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Abstract

The World’s Best Fairy Tales is a well-known book and contains sixty nine best-loved stories over the world. However, the stories written in The World’s Best Fairy Tales contain too long and complicated sentences for Junior High School students in Indonesia especially in SMPN 1 Slawi. This problem can be solved by simplifying of The World’s Best Fairy Tales. The R&D steps are used to know the existing materials, kinds of materials needed by the students, how the simplified materials developed, the advantages of teaching and learning using the simplified materials, and the effectiveness of the simplified materials toward students’ achievement. The result was simplified materials giving positive influence to the students and able to motivate them in learning English.
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INTRODUCTION

School-Based Curriculum has been issued by the Indonesia government since 2006. This Curriculum gives a chance to the teachers to develop their own materials, methods, media and assessment. Teachers in each school must arrange and develop materials according to the standard of content (standard competence and basic competence) specified in the curriculum. The researcher found out that the teachers of Junior High School 1 Slawi faced the problems in developing narrative materials. In practice, many teachers did not develop materials for students’ need. Most teachers used the available text books and taught the students using such text books. Such books did not provide enough narrative texts. Furthermore, the researcher also found out that there are some improper narrative materials, particularly those taken from the world famous narrative texts. These were mostly taken from the internet and contained difficult words and long sentences. Some teachers lacked of teaching materials, but they still taught their students using the insufficient materials. From these problems, the researcher tried to provide the spoken narrative material of world famous narrative texts using simplified The World’s Best Fairy Tales.

In this research, the researcher used narrative texts as materials. Narrative texts are interesting materials for students. According to Anderson and Anderson (2003: 8) narrative is a piece of text which tells a story and, in doing so, entertains or informs the reader or listener. The interesting materials are important strategy to attract the students learn the materials. Narrative texts have some text types namely fantasy novels, bedtime stories (spoken), historical fiction and stories (Anderson and Anderson, ibid: 7). Furthermore, Sadler and Hayllar (2000: 14) add that fairy tales is one of narrative text types. The following table is narrative text construction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1 Narrative Text Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson and Sadler and Hayllar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) An orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) A compilation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) A sequence of events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) A resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) A coda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The narrative texts used as teaching materials were fairy tales. According to Cambridge Dictionary, fairy tales is a traditional story written for children which usually involves imaginary creatures and magic. However, there are not many world famous narrative texts in textbooks used by the teachers. The World’s Best Fairy Tales is a good source of fairy tales materials. The Worlds’ Best Fairy Tales is a well-known book and contains sixty nine best-loved stories all over the world. On the other hand, fairy tales in this book are too complex for the students of Junior High School in Indonesia, so the researcher simplified these fairy tales to make them easier to be understood.

Simplifying The World’s Best Fairy Tales is very important for Junior High School students. The researcher simplified the stories in order that to make the students can understand the content easily. Simplifying is an important technique to make complicated texts simpler and easier. Simplifying category is divided into three categories: plus category, minus category and zero category. Indriyati and Sa’jaun (2009: 19) states that the various techniques of simplifying materials can be divided into three main categories in term of quantity: Plus (+), Minus (-) or Zero (0), for example modification without changing the quantity.

Hyland (2003: 99) states that simplifying is rewriting to reduce the difficult tasks, explanations or instruction. The simplifying of the material is one of the ways to make the material simple, understandable and easier to the students. A list of simplifying technique is referred by McDonough and Shaw (1993), Cunningworth (1995) these techniques are: adding; extending and expanding, deleting; subtracting and abridging, simplifying, recording, and replacing materials. The principles of simplifying the material include reduction of the length of text, shortening the sentences, omission of qualifying clause, and non-essential detail or replacement of difficult words or structures. Hyland (2003: 92) states that simplifying a text involves altering its syntax and lexis to improve readability. So, simplifying narrative is needed to make texts readable for the students, particularly in terms of grammar and vocabulary.

The researcher hoped that the simplified The World’s Best Fairy Tales could provide the teachers with appropriate and interesting spoken narrative text teaching materials for Junior High Schools students of 1 Slawi.

METHOD

Research and Development (R&D) is the research design used by the researcher. According to Gall and Borg (2003: 569), R&D is an industry based-development model in which the findings of
research are used to design new products and procedures, which then are systematically field-tested, evaluated and refined until they meet specified criteria of effectiveness, quality, or similar standards.

Research and development's steps as cited in Gall and Borg (2003: 572) take a lot of time and cost since it used a big-scale project. However, a small-scale project or a limited scope of the material can be used. As stated by Gall and Borg (2003:572): It is best to undertake a small-scale project that involves a limited amount of origin instructional design. Also, unless you have substantial financial resources, you will need to avoid expensive instructional media, such as a film and synchronize slide-tape. Another way to scale down the project was to limit development to just a few steps of R & D cycle.

It was concluded that the R & D steps could be minimized according to our need so it did not take a lot of time and cost. Besides, Thiagarajan et al (1974) mention four stages of R&D, stage of defining, designing, developing, and disseminating. These stages were called four-D model. Stage of defining was done by the prescribing objectives and constraints of the material. In the stage of designing, the researcher established the media of the material. Stage of developing was done by revising the material through formative evaluation. In the stage of disseminating, the researcher produced the final product.

In this research, the researcher used closed questionnaire. The objective of questionnaire was to find out whether the students were interested in the product application or not. The researcher used rating scale to analyze data of the questionnaire. The form of scale referred to Cohen et al (2007: 325): 1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3=neutral (neither agree nor disagree), 4=agree and 5=strongly disagree. The second form of scale is 1= always, 2=most of the time, 3=sometimes, 4=not really, and 5=never. The researcher used the first form of scale. However, the researcher substituted the form of neutral scale with the form of fairly agree scale. After the students and teacher filled the questionnaire, the researcher calculated them. The calculating of questionnaire was also to know the effectiveness of product.

Observation checklists were also used by the researcher. The observer also helped the researcher observing the students and the teacher. The researcher and the observer focused on the teacher during the teaching and learning process. The checklist were used to record the teacher's preparation, teacher's performance in classroom, teacher's method of teaching, teacher’ personal, and teacher’s interaction to the learners. The classroom observation sheet had the classifications of scale. Scale of 4 meant excellent, scale of 3 meant above average, scale of 2 meant average, scale of 1 meant unsatisfactory, and N/A means not applicable. Observation checklists also were used to record the learner’s achievement, learner’s learning and learner’s activeness. The teachers filled the observation sheet then the researcher calculated them.

The researcher also interviewed the teacher. The questions were source of the materials, method of teaching and learning, additional sources of materials, assessment of spoken narrative texts. The interview was done by the researcher. The result of interview described qualitatively.

In the post-test, the researcher used the question-answer as the speaking assessment. The aspects of speaking were pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, fluency and content. The aspects of speaking adopted from Yulisari (2003: 106). After assessing the students, the researcher categorized the students’ score into very low, low, above average, average, and high. The very low score was 1-20, the low score was 21-40, the above average score was 41-60, the average score was 61-80 and the high score was 81-100. Those scoring level was adopted from Paul (2003:65-66). The scoring of speaking could be seen below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pronunciation is unintelligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Errors in pronunciation are frequent and interfere with understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Few errors in pronunciation but not interfering understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pronunciation is very clear and intelligible, almost no errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Grammar is almost entirely inaccurate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Some grammatical errors that occasionally interfere with understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Few errors in grammar that do not interfere with understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No major grammatical errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Vocabulary is almost entirely inaccurate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Some lexical errors that occasionally interfere with understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Few lexical errors that do not interfere with understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No lexical error</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The aspects of narrative assessment included pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, and content. Each of these aspects had maximal score of 4 so the sums of all aspects were 20. To measure the improvement of the students’ achievement, the researcher used the following formula:

\[
M_1 = \frac{\sum X_1}{N} \quad \text{and} \quad M_2 = \frac{\sum X_2}{N}
\]

Where:
- \(M_1\) = the mean score of the pre-test
- \(M_2\) = the mean score of the post-test
- \(N\) = the number of the students
- \(X_1\) = the number of pre-test scores
- \(X_2\) = the number of post-test scores

(Brown, 2005: 98)

In this case, the researcher used single-group design to calculate the t-ratio and to take the correlation between the two means. The researcher compared the pretest and posttest of single group design. There were two hypotheses in this study as follows:

Null hypothesis (Ho) : \(X_1 = X_2\), or \(\bar{X}_1 = \bar{X}_2 = 0\)

Research hypothesis (H1) : \(X_2 > X_1\) or \(X_2 > 0\) (directional)

And the level significance was 0.05

\[
t = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{S^2_1}{N_1} + \frac{S^2_2}{N_2}}} - 2r_{12}\frac{S_1}{S_2}
\]

Where:
- \(\bar{X}_1\) and \(\bar{X}_2\) are the means of the pretest and posttest
- \(S^2_1\) and \(S^2_2\) are the squares of the standard errors of the pretest and posttest
- \(r_{12}\) is the coefficient of correlation both the pretest and posttest

(Bachman, 2004: 240)

In this step, the researcher analyzed the needs of spoken narrative materials not only based on the questionnaire, interview and observation with the teachers and students but also based on the literature studies mentioning the needs of simplifying technique. The researcher interviewed teachers and students about what kinds of spoken narrative texts they wanted to. Then, from the literature studies, the researchers substituted the low-frequency words to high-frequency words and analyzing the needs from journals and previous researches on the needs of simplifying technique.

Plus category was used by the researcher. This category of simplifying texts was important to substitute the difficult words to the simple words. This category might be added different words that represent the difficult words. This category was also expanded the length, difficulty and depth of difficult and simple words.

Minus category was used by the researcher. This category of simplifying texts was mostly used by the researcher to substitute the low-frequency words to high-frequency words. This category included deletion, subtraction, and reduction technique. The deletion technique deleted some difficult low-frequency words. The subtraction technique decreased the number of low-frequency words and the reduction technique reduced the length, difficulty and depth of words.

Zero category was mostly used by the researcher. This technique of simplifying texts modified and replaced the low-frequency words. The modifying technique was the researcher making change the texts. And the replacement technique was the researcher swapping the difficult words with simple words.

There were two experts, Dr. Dwi Anggani Linggar B. M, Pd and Dr. Januarius Mujiyanto, M. Hum. The experts evaluated the instrument to validate the material. The experts reviewed the language, the appropriateness of the content, the effectiveness of the materials, and the feasibility of the materials. These reviews could be seen in the appendix. The instruments of validating were adapted from Thiagarajan et al (1974: 130-136).

The review of language was to evaluate the appropriateness of the language, the correctness and clarity of its usage. The appropriateness review was conducted to evaluate the objectives and the content whether they were already appropriate with the goals of simplifying material or not. The critical inspection by the experts gave the researcher a suggestion to improve the appropriateness of the materials.

The effectiveness review was conducted to evaluate the use of material. The reviews consisted of the statement of objective, tests, instructional content, level of language, style of presentation instructional activities, difficulty level, sequence of presentation, practice and review, feedback to the
students and teacher’s manual. The feasibility review was conducted to evaluate the simplified material whether it was usable for the students and teachers or not.

The researcher also adapted the instrument of validation from Byrd in Celce-Murcia (2001:417-418). In this section, the experts also validated the aspects of material. The aspects were content or explanations, examples, exercises, presentation. The ranks of the validation consisted of five level that were 1 unacceptable, 2 below average, 3 average, and 4 better than average, 5 outstanding quality. The experts ticked the number in the checklist that consider to the useful of materials.

Table 3 Experts Validation’s Result

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Checklist</th>
<th>First Expert</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Second Expert</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Language</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Content</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Vocabulary and structure</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Exercise</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Suitability to the curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Suitability to the teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Suitability to the teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Multimedia</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this case, the researcher used single-group design to calculate the t-rational to examine the correlation between the two means. The researcher compared the pretest and posttest of single group design. Here, there were two hypotheses as follows:

Null hypothesis (H0): \( \bar{X}_1 = \bar{X}_2 \), or \( \bar{X}_1 = \bar{X}_2 = 0 \)

Research hypothesis (H1): \( \bar{X}_2 > \bar{X}_1 \) (directional)

And the level significance \( \alpha = 0.05 \)

\[ t = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{s^2_{x_1} + s^2_{x_2} - 2r_{12}s_{x_1}s_{x_2}}} \]

Where: \( \bar{X}_1 \) and \( \bar{X}_2 \) are the means of the pretest and posttest

\( s^2_{x_1} \) and \( s^2_{x_2} \) are the squares of the standard errors of the pretest and posttest

\( r_{12} \) is the coefficient of correlation both the pretest and posttest

(Bachman, 2004: 240)

The result showed t-ratio was higher than the value required, so the researcher rejected the null hypothesis. The result showed that there was a significant difference in mean scores, indicating the real difference in speaking scores between the pretest and posttest. So, the product application was effective and successful at eight grade of Junior High School of 1 Slawi, particularly at VIII.2 class.

The researcher found that the original sentences were low-frequency words. The researcher reduced the words of “so one fine morning in the spring” and be the high-frequency words of “the next day” in the Two Frogs text.

The most important thing in simplifying texts was providing the material of spoken narrative texts that increased the text comprehensibility and the students ability to understand the simplified texts. In addition, the objectives of texts simplification were adding sentences’ connectors, repetition words or phrase, removal the subordinate clauses to reduce the sentences length and complexity and restriction of lexis to familiar words.

The criteria evaluated by the teacher and experts were: content, vocabulary and structure, exercises, suitability of the curriculum, students, and teacher, multimedia criteria, language review, appropriateness review, effectiveness of instructional material and feasibility of the material. After filling the checklist, the experts gave a comment to revise the product. The validation result was presented below:

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The researcher found that the original sentences were low-frequency words. The researcher reduced the words of “so one fine morning in the spring” and be the high-frequency words of “the next day” in the Two Frogs text.

The most important thing in simplifying texts was providing the material of spoken narrative texts that increased the text comprehensibility and the students ability to understand the simplified texts. In addition, the objectives of texts simplification were adding sentences’ connectors, repetition words or phrase, removal the subordinate clauses to reduce the sentences length and complexity and restriction of lexis to familiar words.

The criteria evaluated by the teacher and experts were: content, vocabulary and structure, exercises, suitability of the curriculum, students, and teacher, multimedia criteria, language review, appropriateness review, effectiveness of instructional material and feasibility of the material. After filling the checklist, the experts gave a comment to revise the product. The validation result was presented below:
Simplifying The World’s Best Fairy Tales for Teaching Narrative Texts in Junior High School

Tales contains many world stories. This book was as a reference to the teachers and the students.

The researcher used simplifying technique to substitute the difficult words of The World’s Best Fairy Tales simple words. Most of the simplified texts were shorter than the original texts. The technique of simplifying text substituted the low-frequency lexical terms with higher-frequency lexical terms so the students were familiar with the simplified text. So, the texts simplification was helpful and successful to help the students learn spoken narrative texts.

The use of simplified World’s Best Fairy Tales was helpful and effective to teach spoken narrative text. The success of product application was supported by the result of the validation form, classroom observation, the checklist of language review, appropriateness review, effectiveness of instructional materials and material feasibility. It was proven that the teachers could use the product easily and it motivated the students to speak English better.

The simplified World’s Best Fairy Tales was validated by the experts. The experts advised some revision to the researcher before gave validation. The expert reviewed language, appropriateness, instructional materials effectiveness, material feasibility, content and materials. The experts filled the form and gave comment to revise the product.

Texts simplification is also a good way to replace the difficult texts with easy ones. Simplifying texts helps the students understand the materials. Teachers can simplify texts to develop the teaching and learning material.

The researcher offers suggestions that simplifying technique should be conducted in other classes of others schools, and the researcher hopes, there will be many research about develop the speaking materials to improve students’ speaking.

REFERENCES


Thiagarajan, Sivasailam., Semmel, DorothyS., And Semmel, Melvyn L. 1974,
Introduction Development for Training Teachers of Exceptional Children, A Source Book, Blomington: Center of Innovation on Teaching the Handicapped. Minneapolis: Indiana University