

CHAPTER IV

RESULT OF THE STUDY

This chapter discussed the data which had been collected from the research in the field of study. this case consisted of description of the data, normality and homogeneity test, testing hypothesis using manual calculation and testing hypothesis using SPSS 17.0 program, interpretation and discussion.

A. Description of the Data

1. The Result of Pre-Test Score of the Experiment and Control Group

The Pre-Test was conducted to the first control class in VIII A room on march 3th, 2015, at 10.10-11.30 am. Then the experiment class was given pretest in same class on March 4th, 2015, at 09.30-10.50 am. The Pre-test scores of the classes were presented in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 the Pre-Test Score of Control Group and Experiment Group

No.	Subject	Pre-Test Score			
		Control	Interpretation	Experiment	Interpretation
1	E1	56	Poor	50	Poor
2	E2	56	Poor	54	Poor
3	E3	53	Poor	54	Poor
4	E4	50	Poor	48	Very Poor
5	E5	44	Very Poor	44	Very Poor
6	E6	58	Poor	50	Poor
7	E7	46	Very Poor	55	Poor
8	E8	49	Very Poor	47	Very Poor
9	E9	63	Enough	59	Poor
10	E10	48	Very Poor	60	Enough
11	E11	46	Very Poor	53	Poor
12	E12	50	Poor	56	Poor

13	E13	62	Enough	59	Poor
14	E14	51	Poor	54	Poor
15	E15	48	Very Poor	49	Very Poor
16	E16	45	Very Poor	44	Very Poor
17	E17	45	Very Poor	47	Very Poor
18	E18	61	Enough	47	Very Poor
19	E19	49	Very Poor	48	Very Poor
20	E20	50	Poor	56	Poor
21	E21	75	Good	77	Good
22	E22	57	Poor	56	Poor
23	E23	47	Very Poor	54	Poor
24	E24	54	Poor	57	Poor
25	E25	55	Poor	57	Poor
26	E26	57	Poor	58	Poor
27	E27	60	Enough	62	Enough
28	E28	53	Poor	49	Very Poor
29	E29	57	Poor	52	Poor
30	E30	60	Enough	61	Enough
SUM		1589	-	1637	-
Lowest Score		44	-	44	-
Higest Score		75	-	77	-
Mean		52.966	-	54.233	-

Based on the result of research in class VIII A as control group and experiment group before being taught by outline technique in writing descriptive text, the highest pre- test score of student control class was 75 and the lowest score of control class was 44 with sum of the data was 1589 mean was 52.966. In contrary, the highest score of experiment class was 77 and the lowest score of the experiment class was 44 with sum of the data was 1637 and the mean was 54.233. It meant that the experimental and control group have the same level in writing skill before getting the treatment.

a. Description Data of Pretest Score of Control Group

Based on the data above, it was known the highest score was 75 and the lowest score was 44. To determine the range of score, the class interval, and interval of temporary, the writer calculated using formula as follows:

$$\text{The Highest Score (H)} = 75$$

$$\text{The Lowest Score (L)} = 44$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{The Range of Score (R)} &= H - L + 1 \\ &= 75 - 44 + 1 \\ &= 31 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{The Class Interval (K)} &= 1 + (3.3) \times \text{Log } n \\ &= 1 + (3.3) \times \text{Log } 30 \\ &= 1 + 4.874 \\ &= 5.874 \\ &= 6 \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Interval of Temporary (I)} = \frac{R}{K} = \frac{31}{5} = 5.1 = 5$$

So, the range of score was 31, the class interval was 6, and interval of temporary was 5. Then, it was presented using frequency distribution in the following table:

Table 4.2, Table Frequency Distribution of the Pretest Score Control Group

Class (K)	Interval (I)	Frequency (F)	Mid Point (x)	The Limitation of each group	Frequency Relative (%)	Frequency Cumulative (%)
1	73-78	1	75.5	72.5-78.5	3.333	100
2	68-72	1	70	67.5-72.5	3.333	96.667
3	62-67	2	64.5	61.5-67.5	6.666	93.334
4	56-61	8	58.5	55.5-61.5	26.666	73.334
5	50-55	9	52.5	49.5-55.5	30	70
6	44-49	9	46.5	43.5-49.5	30	70
		$\Sigma F=30$			$\Sigma P = 100$	

Based on tabel above, it can be seen about the students' predicate in pretest score. There were ninth students who got 44-49. There were ninestudents who got50-55 score. There were eight students who got 56-61 score. There were two students who got 62-67 score. There was one student who got 68-72 score. There was one student who got 73-78 score.

The result of the scores and percentage of students' pre-test score as follow:

Table 4.3 The Distribution of Frequency And Percentage Pre-Test Score of Control Group

No	Interval Scale	Qualification	Interpretation	F	%
1	80-100	A	Very Good	-	-
2	70-<80	B	Good	1	3.33%
3	60-<70	C	Enough	5	16.66
4	50-<60	D	Poor	14	46.66%
5	0-<50	E	Very Poor	10	33.33
				30	100%

The next step, the writer tabulated the scores into the table for the calculation of mean, standard deviation, and standard error as follows:

Table 4.4, Table for Calculating Mean, Median, Modus, Standard Deviation. and Dstandard Error of Pretest Score of Control Group

Class (K)	Interval (I)	Frequency	Mid	F.X	FX ²	Fka	Fkb
		(F)	Point (x)				
1	73-78	1	75.5	75.5	5700.25	1	30
2	68-72	1	70	70	4900	2	29
3	62-67	2	64.5	129	16641	4	28
4	56-61	8	58.5	468	219024	12	26
5	50-55	9	52.5	472.5	223256	21	18
6	44-49	9	46.5	418.5	175142	30	9
		$\Sigma F=30$		$\Sigma F.X=1633.5$	$\Sigma FX^2=644664$		

1) Calculating Mean

$$M_x = \frac{\Sigma FX_i}{n} = \frac{1633.5}{30} = 54.235$$

2) Median

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Mdn} &= \ell + \frac{\frac{1}{2}N - f_{kb}}{f_i} X_i \\ &= 49.5 + \frac{\frac{1}{2}30 - 9}{8} X_6 \\ &= 49.5 + \frac{14.5}{8} X_6 \\ &= 60.375 \end{aligned}$$

3) Modus

$$\begin{aligned} Mo &= u + \left(\frac{fa}{fa+fb} \right) x i \\ &= 49.5 + \left(\frac{1}{1+9} \right) x 6 \\ &= 49.5 + 0.6 \\ &= 50.1 \end{aligned}$$

4) Standard Deviation

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \sqrt{\frac{n \cdot \sum FX_i^2 - (\sum FX_i)^2}{n(n-1)}} \\ S &= \sqrt{\frac{30.644664 - (1633.5)^2}{30(30-1)}} \\ S &= 6.077 \end{aligned}$$

5) Standard Error

$$SE_{md} = \frac{S}{\sqrt{N-1}} = \frac{6.077}{\sqrt{30-1}} = \frac{6.077}{5.385} = 1.109$$

After Calculating, it was found that the standard deviation and the standard error of pretest score were 6.077 and 1.109

b. Description Data of Pretest Score of Experiment Group

Based on the data pretest score of control group, it was known the highest score was 77 and the lowest score was 44. To determine the range of score, the class interval, and interval of temporary, the writer calculated using formula as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{The Highest Score (H)} &= 77 \\ \text{The Lowest Score (L)} &= 44 \\ \text{The Range of Score (R)} &= H - L + 1 \end{aligned}$$

$$= 77 - 44 + 1$$

$$= 34$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{The Class Interval (K)} &= 1 + (3.3) \times \text{Log } n \\ &= 1 + (3.3) \times \text{Log } 30 \\ &= 1 + 4.874 \\ &= 5.874 = 6 \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Interval of Temporary (I)} = \frac{R}{K} = \frac{34}{6} = 5.666 = 6$$

So, the range of score was 34, the class interval was 6, and interval of temporary was 6. Then, it was presented using frequency distribution in the following table:

Table 4.5, Table Frequency Distribution of the Pretest Score of Experiment Group

Class (K)	Interval (I)	Frequency (F)	Mid Point (x)	The Limitation of each group	Frequency Relative (%)	Frequency Cumulative (%)
1	73-78	1	75.5	72.5-78.5	3.333	100
2	68-72	1	70	67.5-72.5	3.333	96.667
3	62-67	1	64.5	61.5-67.5	3.333	93.334
4	56-61	9	58.5	55.5-61.5	30	63.334
5	50-55	12	52.5	49.5-55.5	40	23.334
6	44-49	6	46.5	43.5-49.5	20	3.334
		$\Sigma F = 30$			$\Sigma P = 100$	

Based on tabel above, it can be seen about the students' predicate in pretest score. There were six students who got 44-49. There were twelve students who got 50-55 score. There were nine students who got 56-61 score. There was one

student who got 62-67 score. There was one student who got 68-72 score. There was one student who got 73-78 score.

The result of the scores and percentage of students' pre-test score as follow:

Table 4.6, The Distribution of Frequency and Percentage Pre-Test Score of Experiment Group

No	Interval Scale	Qualification	Interpretation	F	%
1	80-100	A	Very Good	-	-
2	70-<80	B	Good	1	3.33%
3	60-<70	C	Enough	3	10%
4	50-<60	D	Poor	17	56.66%
5	0-<50	E	Very Poor	9	30%
				30	100%

The next step, the writer tabulated the scores into the table for the calculation of mean, standard deviation, and standard error as follows:

Table 4.7, Table for Calculating Mean, Median, Modus, Standard Deviation. and Dstandard Error of Pretest Score of Experiment Group.

Class (K)	Interval (I)	Frequency	Mid	F.X	FX ²	Fka	Fkb
		(F)	Point (x)				
1	73-78	1	75.5	75.5	5700.25	1	30
2	68-72	1	70	70	4900	2	29
3	62-67	1	64.5	64.5	4160.25	3	28
4	56-61	9	58.5	526.5	277202.3	12	27
5	50-55	12	52.5	630	396900	24	18
6	44-49	6	46.5	279	77841	30	6
		∑F=30		∑1645.5	∑766703.8		

1) Calculating Mean

$$M_x = \frac{\sum FX_i}{n} = \frac{1645.5}{30} = 54.85$$

2) Median

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Mdn} &= \ell + \frac{\frac{1}{2}N - f_{kb}}{f_i} X_i \\
 &= 49.5 + \frac{\frac{1}{2}30 - 12}{6} X_6 \\
 &= 49.5 + 2.5 \\
 &= 51.5
 \end{aligned}$$

3) Modus

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Mo} &= u + \left(\frac{f_a}{f_a + f_b} \right) x_i \\
 &= 49.5 + \left(\frac{6}{6+3} \right) x_6 \\
 &= 49.5 + 4.02 \\
 &= 53.52
 \end{aligned}$$

4) Standard Deviation

$$\begin{aligned}
 S &= \sqrt{\frac{n \cdot \sum F X_i^2 - (\sum F X_i)^2}{n(n-1)}} \\
 S &= \sqrt{\frac{30766703.8 - (1645.5)^2}{30(30-1)}} \\
 S &= 6.641
 \end{aligned}$$

5) Standard Error

$$SE_{md} = \frac{s}{\sqrt{N-1}} = \frac{6.641}{\sqrt{30-1}} = \frac{6.641}{5.385} = 1.212$$

After Calculating, it was found that the standard deviation and the standard error of pretest score were 6.641 and 1.212

2. Result of Post-Test of Control and Experiment Class

The test of Post- Test score at the control class had been conducted on March, 24th 2015 at time 10.10-11.30 am in class VIII A with the number of student was 30 students. Then the experiment class had been conducted on March, 25th 2015 at time 09.30-10.50 am in the same class VIII A with the number of student was 30 students. The Post-test scores of both of class were presented in 4.8:

Table 4.8 the Post-test Score of Students Writing Ability of Control and Experiment Group

No.	Subject	Post-Test Score			
		Control	Interpretation	Experiment	Interpretation
1	E1	55	Poor	71	Good
2	E2	54	Poor	76	Good
3	E3	60	Enough	67	Enough
4	E4	54	Poor	69	Enough
5	E5	46	Very Poor	46	Very Poor
6	E6	63	Enough	73	Good
7	E7	64	Enough	76	Good
8	E8	62	Enough	65	Enough
9	E9	67	Enough	75	Good
10	E10	48	Very Poor	61	Enough
11	E11	61	Enough	64	Enough
12	E12	51	Poor	78	Good
13	E13	50	Poor	73	Good
14	E14	61	Enough	82	Very Good
15	E15	60	Enough	60	Enough
16	E16	47	Very Poor	82	Very Good

17	E17	63	Enough	74	Good
18	E18	50	Poor	60	Enough
19	E19	50	Poor	66	Enough
20	E20	65	Enough	71	Good
21	E21	55	Poor	79	Good
22	E22	62	Enough	72	Good
23	E23	65	Enough	67	Enough
24	E24	61	Enough	66	Enough
25	E25	68	Enough	78	Good
26	E26	49	Very Poor	66	Enough
27	E27	78	Good	83	Very Good
28	E28	60	Enough	76	Good
29	E29	56	Poor	78	Good
30	E30	63	Enough	77	Good
SUM		1804	-	2126	-
Lowest Score		46	-	46	-
Higest Score		78	-	83	-
Mean		60.133	-	70.866	-

To find Lowest Score, Highest Score, Mean, and the Standard Deviation, researcher used manual calculation and SPSS 17.0.

Based on the result of research in control group which taught by freewriting technique, the highest post-test score of students of control group was 78 and the lowest score was 46 with sum was 1804, and the mean was 60.133. Where, the result of experiment group after being taught by outline technique in writing descriptive text. The highest score of students of experiment class was 83, and the lowest score was 46, with sum was 2126, and the mean was 70.866.

a. Description Data of Post-test Score of Experimental Group

Based on the data Post-test score of experimental group, it was known the highest score was 83 and the lowest score was 46. To determine the range of score, the class interval, and interval of temporary, the writer calculated using formula as follows:

$$\text{The Highest Score (H)} = 83$$

$$\text{The Lowest Score (L)} = 44$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{The Range of Score (R)} &= H - L + 1 \\ &= 83 - 46 + 1 \\ &= 38 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{The Class Interval (K)} &= 1 + (3.3) \times \text{Log } n \\ &= 1 + (3.3) \times \text{Log } 30 \\ &= 1 + 4.874 \\ &= 5.874 \\ &= 6 \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Interval of Temporary (I)} = \frac{R}{K} = \frac{38}{6} = 6.3 = 6$$

So, the range of score was 38, the class interval was 6, and interval of temporary was 6. Then, it was presented using frequency distribution in the following table:

Table 4.9, Table Frequency Distribution of the Post-test Score of Experiment Group

Class (K)	Interval (I)	Frequency (F)	Mid Point (x)	The Limitation of each group	Frequency Relative (%)	Frequency Cumulative (%)
1	78-83	6	80.5	77.5-83.5	20	100
2	72-77	10	74.5	71.5-77.5	33.333	66.67
3	65-71	9	68	64.5-70.5	30	70
4	58-64	4	61	57.5-63.5	13.333	86.667
5	52-57	0	54.5	51.5-57.5	0	100
6	46-51	1	48.5	45.5-51.5	3.333	96.666
		$\Sigma F=30$			$\Sigma P = 100$	

Based on tabel above, it can be seen about the students' predicate in pretest score. There was one student who got 46-51. There was no student who got 52-57 score. There were four students who got 58-64 score. There were nine students who got 65-71 score. There were ten students who got 72-77 score. There were six students who got 78-83 score.

The result of the scores and percentage of students' post-test score as follow:

Table 4.10, The Distribution of Frequency and Percentage Post-Test Score of Control Group

No	Interval Scale	Qualification	Interpretation	F	%
1	80-100	A	Very Good	-	-
2	70-<80	B	Good	1	3.33%
3	60-<70	C	Enough	16	53.33%

4	50-<60	D	Poor	9	30%
5	0-<50	E	Very Poor	4	13.33%
				30	100%

The next step, the writer tabulated the scores into the table for the calculation of mean, standard deviation, and standard error as follows:

Table 4.11, Table for Calculating Mean, Median, Modus, Standard Deviation and Standard Error of Post-test Score of Experiment Group

Class (K)	Interval (I)	Frequency	Mid	F.X	FX ²	Fka	Fkb
		(F)	Point (x)				
1	78-83	6	80.5	483	233289	6	30
2	72-77	10	74.5	745	555025	16	24
3	65-71	9	68	612	374544	25	14
4	58-64	4	61	244	59536	29	5
5	52-57	0	54.5	0	0	29	1
6	46-51	1	48.5	48.5	2352.25	30	1
		∑F=30		∑FX=2132.5	∑FX ² =1224746		

1) Calculating Mean

$$M_x = \frac{\sum F X_i}{n} = \frac{2132.5}{30} = 70.866$$

2) Median

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Mdn} &= \ell + \frac{\frac{1}{2}N - f_{kb}}{f_i} X_i \\ &= 71.5 + \frac{\frac{1}{2}30 - 10}{9} X 6 \\ &= 71.5 + 0.37 \\ &= 71.87 \end{aligned}$$

3) Modus

$$\begin{aligned}
 Mo &= u + \left(\frac{fa}{fa+fb} \right) x i \\
 &= 71.5 + \left(\frac{1}{1+4} \right) x 6 \\
 &= 71.5 + 1.2 \\
 &= 72.7
 \end{aligned}$$

4) Standard Deviation

$$\begin{aligned}
 S &= \sqrt{\frac{n \cdot \sum FX_i^2 - (\sum FX_i)^2}{n(n-1)}} \\
 S &= \sqrt{\frac{30.1224746 - (2132.5)^2}{30(30-1)}} \\
 S &= 8.114
 \end{aligned}$$

5) Standard Error

$$SE_{md} = \frac{S}{\sqrt{N-1}} = \frac{8.112}{\sqrt{30-1}} = \frac{8.114}{5.385} = 1.481$$

After Calculating, it was found that the standard deviation and the standard error of pretest score were 8.114 and 1.481.

b. Description Data of Post-test Score of Control Group

Based on the data Post-test score of control group, it was known the highest score was 78 and the lowest score was 46 To determine the range of score, the class interval, and interval of temporary, the writer calculated using formula as follows:

$$\text{The Highest Score (H)} = 78$$

$$\text{The Lowest Score (L)} = 46$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{The Range of Score (R)} &= H - L + 1 \\ &= 78 - 46 + 1 \\ &= 33 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{The Class Interval (K)} &= 1 + (3.3) \times \text{Log } n \\ &= 1 + (3.3) \times \text{Log } 30 \\ &= 1 + 4.874 \\ &= 5.874 \\ &= 6 \end{aligned}$$

So, the range of score was 33, the class interval was 6, and interval of temporary was 6. Then, it was presented using frequency distribution in the following table:

Table 4.12, Table Frequency Distribution of the Post-test Score of Control Group

Class (K)	Interval (I)	Frequency (F)	Mid Point (x)	The Limitation of each group	Frequency Relative (%)	Frequency Cumulative (%)
1	77-82	1	79.5	76.5-82.5	3.333	100
2	71-76	0	73.5	71.5-76.5	0	96.67
3	65-70	7	67.5	64.5-70.5	23.333	100
4	58-64	13	61	57.5-64.5	43.333	76.667

1	77-82	1	79.5	79.5	6320.25	1	30
2	71-76	0	73.5	0	0	1	29
3	65-70	7	67.5	472.5	223256.3	8	29
4	58-64	13	61	793	628849	21	22
5	52-57	3	54.5	163.5	26732.25	24	9
6	46-51	6	48.5	291	84681	30	6
		$\Sigma F=30$		$\Sigma FX=$ 1799.5	$\Sigma FX^2=$ 969838.8		

1) Calculating Mean

$$M_x = \frac{\Sigma FX_i}{n} = \frac{1799.5}{30} = 60.133$$

2) Median

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Mdn} &= \ell + \frac{\frac{1}{2}N - f_{kb}}{f_i} X_i \\ &= 57.5 + \frac{\frac{1}{2}30 - 13}{3} X_6 \\ &= 57.5 + 4 \\ &= 61.5 \end{aligned}$$

3) Modus

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Mo} &= u + \left(\frac{f_a}{f_a + f_b} \right) x_i \\ &= 57.5 + \left(\frac{10}{10 + 6} \right) x_6 \\ &= 57.5 + 3.75 \\ &= 61.25 \end{aligned}$$

4) Standard Deviation

$$S = \sqrt{\frac{n \cdot \Sigma FX_i^2 - (\Sigma FX_i)^2}{n(n-1)}}$$

$$S = \sqrt{\frac{30.969838.8 - (1799.5)^2}{30(30-1)}}$$

$$S = 7.281$$

5) Standard Error

$$SE_{md} = \frac{S}{\sqrt{N-1}} = \frac{7.275}{\sqrt{30-1}} = \frac{7.275}{5.385} = 1.329$$

After Calculating, it was found that the standard deviation and the standard error of posttest score were 7.281 and 1.329.

3. Comparison Result of Pre-Test and Post- Test Score of Experiment Group

The comparison between students' pre-test and post-test after doing the experiment can be seen in the following Table 4.3.

Table 4.15, the Comparison Result of Pre-Test and Post- Test Score of Experiment Group

No.	Subject	Score				Improvement
		Pre-test	Interpretation	Post-test	Interpretation	
1	E1	50	Poor	71	Good	21
2	E2	54	Poor	76	Good	22
3	E3	54	Poor	67	Enough	12
4	E4	48	Very Poor	69	Enough	21
5	E5	44	Very Poor	46	Very Poor	2
6	E6	50	Poor	73	Good	23
7	E7	55	Poor	76	Good	21
8	E8	47	Very Poor	65	Enough	18
9	E9	59	Poor	75	Good	16
10	E10	60	Enough	61	Enough	1
11	E11	53	Poor	64	Enough	11
12	E12	56	Poor	78	Good	22
13	E13	56	Poor	73	Good	17
14	E14	54	Poor	82	Very Good	28

15	E15	52	Very Poor	60	Enough	8
16	E16	44	Very Poor	82	Very Good	38
17	E17	55	Very Poor	74	Good	19
18	E18	47	Very Poor	60	Enough	13
19	E19	48	Very Poor	66	Enough	18
20	E20	56	Poor	71	Good	15
21	E21	77	Good	79	Good	2
22	E22	56	Poor	72	Good	16
23	E23	54	Poor	67	Enough	13
24	E24	57	Poor	66	Enough	9
25	E25	57	Poor	78	Good	21
26	E26	58	Poor	66	Enough	8
27	E27	62	Enough	83	Very Good	21
28	E28	49	Very Poor	76	Good	27
29	E29	52	Poor	78	Good	26
30	E30	61	Enough	77	Good	16
SUM		1637	-	2126	-	-
Lowest Score		44	-	46	-	-
Highest Score		77	-	83	-	-
Mean		54.233	-	70.866	-	-
Standard Deviation		6.641	-	8.114	-	-

Based on the data above, mean of pre-test were 54.233 in pretest to 70.866 in post-test. It could be concluded that the students writing ability of experiment class was increased from pre-test to post-test.

B. Testing Normality and Homogeneity

1. Normality Test

- a. Testing normality of pre-test experimental and control group

Table 4.16, Testing Normality of Pre-Test Experimental and Control Group

		Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
writingscore	Experimentgroup	.136	30	.161	.908	30	.013
	Controlgroup	.121	30	.200 [*]	.965	30	.403

The table showed the result of test normality calculation using SPSS 17.0 program. To know the normality of data, the formula could be seen as follows:

If the number of sample. > 50 = Kolmogorov-Smirnov

If the number of sample. < 50 = Shapiro-Wilk

Based on the number of data the writer was $60 > 50$, so to analyzed normality data was used Kolmogorov-Smirnov. The next step, the writer analyzed normality of data used formula as follows:

If Significance > 0.05 = data is normal distribution

If Significance < 0.05 = data is not normal distribution

Based on data above, significant data of experiment and control group used Kolmogorov-Smirnov was $0.161 > 0.05$ and $0.200 > 0.05$. It could be concluded that the data was in normal distribution.

b. Testing normality of pre-test experimental and control group

Table 4.17, Testing Normality of Post-Test Experimental and Control Group

Tests of Normality						
studentsgroup	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Writingscore experiment group	.107	30	.200*	.936	30	.069
control group	.193	30	.146	.947	30	.145

The table showed the result of test normality calculation using SPSS 17.0 program. To know the normality of data, the formula could be seen as follows:

If the number of sample. > 50 = Kolmogorov-Smirnov

If the number of sample. < 50 = Shapiro-Wilk

Based on the number of data the writer was $60 > 50$, so to analyzed normality data was used Kolmogorov-Smirnov. The next step, the writer analyzed normality of data used formula as follows:

If Significance > 0.05 = data is normal distribution

If Significance < 0.05 = data is not normal distribution

Based on data above, significant data of experiment and control group used Kolmogorov-Smirnov was $0.200 > 0.05$ and $0.146 > 0.05$. It could be concluded that the data was in normal distribution.

2. Homogeneity Test

- a. Testing Homogeneity of pre-test experimental and control group

Table 4.18, Testing Homogeneity of Pre-test Experimental and Control Group

Homogeneity Test										
	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means							
								99% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
	F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper	
writings core	Equal variances assumed	.138	.711	.771	58	.450	1.26667	1.64363	-3.11080	5.64414
	Equal variances not assumed			.752	57.548	.444	1.26667	1.64363	-3.11197	5.64530

The table showed the result of Homogeneity test calculation using SPSS 17.0 program. To know the Homogeneity of data, the formula could be seen as follows:

If Sig. > 0,01 = Equal variances assumed or Homogeny distribution

If Sig. < 0,01 = Equal variances not assumed or not Homogeny distribution

Based on data above, significant data was 0,711. The result was $0,711 > 0,01$, it meant the t-test calculation used at the equal variances assumed or data was Homogeny distribution

b. Testing Homogeneity of post-test experimental and control group

Table 4.19, Testing Homogeneity of post-test experimental and control group

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									99% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Writing score	Equal variances assumed	.405	.527	5.392	58	.390	10.73333	1.99048	5.43213	16.03454
	Equal variances not assumed			5.390	57.332	.298	10.73333	1.99048	5.43003	16.03663

The table showed the result of Homogeneity test calculation using SPSS 21.0 program. To know the Homogeneity of data, the formula could be seen as follows:

If Sig. > 0.01 = Equal variances assumed or Homogeneity distribution

If Sig. < 0.01 = Equal variances not assumed or not Homogeneity distribution

Based on data above, significant data was 0.527. The result was $0.527 > 0.01$, it meant the t-test calculation used at the equal variances assumed or data was Homogeneity distribution.

C. Result of Data Analysis

In this case writer found the answer the problem of the study, does using outline technique give effect toward the students' ability in writing descriptive text at the eight graders of MTs. AN-Nur Palangka Raya. Writer also carried out the hypothesis of the study, alternative hypothesis (H_a) the use of outline technique gives effect to improve students' ability in writing descriptive text at the eight graders of MTs. AN-Nur Palangka Raya. Null hypothesis (H_0), the use of outline technique does not give effect to improve students' ability in writing descriptive text at the eight graders of MTs. AN-Nur Palangka Raya.

1. Testing Hypothesis Using Manual Calculation

Table 4.20, the Standard Deviation and the Standard Error of Experiment and Control Group

Group	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Experimental Group	8.114	1.481
Control Group	7.281	1.329

The table showed the result of the standard deviation calculation of Experiment group was 8.112 and the result of the standard error was 1.433. The result of the standard deviation calculation of Control group was 7.275 and the result of standard error was 1.350. To examine the hypothesis, the writer used the formula as follow:

$$\begin{aligned}
 t_{\text{observed}} &= \frac{M1 - M2}{SEm1 - SEm2} \\
 &= \frac{8.114 - 7.281}{1.481 - 1.329} \\
 &= \frac{0.833}{0.152} = 5.480
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbf{df} &= (N_1 + N_2 - 2) \\
 &= 30 + 30 - 2 \\
 &= 58
 \end{aligned}$$

2. Testing Hypothesis Using SPSS 17.0

The writer also applied SPSS 17.0 program to calculate t – test in testing hypothesis of the study. The result of t – test using SPSS 17.0 was used to support the manual calculation of t – test. The result of t – test using SPSS 17.0 program could be seen as follows:

- a. Calculation of mean, standard deviation, standard error of Post Test Experiment and Control group

Table 4.21, Mean, Standard Deviation and the Standard Error of Post Test Experiment and Control group using SPSS 17.0 Program

studentsgroup	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
ffWritingscore experiment group	30	70.8667	8.11441	1.48148
control group	30	60.1333	7.28122	1.32936

The table showed the result of mean calculation of experiment group was 70.866, standard deviation calculation was 8.114, and standard error of

meancalculation was 1.481. The result of mean calculation of control group was 60.133, standard deviation calculation was 7.281, and standard error of mean was 1.329.

b. Calculation of T-Test

Table 4.22, The Calculation of T – Test Using SPSS 17.0

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									99% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Writing score	Equal variances assumed	.405	.527	5.392	58	.390	10.73333	1.99048	5.43213	16.03454
	Equal variances not assumed			5.390	57.332	.298	10.73333	1.99048	5.43003	16.03663

The table showed the result of t – test calculation using SPSS 17.0 program. To know the variances score of data, the formula could be seen as follows:

If Sig. > 0.01 = Equal variances assumed

If Sig. < 0.01 = Equal variances not assumed

Based on data above, significant data was 0.527. The result was $0.527 > 0.01$, it meant the t-test calculation used at the equal variances assumed. It found that the

result of tobserved was 5.392, the result of mean difference between experiment and control group was 10.733, and the standard error difference between experiment and control group was 16.034.

D. Interpretation

The result of t – test was interpreted on the result of degree offreedom to get the ttable. The result of degree of freedom (df) was 58. The following table wasthe result of tobserved and ttable from 58 df at 5% and 1% significance level.

Table 4.23, The Result of T-Test Using SPSS 17.0 Program

t _{-observe}	t _{-table}		Df
	5 % (0.05)	1 % (0.01)	
5.392	2.423	2.704	58

The interpretation of the result of t-test using SPSS 17.0 program, it wasfound the tobserved was greater than the ttable at 5% and 1% significance level or2.423, <5.392>2.704. It meant Ha was accepted and Ho was rejected.It could be interpreted based on the result of calculation that Ha stating that the use of outline technique gives effect to students' ability in writing descriptive text at the eight graders of MTs. AN-Nur Palangka Raya was accepted. Ho stating that The use of outline technique does not give effect to students' ability in writing descriptive textat the eight graders

of MTs. AN-Nur Palangka Raya was rejected. It meant that teaching writing descriptive text with Outline Technique the eight gradestudents at MTs AN-Nur Palangka Raya gave significant effect at 5% and 1% significance level.

E. Discussion

The result of analysis showed that there was significant effect of outline technique Toward writing ability for the eight gradestudents of MTs. AN-Nur Palangka Raya. The students who were taught used outline technique reached higher in post-test with the result of analysis showed that was significant effect of using outline on students writing ability of the eight gradestudents of MTs. AN-Nur Palangka Raya. The students who were taught using outline technique on got higher score in post-test with mean (70.866) in writing test, than those students who were taught by freewriting technique with mean (60.133) in writing test. Moreover, after the data calculated using T Test with 5% level of significant. It was found that the t observed was higher than t table with $\alpha = 0.05$.

The first result based on the data analysis, it was shown that teaching using outline technique was more effective on students' writing ability than teaching writing without giving the outline technique. It was shown after the data was calculated of t_{test} . It was found the $t_{observed}$ was higher than the t_{table} at 5% and 1% significance level or 2.423, $< 5.392 > 2.704$. It meant H_a was accepted and H_o was rejected. This finding indicated that the alternative hypothesis (H_a) stating that there was any significant

effect of outline technique Toward writing ability for the eight gradestudents at MTs AN-Nur Palangka Raya was accepted. On the contrary,the Null hypothesis (Ho) stating that there was no significant effect of outline technique toward writing ability for the eight gradestudents at MTs AN-Nur Palangka Raya was rejected. Based on the result the data analysis showed that using outline technique gave significance effect for the students' writing ability scores of eight gradestudents at MTs AN-Nur Palangka Raya. The result of the analysis showed that there is significant difference between pre-test and post-test of writing descriptive text using outline technique in eight gradeof MTs. AN-Nur Palangka Raya.

The result the data analysis showed that using outline technque gave significance effect for the students' writing ability for the eight gradestudents at MTs. AN-Nur Palangka Raya. After the students have been taught by using Outline Technique, the writing score were higher than without implementing Outline Tecnique as a learning strategy. It can be seen in the comparison of post test score of control and experimental group. This finding indicated that outline technique was effective and supports the previous research done by Michigan, Meliya and Ali Ahmed Husein that also stated teaching writing by using outline technique was effective.

It was suitable with the result of pre-test and post test for Experiment and control Group. (See p.57). In the pre-test of experiment group there werenine students that got very poor predicate. They were E-4, E-5, E-8, E-15, E-16, E-17,E-18, E-19

and E-28. There were seventeen students that got poor predicate. They were E-1, E-2, E-3, E-6, E-7, E-9, E-11, E-12, E-13, E-14, E-20, E-22, E-23, E-24, E-25, E-26 and E-29. There were three students that got enough predicate. They are E-10, E-27 and E-30. There was one student that got good predicate. She was E-21. Then, in the pre-test score of control group there were teen students that got very poor predicate. They were E-5, E-7, E-8, E-10, E-11, E-15, E-16, E-17, E-19 and E-23. There were fourteen students that got poor predicate. They were E-1, E-2, E-3, E-4, E-6, E-12, E-14, E-20, E-22, E-24, E-25, E-26, E-28 and E-29. There were five students that got enough predicate. They were E-9, E-13, E-27, and E-30. There was one student that got good predicate. She was E-21.

Based on the result of post-test for experimental and control group, (See p.66). In the experimental group, there was one student that got vey poor predicate. He was E-5. There was no student that got in poor predicate. There were eleven students that got enough predicate. They were E-3, E-4, E-8, E-10, E-11, E-15, E-18, E-19, E-23, E-24, and E-26. There were fifteen students that got good predicate. They were E-1, E-2, E-6, E-7, E-9, E-12, E-13, E-17, E-20, E-21, E-22, E-25, E-28, E-29 and E-30. There was three students that got very good predicate, they were E-14, E-16 and E-27. In the control group, there were four students that got in very poor predicate. They were E-5, E-10, E-16, and E-26. There were nine students that got poor predicate. They were E-1, E-2, E-4, E-12, E-13, E-18, E-19, E-21 and E-29. There were sixteen students that got enough predicate. They were E-3, E-6, E-7, E-8, E-9,

E-11, E-14, E-15, E-17, E-20, E-22, E-23, E-24, E-25, E-28 and E-30. There was one student that got good predicate. She Was E-27.

Outline technique is effective in terms of improving the students' English writing achievement. It can be seen from the improvement of the students' average in the post-test, from the mean score were 70.866.

There are several reasons of using outline technique gives effect on students writing ability. First, outline technique was effective in terms of improving the students' English writing score. It can be seen from the improvement of the students' score average in the post-test. This finding was related to Gina Bakhlini who stating that outline helps students become effective written communicators. also help them to explore theirs thought.¹

Second, based on teaching learning process, the students understand what they should do first when the researcher asked them to write a descriptive text based on the theme. The finding was suitable with Mogahed, according to him outline helps students find ideas and arrange them properly.²

Third, the students can explore many ideas from mind and arrange them use outline technique. It was suitable with oshima and hogue according to them outline is

¹Gina Baakhlini Hogan, *Building Better Paragraph*: Wadsworth Cengage Learning, Boston, 2010. P. 13

²Mogahed M. Mogahed, *Planning out pre-writing activities Faculty of Education, Mansoura University, Egypt 2013*: P. 60

a good way to organize ideas to be paragraphs before begin to write.³ The learners can do it on their own or with friends or classmate to try find inspiration or idea.

Finally, outline technique is an instructional scheme that develops active writing of descriptive texts by activating learners' background knowledge. Outline technique could help students collect the ideas in writing descriptive text. There are some advantages of outline technique. First it make students more enthusiastic to write a text. Second it was shown of improvement students' score before and after the writer gave a treatment. If the students interested in learning, it made the students focus in learning. If the students focused, it made the students to be understand in learning and the student's score could be improve. As like the result, there is significant difference in the pre-test score of teaching English using outline technique and the post-test score of teaching English using outline technique at eight grade students of MTs. AN-Nur Palangka Raya.

³Alice Oshma and Ann Hogue, *Introduction to Academic Writing Third Edition*: Pearson Education, New York 2007. P. 54