

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF USING INTERACTIVE WRITING IN TEACHING WRITING

(1)Hidayati, (2)Fatimah

(1) Lecturer of English Department University of Muhammadiyah Mataram

(2) Student's of English Department University of Muhammadiyah Mataram

Abstract

This experiment was to evaluate the effectiveness of using interactive writing in teaching writing at the second grade students of MTs Al-Raisiyah Sekarbela in Academic year 2014/2015.66 out of 100 students participated during the treatment. This study used quasi-experiment design which comprised two groups as the experiment and the control groups. To obtain the findings, tests were administered before and after the treatment. The results showed the interactive writing strategy was effective to help students improve their writing skill.

INTRODUCTION

Writing is the most difficult subject in the school since the students have to produce a text by using English. They have to write about what they think in their mind and state it on a paper by using the correct procedure. Meyers (2005: 2) states that writing is a way produce language you do naturally when you speak. Writing is speaking to other on paper-or on a computer screen. Writing is also an action-a process of discovering and organizing your ideas, putting them on a paper and reshaping and revising them. In other words, Palmer (1994:5) states that writing is process and that the writer write is often heavily influenced by constrains of genres, then these elements have to present in learning activities.

Bordman (2002: 11) states that writing is a continue process of thinking and organizing, rethinking, and reorganizing. Writing is a powerful tool to organize overwhelming events and make them, manageable. Writing is a really form of thinking using the written word. From the definitions above writer conclude that writing is a way to produce language that comes from our think. It is to write on paper or a computer screen.

In learning English,learners often find difficulties in English writing. In observation writer did at MTs Al-Raisiyah Sekarbela,he found they were struggle to express their ideas in English writing. It was because the lack of participation of the student in the classroom, teacher-role played much higher than the students, and uninteresting teaching strategies that could not triggered students interest. In other words, the teaching and learning English writing was not interactive.

Based on the problems, the writer proposed to use interactive writing. Interactive writing provides scaffolding for young children moving from invented spelling into conventional spelling or to order students who are in need of skill-

confidence-building. It is especially appropriate for English learners because provided experience about which to write is the first step in interactive writing. While discussing experience, the students provide the language to be writing. The teacher helps them in creating complete English sentence, sounding out the words to be writing, and teaching the use of capitalization and punctuation.

Interactive writing involves a sharing of the pen between teacher and children McCarrier, Pinell, and Fountas (2000: 115). The focus of Interactive Writing is on concepts and conventions of print, the sounds in words and how the sounds connect with letters. Children actively plan and construct the text. For the most part, children also control the writing of the text. The teacher guides this process and provides appropriate pacing, assistance and instruction when needed.

Furthermore, McCarrier, Pinell, and Fountas (2000: 118) said that interactive Writing demonstrates early reading strategies and how words work. Children are given the opportunity to plan and construct text. Because students generally control the writing of the text, spelling knowledge increases, as well as the ability to construct words through connecting letters, clusters of letters, and sounds. Text created in an Interactive Writing experience can be used for independent reading in the classroom and thus provides a connection between reading and writing.

As children become more and more able to write independently, displaying knowledge of concepts of print, writing conventions, sound-letter matching, and the spelling of high frequency words, Interactive Writing may no longer be the most effective tool for increasing student literacy.

Moreover, McCarrier, Pinell, and Fountas (2000: 121) Interactive writing is a cooperative event in which teacher and children jointly compose and write text. Not only do they share the decision about what they are going to write, they also share the duties of scribe. The teacher uses the interactive writing session to model reading and writing strategies as he or she engages children in creating text. Interactive writing can be used to demonstrate concepts about print, develop strategies, and learn how words work. It provides children with opportunities to hear sounds in words and connect those sounds with corresponding letters. Students are engaged in the encoding process of writing and the decoding process of reading, all within the same piece of text. Interactive writing is a unique opportunity to help children see the relationship between reading and writing McCarrier, Pinell, and Fountas (2000: 133).

During the interactive writing process, students and the teacher talk about what they are going to write. The teacher serves as the facilitator of the discussion guiding, modeling, adding, summarizing, confirming, combining, and synthesizing the children's ideas. As the actual writing begins, many opportunities for specific teaching are available. The goal is to get the children's thoughts on paper, discussing the topic and the process of writing, dealing with the conventions of print, and working on grammar, spelling, punctuation, letter formation, phonics, and voice. As children become more proficient writers, lessons can focus on style and writing for different purposes.

The finished writing is displayed in a way that allows for continued use as a text for shared reading or independent reading. The work is not as neat as

teacher writing or commercial posters, but children are more likely to use it as a source of information because of the ownership that comes with their involvement in the writing process. The goal of interactive writing is that the skills learned will transfer to students' independent writing and support the development of reading skills as well. There is no one right way to do interactive writing. Interactive writing involves teacher choices based on observation of student needs, and uses the grade level curriculum and district and state standards. Teachers can begin with basic procedures and use interactive writing for more advanced purposes as they become more familiar with the procedures.

There were some researchers that had been conducted interactive writing in teaching writing. The first one is Azizah (2008). She studied the effectiveness of the using interactive writing technique an authentic medium teaching writing at the twelve of MA AL Ikhlas Munge. Then, Anisatun (2009) investigated the effectiveness interactive writing as technique in teaching writing. Ramadhan (2006), conducted a study about the effect of interactive writing technique to improve the students' writing ability of MTs Arrahman in West Java. The three experiement studies showed that interactive writing technique was effective in teaching writing.

Based on the phenomena above, the writer interested to investigate a research entitled "The Effectiveness of Using Interactive Writing in Teaching Writing at the Second Year Students of MTs Al-Raisyah Sekarbela in Academic Year 2014/2015".

METHOD

This study used quasi-experiment design. Two groups was given different treatments. The experiment was taught by utilizing interactive writing strategy, while the control group was taught using conventional method. 66 out of 100 students participated during the treatment. They are the second grade students of class A and class B. Class A was treated as the experimental group, while the latter as the control group. To collect the data the writer provide pre-test and post-test.

To assess student writing ability, the writer used scoring rubric. The assessment covers all the aspects of writing which are content, organization, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics. Those aspects have different weighting in the process of assessment.

After obtaining individual of both groups, the writer would calculate the mean scores of both the experimental and control groups. The standard deviation scores of two groups and testing significance of two groups.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

Findings

In analyzing the data, the writer firstly counted the deviation scores of pre-test and post-test of individual sample for each group, and then followed

computation of mean scores of the sample groups. The two mean scores are then compared by using the formula stated previously.

Data Description from Students score

In this part, the writer presented the statistical computation of obtained data, namely group A (experimental group) and group B (control group).

Table 01. The Pre-Test Score of Experimental group

No	Name of Student	Aspects					Total Score
		Content	Organiza- tion	Vocabu- lary	Language use	Mecha- nics	
1	RijalRizdian	20	18	20	20	2	80
2	FathurRahman	16	14	14	13	3	60
3	SaskiaKhataminMiskia	13	14	18	18	2	65
4	RadiatulLaili	16	14	14	13	3	60
5	EkaSafitri	16	14	14	13	3	60
6	Icham	13	14	18	18	2	65
7	Azrina	17	17	17	17	2	70
8	Maziana	20	18	20	20	2	80
9	Baihaqi	18	18	18	18	3	75
10	HalizaIswar	20	18	20	20	2	80
11	Zahrul Bayan	16	14	14	13	3	60
12	DwiPutri	16	14	14	13	3	60
13	FitrahSafira	16	14	14	13	3	60
14	FitriWulandari	13	14	18	18	2	65
15	YeftaPurwanto	16	14	14	13	3	60
16	L Iwan	20	18	20	20	2	80
17	NurhaliZa	20	18	20	20	20	98
18	Ida Nurya	17	14	14	13	3	61
19	SitiAndriani	16	17	17	17	2	69
20	FadliyaHisani	17	17	17	17	2	70
21	Ahmad yusuf	16	14	14	13	3	60
22	Al fian	18	18	18	18	3	75
23	Yadi	17	17	17	17	2	70
24	M. Zaenal	13	13	14	12	2	54
25	Wulandari	16	14	14	13	3	60
26	Irma Maulana	18	18	18	18	3	75
27	Hindala	18	18	18	18	3	75
28	Ekarahayu	13	14	18	18	2	65
29	IntanRamadhan	13	13	14	13	2	55

30	NispiAni	17	17	17	17	2	70
31	DindaAnanda	13	14	18	18	2	65
32	Qashmal	16	14	14	13	3	60
33	Azrini	17	17	17	17	2	70
Total Score							2215

Table 02. The Pre- Test Score of Control Group

No	Name of Student	Aspects					Total Score
		Content	Organiza- tion	Vocabu- lary	Language use	Mecha- nics	
1	Nurul Yakin	17	17	17	17	2	70
2	Nabila Rabani	16	14	14	13	3	60
3	IntanKomala	17	17	17	17	2	70
4	FakhriaHanim	16	14	14	13	2	59
5	Rahmawati	13	13	14	12	2	54
6	HadijatulAnisa	16	14	14	13	3	60
7	ZahratulRiani	17	17	17	17	2	70
8	Gina	16	14	14	13	3	60
9	M. Zulajaeni	13	14	18	18	3	66
10	Linda Apriani	16	14	14	13	3	60
11	JauniNisa	13	13	14	12	2	55
12	Anita putrid	13	14	18	18	3	65
13	BaiqApjaki	16	14	14	13	3	60
14	RaematuPutriani	13	14	18	18	3	65
15	RiskaWati	13	13	14	12	2	55
16	UrzanZaipani	17	17	17	17	2	70
17	Solihin	13	14	18	18	3	65
18	Supriadi	13	14	18	18	3	65
19	SyahrulRozi	17	17	17	17	2	17
20	Wahyudi	13	14	14	13	3	60
21	WahyuFirmansyah	13	14	18	18	3	65
22	Indira Pridarsini	13	14	14	13	3	60
23	Munawir	13	14	14	13	3	60
24	Silmisoraya	13	14	14	13	3	55
25	Roby Irawan	13	14	18	18	3	65
26	HilyatulAliyah	17	17	17	17	2	70
27	SudiatamaArman	13	13	14	12	2	55

28	SofiyanHidayatullah	16	14	14	13	3	60
29	SohanaRahmayani	13	13	14	12	2	55
30	M. Ramadhan	13	14	18	18	2	65
31	Ramadhan	16	14	14	13	3	60
32	NovitaRahman	17	17	17	17	2	70
33	Azmid	17	17	17	17	2	70
Total Score							2070

Table 03. The Post- Test scores of Experimental Group

No	Name of Student	Aspects					Total Score
		Content	Organiza- tion	Vocabu- lary	Language use	Mecha- nics	
1	RijalRizdian	26	22	20	18	4	90
2	FathurRahman	20	18	20	20	2	80
3	SaskiaKhataminMiskia	20	18	20	20	2	80
4	RadiatulLaili	23	22	20	18	2	85
5	EkaSafitri	23	22	20	18	2	85
6	Icham	18	18	18	18	2	75
7	Azrina	20	18	20	20	2	80
8	Maziana	23	22	20	18	2	85
9	Baihaqi	20	18	20	20	2	80
10	HalizaIswar	26	22	20	20	4	90
11	Zahrul Bayan	17	17	17	17	2	70
12	DwiPutri	20	18	20	20	2	80
13	FitrahSafira	18	18	18	18	3	75
14	FitriWulandari	18	18	18	18	3	75
15	YeftaPurwanto	23	22	20	18	2	85
16	L Iwan	26	22	20	18	4	90
17	NurhaliZa	26	22	20	18	4	90
18	Ida Nurya	23	22	20	18	2	85
19	SitiAndriani	23	22	20	18	2	85
20	FadliyaHisani	23	22	20	18	2	85
21	Ahmad yusuf	18	18	18	18	3	75
22	Al fian	26	22	20	18	4	90
23	Yadi	20	18	20	20	2	80
24	M. Zaenal	17	17	17	17	2	70
25	Wulandari	20	18	20	20	2	80
26	Irma Maulana	26	22	20	18	4	90

27	Hindala	26	22	20	18	4	90
28	Ekarahayu	20	18	20	20	2	80
29	IntanRamadhan	18	18	18	18	3	75
30	NispiAni	20	18	20	20	2	80
31	DindaAnanda	18	18	18	18	3	75
32	Qashmal	17	17	17	17	2	70
33	Azrini	23	22	20	18	2	85
Total Score							2690

Table 04. The Post-Test scores of Control group

No	Name of Student	Aspects					Total Score
		Content	Organiza- tion	Vocabu- lary	Language use	Mecha- nics	
1	Nurul Yakin	20	18	20	20	2	80
2	Nabila Rabani	17	17	17	17	2	70
3	IntanKomala	20	18	20	20	2	80
4	FakhriaHanim	17	17	17	17	2	70
5	Rahmawati	17	17	17	17	2	70
6	HadijatulAnisa	17	17	17	17	2	70
7	ZahratulRiani	20	18	20	20	2	80
8	Gina	18	18	18	18	3	75
9	M. Zulajaeni	17	17	17	17	2	70
10	Linda Apriani	18	18	18	18	3	75
11	JauniNisa	13	14	18	18	2	65
12	Anita putrid	20	18	20	20	2	80
13	BaiqApjaki	17	17	17	17	2	70
14	RaematuPutriani	17	17	17	17	2	70
15	RiskaWati	17	17	17	17	2	70
16	UrzanZaipani	13	14	18	18	2	65
17	Solihin	17	17	17	17	2	70
18	Supriadi	17	17	17	17	2	70
19	SyahrulRozi	20	18	20	20	2	80
20	Wahyudi	18	18	18	18	3	75
21	WahyuFirmansyah	17	17	17	17	2	70
22	Indira Pridarsini	17	17	17	17	2	70
23	Munawir	13	14	18	18	2	65
24	Silmisoraya	13	14	14	13	3	60
25	Roby Irawan	17	17	17	17	2	70

26	HilyatulAliyah	20	18	20	20	2	80
27	SudiatamaArman	13	14	14	13	3	60
28	SofiyahHidayatullah	17	17	17	17	2	70
29	SohanaRahmayani	13	14	18	18	2	65
30	M. Ramadhan	18	18	18	18	3	75
31	Ramadhan	14	14	14	13	2	75
32	NovitaRahman	20	18	20	20	2	80
33	Azmid	20	18	20	20	2	80
Total Score							2440

Table 05. The deviation and scores of deviation of Experimental group

No	Name	Pre-test	Post-test	Deviation (x)	X ²
1	RijalRizdian	80	90	10	100
2	FathurRahman	60	80	20	400
3	SaskiaKhataminMiskia	65	80	25	625
4	RadiatulLaili	60	85	25	625
5	EkaSafitri	60	85	25	625
6	Icham	65	75	10	100
7	Azrina	70	80	10	100
8	Maziana	80	85	5	25
9	Baihaqi	75	80	15	225
10	Halizalswar	80	90	10	100
11	Zahrul Bayan	60	70	10	100
12	DwiPutri	60	80	20	400
13	FitrahSafira	60	75	15	225
14	FitriWulandari	65	75	10	100
15	YeftaPurwanto	60	85	25	625
16	L Iwan	80	90	10	100
17	NurhaliZa	80	90	10	100
18	Ida Nurya	60	85	25	625
19	SitiAndriani	70	85	15	225
20	FadliyaHisani	70	85	15	225
21	Ahmad yusuf	60	75	15	225
22	Al fian	75	90	25	625
23	Yadi	70	80	10	100
24	M.Zaenal	55	70	25	625
25	Wulandari	60	80	20	400
26	Irma Maulana	75	90	25	625
27	Hindala	75	90	25	625
28	Ekarahayu	65	80	25	625

29	IntanRamadhan	55	75	20	400
30	NispiAni	70	80	10	100
31	DindaAnanda	65	75	10	100
32	Qashmal	60	70	10	100
33	Azrini	70	85	15	225
TOTAL		2215	2690	545	10425

Table 06. The deviation and scores of Control group

No	Name	Pre-test	Post-test	Deviation (y)	Y ²
1	Nurul Yakin	70	80	10	100
2	Nabila Rabani	60	70	10	100
3	IntanKomala	70	80	10	100
4	FakhriaHanim	60	70	10	100
5	Rahmawati	55	70	15	225
6	HadijatulAnisa	60	70	10	100
7	ZahratulRiani	70	80	10	100
8	Gina	60	75	15	225
9	M. Zulajaeni	65	70	5	25
10	Linda Apriani	60	75	15	225
11	JauniNisa	55	65	10	100
12	Anita putri	65	80	15	225
13	BaiqApjaki	60	70	10	100
14	RaematuPutriani	65	70	5	25
15	RiskaWati	55	65	10	100
16	UrzanZaipani	70	75	5	25
17	Solihin	65	70	5	25
18	Supriadi	65	70	5	25
19	SyahrulRozi	70	80	10	100
20	Wahyudi	60	75	15	225
21	WahyuFirmansyah	65	70	5	25
22	Indira Pridarsini	60	70	10	100
23	Munawir	60	65	5	25
24	Silmisoraya	55	60	5	25
25	Roby Irawan	65	70	5	25
26	HilyatulAliyah	70	80	10	100
27	SudiatamaArman	55	60	5	25
28	SofiyaniHidayatullah	60	70	10	100
29	SohanaRahmayani	55	65	10	100
30	M. Ramadhan	65	75	10	100
31	Ramadhan	60	57	15	225
32	NovitaRahman	70	80	10	100
33	Azmid	70	80	10	100
TOTAL		2070	2440	335	4375

Computation of the mean scores

After the deviation scores of the two group sample have been obtained. Than the computation of mean scores of the groups were evaluated as:

1. The mean scores of the Experimental group

$$\begin{aligned} Mx &= \frac{\sum x}{N} \\ &= \frac{545}{33} = 16.515 \end{aligned}$$

2. The mean scores of the Control group

$$\begin{aligned} Mx &= \frac{\sum y}{N} \\ &= \frac{335}{33} = 10.151 \end{aligned}$$

Since the two group are evaluated using the test then, that we can see from the mean scores was that the greater the mean score obtained by certain group, the better their achievement was or vive versa.

Computation of Standard Deviation

As stated above, the mean score of each group was obtained by dividing the sum of the deviation scores with the number of sample in the groups there were the evaluation:

- a. The standar deviation of Experimental group

$$\begin{aligned} \sum x^2 &= \sum x^2 - \frac{(x)^2}{Nx} \\ &= 10425 - \frac{(545)^2}{33} \\ &= 10425 - \frac{297025}{33} \\ &= 10425 - 9000.757 \\ &= 1424.242 \end{aligned}$$

- b. The standar deviation of control group;

$$\begin{aligned} \sum y^2 &= \sum y^2 - \frac{(y)^2}{Ny} \\ &= 4375 - \frac{(335)^2}{33} \\ &= 4375 - \frac{112225}{33} \\ &= 4375 - 3400.757 \\ &= 974.242 \end{aligned}$$

Since both of two groups are evaluated by the same test, than what we can see from the mean scores was that the greater mean scores obtained certain group, the better their achievement was or vice versa.

Computation of t-test

The process of determining whether the experimental treatment was comparing the mean scores and testing the deviation of the mean scores of the groups. Regarding this process as stated previously, the formula applied.

$$\begin{aligned} t\text{-test} &= \frac{M_x - M_y}{\sqrt{\frac{\sum x^2 + \sum y^2}{(N_x + N_y) - 2} \left[\frac{1}{N_x} + \frac{1}{N_y} \right]}} \\ t &= \frac{16.515 - 10.151}{\sqrt{\frac{1424.242 + 974.242}{(33 + 33) - 2} \left[\frac{1}{33} + \frac{1}{33} \right]}} \\ t &= \frac{6.364}{\sqrt{\frac{2398.484}{64} \left[\frac{2}{33} \right]}} \\ t &= \frac{6.364}{\sqrt{37.476 [0.06]}} \\ t &= \frac{6.364}{\sqrt{2.248}} \\ t &= \frac{6.364}{1.499} \\ t &= 4.245 \end{aligned}$$

It is found that t-test 4.241 now it is to be interpreted to find out if it is significance and the degrees of freedom used in this study are: the level of significance 0,05% (95%). While the degrees of freedom (df) that is $NX + NY - 2 = 33 + 33 - 2 = 64$.

Discussion

As the degrees of freedom and level of significance have been pointed out, the coefficient (to) was directly checked consulted with the table of t distribution. Based on the table, the critical value of "t" is 4.245 with the level of significant 95% is 2,000 and t test = 4.245 the t-table was 2,000 it showed that the result of t-test was higher than t-table. It can be concluded that the alternative hypothesis (Ha) was accepted and null hypothesis (Ho) was rejected. So that the treatment was significant to develop students' writing and good effect upon the writing ability of the students.

Based on the statistical analysis on the research finding, it could be concluded that interactive writing method was effective in improving students writing. The interactive writing strategy at the second year students of MTs Al-Raisyah sekarbela in academic year 2014/2015 was effective and proved by significance difference on the scores of Pre-test and Post-test.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This study concludes that the use of interactive writing strategy is effective in teaching writing. There was significant difference between student score of the experiment and control groups. The experiment had higher score than the control. The data score indicated that t-test was higher than t-table so that the alternative hypothesis (ha) of the research was accepted, and the null hypothesis was rejected.

According to the positive result gain from the research, the implementation of interactive writing in this research could provide great impact for improvements of students' writing ability. the use of interactive writing in this research are highly recommended to be applied in teaching of writing.

REFERENCES

- Arikunto, (2010). *Procedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Jakarta. PT Rineka Cipta
- Brown, H.D, (2001). *Teaching by principles An interactive Approach to language pedagogy (2nd Eds)*. New York: Addition Wesley Longman, Inc
- Byrne, D, (1989). *Teaching writing skills Longman Handbook Longman for language Teacher*. Essex: Longman group
- Depdiknas. (2004). *Competence based curriculum of English subject for SLTP/SMP*. Puskur – Peneliti and andepdiknas : Jakarta
- Desi Ratna Wati (2008) the research entitled “the implementation of interactive writing in teaching writing: an experimental research at the first grade students of SMPN 7 Dompu in academic year 2007/2008.
- Harbeg, Y. Et al (2008). *Development of students in writing in Biochemistry Using calibrate peer review peer review*. Journal of scholarship of teaching and learning. Volume 2 no. 1 pp29-24.
- Hawthome, S. (2000). *Enganging reluctant writers in secondary school English; developing motivation to write*. Available at <http://english.unitechnology.ac.nz/resources/enganging/developing.html>.
- Heaton, J.B. *Composition Through Pictures*. London: Longman 1996.
- Hirose, K. (2000). *Cooperative learning in English instruction trough pee feedback*. Available at [http:// researchfunded](http://researchfunded) by a grant-in-aid for specific research.
- Hornby, A.S. *Oxford Advance learner's Dictionary*. Oxford University Press
- Hyland, K. (2000). *Second language writing*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jack C. Richards and Willy A. Renadya. (2002). *Methology in language teaching : An Anthology of current practice*. New York. Cambridge university Press, p.303
- M. Ramadhan (2006), the research entitled “The effect of interactive writing technique to improve the students' writing ability at the first class of MTs Arrahman Jawa Timur in academic year 2005/2006.
- Mu, C. Carrington, S. (2000). *Investigation of three Chinese students' English writing sratfgies*. available at <http://test-ej.org/ejB41/al.html>

- Mu,C.(2003).A taxonomy of ESL writing strategies. Available on http://conference.nie.edu.sg/paper/confertedpdf/ab_0053.pdf.
- Myles, J. (2003). Second language and research: the writing process and error analysis in student texts. Available at <http://esl-ej.org/ej22/al.htm>.
- Mukhtar,K. (2004).*Improving the second year students' ability in writing narrative paragraph by using picture series at MTS.AIKhaeratKalukubula central Sulawesi*.Unpublished thesis. Malang:Post graduate Program.State University of Malang.
- Nunan, D. 2003. *Practical English language Teaching*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Nurhadi, (2002).*Contextual approach (Contextual teaching learning(CTL)*.Jakarta.Department Pendidikan Nasional.
- Pinnell, G&McCarrier, A (2000). Interactive writing a transition tool for assisting children in learning to read and write. In E. Hiebert, B. Taylor. N (Eds.), *Getting reading right from the start*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Raimes.A. (1983).*Technique in teaching writing*.New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ramelan, Prof. Dr. MA. 1992. *Introduction to Linguistic Analysis*, Semarang; IKIP Semarang Press.
- SitiWatiAzizah (2008) entitled, "The effectiveness of the using of interactive writing technique an authentic medium teaching writing at the twelve of MA AL Ikhlas Munge in academic year 2007/2008.