially the content, form, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics. But the students' writing descriptive text in post-test, which the content, form, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanic could be understood. And then, the students were easy to generate their ideas and write them to be a good descriptive text. To sum up, based on the result of this study, which showed the students' scores were much higher after the treatment in the sample class using language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area was surely beneficial improved students' writing skill.

### 3.2.2. The significant difference students' achievement between before and after implementing language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area

From the comparison of the result of Pretest and Post-test score, the skill of Post-test (after being taught) was getting higher. It means that, the treatment of using language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area in the class was successful.

Some findings from experts that support the findings of this research were first, Albihar (2013) found that there was a significant influence for a blind child. They understood the

part of plant easily by using outdoor learning strategy, and also from Rahmayati (2015) found that using Outdoor Learning with puzzle blocks can improve the students' caring to the environment and also students can easily understand the lesson about ecosystem. Like this research, it was perceived that the learners were more interested in learning English, especially by implementing language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area. It was proved that these strategies influenced the learners' motivation to study English comfortably.

Open area allows students to understand the descriptive text because they are passionate about learning. They were inspired to learn writing because they felt fun learning atmosphere, and the students were enthusiastic about learning descriptive text. Language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area could be a complement to improve students learning, as the researchers points out, but it was important to take into account that students could respond differently to teaching and have different attitudes concerning how to be taught.

Positive attitudes towards the outdoors were also found in Fägerstam (2012) study of high school attitudes towards learning biology and mathematics outdoors compared to indoor learning. Participants in the study mentioned variation as a reason for why they liked outdoor teaching, and many also perceived it as more stimulating, fun, and relevant than their usual school environment.

From the discussion above, it can be concluded that Language Learning Strategies in Writing Descriptive Text in an Open Area can improve students' understanding about the materials given. Such findings from Albihar (2013) found that disability students can easily understand the part of plant by using outdoor learning strategy. For this case, the findings above in line with this research, the students can easily understand the materials. Language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area was a good strategy in teaching writing because it helped the students increase their imagination in writing and made the students feel enjoyable and enthusiastic in writing.

### 3.2.3. Learning strategies used by the students

In the experimental class, there were six times of treatments after doing pre-test. In the first meeting, the topic was general description about descriptive text, social function, and generic structure of the descriptive text. The students were asked to explore their school and make a list of word about the school. After that, the students were asked to make a simple descriptive text based on their writing (list of word). Many of the students consulted the dictionaries. Most of them asked their friends and the researchers. The researchers walked around and asked whether the students had any difficulties.

Next, the researchers asked the students who could not revise their composition to write their ungrammatical sentences on the whiteboard. After some students wrote their sentences, other students tried to help the students in revising the mistakes. In the session, all of the students in the class could give inputs to make well-formed sentences. At last, all of the sentences written on the board were revised. The students were motivated to correct their mistakes when the

sentences were written on the board. During the class activities, some of the students were daydreaming. The researchers sometimes used laughter, and the students positively responded to it. From the whole class activities, the teaching-learning activities were interesting. Moreover, the students learned a lot about sentence construction and descriptive text.

In the first meeting, some learning strategies were observed by the researchers. They were cognitive strategies, metacognitive strategies, affective strategies, and social strategies. The first cognitive strategy was one of the repeating strategies, revising. The second cognitive strategy was practicing naturalistically (exchanging writing with friends). Then the students also used resources, and the resources were dictionaries.

The metacognitive strategies employed by the students were sharing ideas with their friends, self-monitoring (monitoring their mistakes), and self-evaluating (comparing their compositions with their friends). The affective strategies used by the students were progressive relaxation and laughter. The social strategies used by the students were asking for corrections and cooperating with friends.

The topic of the meeting was language features of descriptive text, exactly simple present tense in a nominal sentence. After that, the researchers showed the pattern of nominal sentences and some examples. The researchers asked the students to explore their school and write any objects that they found. Based on the material, the students should make their own descriptive text.

Some of the students wrote drafts first. After writing the drafts, they revised the draft. Some of them moved to another place in order to write in a more comfortable place. Most students stopped writing and asked their friends what strategies they used to write the descriptive text. From the students' conversations, the researchers found that some students made Indonesian version first before they wrote the English sentences. They also checked the dictionaries.

From the observation, the researchers found that the students used cognitive strategies, metacognitive strategies, affective strategies, and social strategies. The cognitive strategies were repeating (revising), practicing naturalistically (exchanging writing with friends), and using resources (dictionaries and papers). The metacognitive strategies were self-monitoring and self-evaluating. The affective strategies were progressive relaxation and deep breathing, laughter, making positive statements, and discussing feelings with someone else. The social strategies were asking for corrections and cooperating with others.

The topic of the meeting was language features of descriptive text, exactly simple present tense in verbal form. After that, the researchers showed the pattern of verbal sentences and some examples. The researchers shared papers with the students and asked them to find out the verb of the descriptive text. Based on the material, the students should make their descriptive text.

Some of the students wrote drafts first. After writing the drafts, they revised the draft. Some of them moved to another place to write in a more comfortable place. Most students stopped writing and asked their friends what strategies they

used to write the descriptive text. From the students' conversation, the researchers found that some students made Indonesian version first before they wrote the English sentences. They also checked the dictionaries.

From the observation, the researchers found that the students used cognitive strategies, metacognitive strategies, affective strategies, and social strategies. The cognitive strategies were repeating (revising), practicing naturalistically (exchanging writing with friends), and using resources (dictionaries and papers). The metacognitive strategies were self-monitoring and self-evaluating. The affective strategies were progressive relaxation and deep breathing, laughter, making positive statements, and discussing feelings with someone else. The social strategies were asking for corrections and cooperating with others.

The topic was adjectives for describing appearances. The researchers gave papers about the list of adjectives in describing appearances and asked the students to look their meaning in dictionary. Afterward, the researchers asked the students to describe their best friend, their parents, or the other person based on their own words. Next, the researchers checked the task and gave some explanation to the students.

Most of the students made drafts and revised them. They exchanged their compositions with the other students in the group and their friend gave comments. They also compared their compositions with their friends. Some of the students made jokes and laughed. Some others daydreamt and sang songs. Still, they focused their attention on the task. In the researchers' opinion, the teaching-learning activities were effective. The researchers also helped the students to improve their learning strategies.

The learning strategies employed by the students were cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective, and social strategies. The cognitive strategies were repeating (revising), practicing naturalistically, and using resources (dictionaries and papers). The compensation strategy was selecting the topic. The metacognitive strategies included sharing ideas or problems, asking questions about the strategies, self-monitoring, and self-evaluating. The affective strategies were progressive relaxation, deep breathing, and laughter. The social strategies used by the students were asking for corrections and cooperating with others.

The topic was adjectives in describing personal and physical appearances. The researchers gave papers about the list of adjectives describing personal and physical appearances and asked the students to look their meaning in dictionary. After that, the researchers gave a game. Next, the researchers asked the students to describe their best friend, their parents, or the other person based on their own words. Next, the researchers checked the task and gave some explanation to the students.

Most of the students made drafts and revised them. They exchanged their compositions with the other students in the group and their friend gave comments. They also compared their compositions with their friends. Some of the students made jokes and laughed. Some others daydreamt and sang songs. Still, they focused their attention on the task. In the researchers' opinion, the teaching-learning activities were

effective. The researchers also helped the students to improve their learning strategies.

The learning strategies employed by the students were cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective, and social strategies. The cognitive strategies were repeating (revising), practicing naturalistically, and using resources (dictionaries and papers). The compensation strategy was selecting the topic. The metacognitive strategies were sharing ideas or problems and asking questions about the strategies, self-monitoring, and self-evaluating. The affective strategies were progressive relaxation, deep breathing, and laughter. The social strategies used by the students were asking for corrections and cooperating with others.

In the sixth meeting, the researchers repeated and reminded all the material about descriptive text briefly to all of the students. After that, the researchers asked them one by one the students about their understanding when they learned descriptive text. Next, the researchers gave the students a task to write a simple description text about *My Best Friend*. Finally, the researchers checked the task and gave an explanation to the students. Many of the students consulted the dictionaries, and most of them asked their friends and the researchers. The researchers walked around and asked whether the students had any difficulties.

Next, the researchers asked the students who could not revise their composition to write their ungrammatical sentences on the whiteboard. After some students wrote their sentences, other students tried to help the students in revising the mistakes. In the session, all the students in the class could give inputs to make well-formed sentences. At last, all the sentences written on the board were revised. The students were motivated to correct their mistakes when the sentences were written on the board. During the class activities, some of the students were daydreaming. The researchers sometimes used laughter, and the students positively responded to it. From the whole class activities, the teaching-learning activities were interesting. Moreover, the students learned a lot about sentence construction and descriptive text.

The learning strategies employed by the students were memory strategies, cognitive strategies, metacognitive strategies, affective strategies, and social strategies. The memory strategies were repeated and reminded all of the material briefly. The cognitive strategy was one of the repeating strategies, revising. The metacognitive strategies employed by the students were sharing ideas with their friends, self-monitoring (monitoring their mistakes), and self-evaluating (comparing their compositions with their friends). The affective strategies used by the students were progressive relaxation and laughter. The social strategies used by the students were asking for corrections and cooperating with friends. Although it was difficult to investigate what was going on in the student's heads, the class observation was useful in identifying the students' learning strategies through their behaviors in the teaching-learning activities. The researchers observed six learning strategies, and they were memory strategies, cognitive strategies, compensation strategies, metacognitive strategies, affective strategies, and social strategies.

#### 4. Conclusion

This research found that implementing language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area is effective to be implemented. There is a significant difference in students' achievement before and after being taught using language learning strategies in writing descriptive text in an open area in every term of writing components. The students were suggested to continue this activity. Due to students' enthusiasm of students in the class, it is expected students can continue to use this method if they want to learn English because it is fun and very educational.

However, the teacher as an instructor has a role in learning activities to make students understand the writing material, especially descriptive text. The teacher should give a brief material about writing to improve its understanding. It is important to make students easier to learn writing by writing descriptive text in an open area. For further research, open-area learning strategies could be studied to improve other skills, such as reading or speaking. It is very meaningful for innovation in teaching English.

#### References

- Albihar, A. P. (2013). Outdoor Study Terhadap Pemahaman Konsep Bagian Tumbuhan Beserta Fungsinya Untuk Anak Tunanetra. *Jurnal Pendidikan Khusus*, 3(3).
- Bruton, A. (2009). Designing research into the effects of grammar correction in L2 writing: Not so straightforward. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18(2), 136–140.
- Coleman, H. (2016). 4. The English Language as Naga in Indonesia. In *Why English?* (pp. 59–71). Multilingual Matters.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research. In *Educational Research*. Pearson.
- De Jong, E. J., & Harper, C. A. (2005). Preparing mainstream teachers for English-language learners: Is being a good teacher good enough? *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 32(2), 101–124.
- Fägerstam, E. (2012). *Space and Place: Perspectives on outdoor teaching and learning*. Linköping University Electronic Press.
- Firkins, A., Forey, G., & Sengupta, S. (2007). Teaching writing to low proficiency EFL students. *ELT Journal*, 61(4), 341–352.
- Jacobs, H. L. (1981). *Testing ESL Composition: A Practical Approach* (Issue v. 1). Newbury House. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=R5djQgAACAAJ>
- Jeffrey, B., & Craft, A. (2004). Teaching creatively and teaching for creativity: distinctions and relationships. *Educational Studies*, 30(1), 77–87.
- McKay, S. L. (2012). Principles of teaching English as an international language. In *Principles and practices for teaching English as an international language* (pp. 28–46). Routledge.
- Ndari, S. S., Mujtaba, I., & Ananto, M. C. (2019). Children's Outdoor Activities and Parenting Style in Children's Social Skill. *Jurnal Pendidikan Usia Dini*, 13(2), 217–231.
- Newton, J. M., & Nation, I. S. P. (2020). *Teaching ESL/EFL Listening and Speaking*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429203114>
- Rahmayati, A. (2015). Penerapan Outdoor Learning Process Berbantu Puzzle Blocks Materi Ekosistem Untuk Meningkatkan Aktivitas Belajar Dan Sikap Peduli Lingkungan. *A Thesis of UNNES Semarang*.
- Rieber, L. P. (2001). Designing learning environments that excite serious play. *Annual Meeting of the Australasian Society for Computers in Learning in Tertiary Education, Melbourne, Australia*.
- Rupley, W. H., & Nichols, W. D. (2005). Vocabulary instruction for the struggling reader. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 21(3), 239–260.