

## CHAPTER IV

## RESULT OF THE STUDY

## CHAPTER IV <br> RESULT OF THE STUDY

This chapter discussed the data which had been collected from the research in the field of study. The data were the result of experiment and control class, the result of post-test experiment and control class, and the result of data analysis.

## A. Description of the Data

## 1. The result of Pre-Test score of the Control and Experiment Class

The Pre-Test was conducted to the first control class in XI IPA 4 room on august $27^{\text {th }}$, 2014, at 08.15-09.45 am. Then the experiment class was given pretest in XI IPA 2 room on august $26^{\text {th }}, 2014$, at $10.00-11.30 \mathrm{am}$. The Pre-test scores of the classes were presented in Table 4.1 and Table 4.2.

Table 4.1 the Pre-Test Score of Students Writing Ability of Experiment and Control Class

| No | Control Class |  | Experiment Class |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Students <br> Code | Score | Students <br> Code | Score |
| 1 | L1 | 84 | C1 | 65 |
| 2 | L2 | 60 | C2 | 73 |
| 3 | L3 | 60 | C3 | 51 |
| 4 | L4 | 67 | C4 | 60 |
| 5 | L5 | 52 | C5 | 61 |
| 6 | L6 | 64 | C6 | 68 |
| 7 | L7 | 60 | C7 | 61 |
| 8 | L8 | 64 | C8 | 57 |
| 9 | L9 | 55 | C9 | 65 |
| 10 | L10 | 82 | C10 | 54 |


| 11 | L11 | 59 | C11 | 57 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12 | L12 | 63 | C12 | 54 |
| 13 | L13 | 48 | C13 | 63 |
| 14 | L14 | 57 | C14 | 53 |
| 15 | L15 | 65 | C15 | 69 |
| 16 | L16 | 61 | C16 | 66 |
| 17 | L17 | 59 | C17 | 66 |
| 18 | L18 | 60 | C18 | 68 |
| 19 | L19 | $62^{52}$ | C19 | 52 |
| 20 | L20 |  | C20 | 60 |
| 21 | L21 | 54 | C21 | 63 |
| 22 | L22 | 64 | C22 | 65 |
| 23 | L23 | 56 | C23 | 59 |
| 24 | L24 | 61 | C24 | 62 |
| 25 | L25 | 61 | C25 | 59 |
| 26 | L26 | 56 | C26 | 63 |
| 27 | L27 | 46 | C27 | 59 |
| 28 | L28 | 65 | C28 | 58 |
| 29 | L29 | 58 | C29 | 60 |
| 30 | L30 | 56 | C30 | 59 |
| 31 | L31 | 64 | C31 | 57 |
| 32 | L32 | 55 | C32 | 53 |
| 33 | L33 | 54 | C33 | 60 |
| 34 | L34 | 57 | C34 | 57 |
| 35 | L35 | 65 | C35 | 52 |
| 36 |  |  | C36 | 70 |
| SUM |  | 2106 |  | 2179 |


| Lowest score | 46 |  | 51 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Highest score | 85 |  | 73 |
| Mean | 60.1714 |  | 60.5278 |
| Standard deviation | 7.48915 |  | 5.53165 |

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

Based on the result of research in class XI-IPA 4 as control class and XI-IPA 2 as experiment class before being taught by clustering technique in writing report text, the highest pre- test score of student control class was 85 and the lowest score of control class was 46 with sum of the data was 2106 , mean was 60.1714 , with standard deviation was 7.48915 . In contrary, the highest score of experiment class was 73 and the lowest score of the experiment class was 51 with sum of the data was 2179 , the mean was 60.5278 with Standard deviation was 5.53165 .

Table 4.2 the Pre-Test Score of Students Writing Apprehension of Control Class And Experiment Class

| No | Control Class |  | Experiment Class |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Students <br> Code | Score | Students <br> Code | Score |
| 1 | L1 | 99 | C1 | 84 |
| 2 | L2 | 63 | C2 | 83 |
| 3 | L3 | 128 | C3 | 89 |
| 4 | L4 | 97 | C4 | 78 |
| 5 | L5 | 87 | C5 | 72 |


| 6 | L6 | 95 | C6 | 73 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7 | L7 | 56 | C7 | 77 |
| 8 | L8 | 125 | C8 | 85 |
| 9 | L9 | 81 | C9 | 82 |
| 10 | L10 | 92 | C10 | 80 |
| 11 | L11 | 93 | C11 | 91 |
| 12 | L12 | 81 | C12 | 74 |
| 13 | L13 | 81 | C13 | 81 |
| 14 | L14 | 105 | C14 | 81 |
| 15 | L15 | 86 | C15 | 81 |
| 16 | L16 | 78 | C16 | 94 |
| 17 | L17 | 91 | C17 | 109 |
| 18 | L18 | 104 | C18 | 97 |
| 19 | L19 | 76 | C19 | 67 |
| 20 | L20 | 64 | C20 | 105 |
| 21 | L21 | 101 | C21 | 70 |
| 22 | L22 | 86 | C22 | 77 |
| 23 | L23 | 75 | C23 | 91 |
| 24 | L24 | 100 | C24 | 89 |
| 25 | L25 | 81 | C25 | 87 |
| 26 | L26 | 73 | C26 | 76 |
| 27 | L27 | 71 | C27 | 82 |
| 28 | L28 | 76 | C28 | 65 |
| 29 | L29 | 91 | C29 | 87 |
| 30 | L30 | 62 | C30 | 105 |
| 31 | L31 | 87 | C31 | 96 |
| 32 | L32 | 56 | C32 | 80 |


| 33 | L33 | 102 | C33 | 82 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 34 | L34 | 89 | C34 | 92 |
| 35 | L35 | 75 | C35 | 86 |
|  |  |  | C36 | 75 |
| SUM | 3007 |  | 3023 |  |
| Lowest score | 56 |  | 65 |  |
| Highest score | 128 |  | 109 |  |
| Mean |  | 85.9143 |  | 83.97 |
| Standard deviation |  | 16.9143 |  | 10.305 |

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

Based on the result of research in class XI-IPA 4 as control class and XI-IPA 2 as experiment class before being taught by clustering technique in writing report text, the highest pre- test score of student control class was 125 and the lowest score of control class was 56 with sum of the data was 2998 , mean was 85.66 , with standard deviation was 16.155 . In contrary, the highest score of experiment class was 109 and the lowest score of the experiment class was 65 with sum of the data was 3023 , the mean was 83.97 with Standard deviation was 10.305

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

The test of Post- Test score at the control class had been conducted on September, $18{ }^{\text {th }} 2014$ (Thursday, at time 12.15-13.45) in class XI-IPA 4 with the number of student was 35 students. Then the experiment class had been conducted on September, $20^{\text {th }} 2014$ (Saturday, at time 12.15-
13.45) in the class XI-IPA 2 with the number of student was 36 students. The Pre-test scores of both of class were presented in 4.3 and 4.4:

Table 4.3 the Posttest Score of Students Writing Ability of Control and Experiment Class

| No | Control Class |  | Experiment Class |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Students Code | Score | Students Code | Score |
| 1 | L1 | 70 | C1 | 76 |
| 2 | L2 | 67 | C2 | 78 |
| 3 | L3 | 55 | C3 | 70 |
| 4 | L4 | 54 | C4 | 71 |
| 5 | L5 | 57 | C5 | 64 |
| 6 | L6 | 63 | C6 | 70 |
| 7 | L7 | 65 | C7 | 75 |
| 8 | L8 | 81 | C8 | 64 |
| 9 | L9 | 60 | C9 | 73 |
| 10 | L10 | 65 | C10 | 57 |
| 11 | L11 | 63 | C11 | 62 |
| 12 | L12 | 58 | C12 | 72 |
| 13 | L13 | 63 | C13 | 75 |
| 14 | L14 | 58 | C14 | 62 |
| 15 | L15 | 66 | C15 | 73 |
| 16 | L16 | 55 | C16 | 64 |
| 17 | L17 | 59 | C17 | 77 |
| 18 | L18 | 61 | C18 | 70 |
| 19 | L19 | 55 | C19 | 65 |


| 20 | L20 | 76 | C20 | 73 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21 | L21 | 60 | C21 | 65 |
| 22 | L22 | 68 | C22 | 74 |
| 23 | L23 | 57 | C23 | 65 |
| 24 | L24 | 63 | C24 | 68 |
| 25 | L25 | 72 | C25 | 84 |
| 26 | L26 | 62 | C26 | 69 |
| 27 | L27 | 63 | C27 | 64 |
| 28 | L28 | 70 | C28 | 69 |
| 29 | L29 | 65 | C29 | 73 |
| 30 | L30 | 56 | C30 | 74 |
| 31 | L31 | 62 | C31 | 73 |
| 32 | L32 | 64 | C32 | 73 |
| 33 | L33 | 64 | C33 | 76 |
| 34 | L34 | 64 | C34 | 87 |
| 35 | L35 | 64 | C35 | 79 |
| 36 |  |  | C36 | 76 |
| SUM |  | 2205 |  | 2560 |
| Lowest score |  | 54 |  | 57 |
| Highest score |  | 81 |  | 87 |
| Mean |  | 63.59951 |  | 71.1111 |
| Standard deviation |  | 5.99510 |  | 6.33709 |

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 class XI-IPA 4 as control class which taught by listing technique, the highest pre-test score of students of control class was 81 and the lowest score was 54 with sum was 2205 , so the mean is 63.59951 and standard deviation was 5.99510. Whereas, XI-IPA 2 as experiment class after being taught by clustering technique in writing report text. The highest score of students of experiment class was 87 , and the lowest score was 57 , with sum was 2560 , so the mean is 71.1111 and Standard deviation was 6.33709 .

Table 4.4 the Posttest Score of Students Writing Apprehension of Control and Experiment Class

| No | Control Class |  | Experiment Class |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Students <br> Code | Score | Students <br> Code | Score |
| 1 | L1 | 100 | C1 | 92 |
| 2 | L2 | 79 | C2 | 93 |
| 3 | L3 | 128 | C3 | 96 |
| 4 | L4 | 96 | C4 | 85 |
| 5 | L5 | 95 | C5 | 86 |
| 6 | L6 | 101 | C6 | 91 |
| 7 | L7 | 105 | C7 | 83 |
| 8 | L8 | 114 | C8 | 94 |
| 9 | L9 | 90 | C9 | 89 |
| 10 | L10 | 76 | C10 | 95 |
| 11 | L11 | 100 | C11 | 107 |
| 12 | L12 | 77 | C12 | 105 |
| 13 | L13 | 83 | C13 | 84 |
| 14 | L14 | 104 | C14 | 89 |


| 15 | L15 | 73 | C15 | 108 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16 | L16 | 73 | C16 | 104 |
| 17 | L17 | 93 | C17 | 122 |
| 18 | L18 | 103 | C18 | 101 |
| 19 | L19 | 85 | C19 | 76 |
| 20 | L20 | 109 | C20 | 113 |
| 21 | L21 | 107 | C21 | 77 |
| 22 | L22 | 92 | C22 | 83 |
| 23 | L23 | 80 | C23 | 104 |
| 24 | L24 | 90 | C24 | 99 |
| 25 | L25 | 83 | C25 | 101 |
| 26 | L26 | 81 | C26 | 81 |
| 27 | L27 | 82 | C27 | 83 |
| 28 | L28 | 86 | C28 | 95 |
| 29 | L29 | 92 | C29 | 103 |
| 30 | L30 | 78 | C30 | 128 |
| 31 | L31 | 92 | C31 | 101 |
| 32 | L32 | 104 | C32 | 103 |
| 33 | L33 | 102 | C33 | 93 |
| 34 | L34 | 96 | C34 | 96 |
| 35 | L35 | 78 | C35 | 103 |
| 36 |  |  | C36 | 102 |
| SUM |  | 3227 |  | 3465 |
| Lowest score |  | 73 |  | 76 |
| Highest score |  | 128 |  | 128 |
| Mean |  | 92.20 |  | 96.25 |
| Standard deviation |  | 12.2000 |  | 11.6481 |

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 class XI-IPA 4 as control class which taught by listing technique, the highest post-test score of students of control class was 128 and the lowest score was 73 with sum was 3227 , so the mean is 92.20 and standard deviation was 12.840. Whereas, XI-IPA 2 as experiment class after being taught by clustering technique in writing report text. The highest score of students of experiment class was 112 , and the lowest score was 65 , with sum was 3079 , so the mean is 88.03 and Standard deviation was 11.165 .

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

## a. The Comparasion of Pre-Test and Post-Test Scores in Writing Ability of Experiment Class

The comparison between students' pre-test and post-test after doing the experiment can be seen in the following Table 4.5.

Table 4.5 the Comparison Result of Pre- Test and Post- Test Score of Writing Ability Experiment Class

| No | Test | Students Code | Experiment Class |  | Improvement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Pre-test | Post-test |  |
| 1 |  | C1 | 65 | 76 | 11 |
| 2 |  | C2 | 73 | 78 | 5 |
| 3 |  | C3 | 51 | 70 | 19 |


| 4 | Writing Ability | C4 | 60 | 71 | 11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 |  | C5 | 61 | 64 | 3 |
| 6 |  | C6 | 68 | 70 | 2 |
| 7 |  | C7 | 61 | 75 | 14 |
| 8 |  | C8 | 57 | 64 | 7 |
| 9 |  | C9 | 65 | 73 | 8 |
| 10 |  | C10 | 54 | 57 | 3 |
| 11 |  | C11 | 57 | 62 | 5 |
| 12 |  | C12 | 54 | 72 | 18 |
| 13 |  | C13 | 63 | 75 | 12 |
| 14 |  | C14 | 53 | 62 | 9 |
| 15 |  | C15 | 69 | 73 | 4 |
| 16 |  | C16 | 66 | 64 | 2 |
| 17 |  | C17 | 66 | 77 | 10 |
| 18 |  | C18 | 68 | 70 | 2 |
| 19 |  | C19 | 52 | 65 | 13 |
| 20 |  | C20 | 60 | 73 | 13 |
| 21 |  | C21 | 63 | 65 | 1 |
| 22 |  | C22 | 65 | 74 | 9 |
| 23 |  | C23 | 59 | 65 | 6 |
| 24 |  | C24 | 62 | 68 | 6 |
| 25 |  | C25 | 59 | 84 | 25 |
| 26 |  | C26 | 63 | 69 | 6 |
| 27 |  | C27 | 59 | 64 | 5 |
| 28 |  | C28 | 58 | 69 | 9 |
| 29 |  | C29 | 60 | 73 | 13 |
| 30 |  | C30 | 59 | 74 | 15 |


| 31 |  | C31 | 57 | 73 | 16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 32 |  | C32 | 53 | 73 | 16 |
| 33 |  | C33 | 60 | 76 | 16 |
| 34 |  | C34 | 57 | 87 | 30 |
| 35 |  | C35 | 52 | 79 | 27 |
| 36 |  | C36 | 70 | 76 | 6 |
|  | Sum |  | 2179 | 2560 | - |
|  | Highest score |  | 73 | 87 | - |
|  | Low score |  | 51 | 57 | - |
|  | Mean |  | 60.5278 | 71.1111 | - |
|  | Standard deviation |  | 5.53165 | 6.33709 | - |

Based on data above, mean of pre-test were 60.52 in pretest to 71.11 in post-test. It could be concluded that the students writing ability of experiment class was increased from pretest to post-test.
b. The Comparison of Pre-Test and Post-Test Scores in Writing Apprehension of

## Experiment Class

The comparison between students' pre-test and post-test after doing the experiment can be seen in the following Table 4.6.

Table 4.6 the Comparison Result of Pre- Test and Post- Test Score of Students Writing Apprehension Experiment Class

| No | Test | Students Code | Experiment Class |  | Improvement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Pre-test | Post-test |  |
| 1 |  | C1 | 84 | 92 | 8 |
| 2 |  | C2 | 83 | 93 | 10 |


| 3 | Writing Apprehension | C3 | 89 | 96 | 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 |  | C4 | 78 | 85 | 7 |
| 5 |  | C5 | 72 | 86 | 14 |
| 6 |  | C6 | 73 | 91 | 18 |
| 7 |  | C7 | 77 | 83 | 6 |
| 8 |  | C8 | 85 | 94 | 9 |
| 9 |  | C9 | 82 | 89 | 7 |
| 10 |  | C10 | 80 | 95 | 15 |
| 11 |  | C11 | 91 | 107 | 17 |
| 12 |  | C12 | 74 | 105 | 31 |
| 13 |  | C13 | 81 | 84 | 3 |
| 14 |  | C14 | 81 | 89 | 8 |
| 15 |  | C15 | 81 | 108 | 27 |
| 16 |  | C16 | 94 | 104 | 10 |
| 17 |  | C17 | 109 | 122 | 14 |
| 18 |  | C18 | 97 | 101 | 4 |
| 19 |  | C19 | 67 | 76 | 9 |
| 20 |  | C20 | 105 | 113 | 8 |
| 21 |  | C21 | 70 | 77 | 7 |
| 22 |  | C22 | 77 | 83 | 6 |
| 23 |  | C23 | 91 | 104 | 13 |
| 24 |  | C24 | 89 | 99 | 10 |
| 25 |  | C25 | 87 | 101 | 15 |
| 26 |  | C26 | 76 | 81 | 5 |
| 27 |  | C27 | 82 | 83 | 1 |
| 28 |  | C28 | 65 | 95 | 30 |
| 29 |  | C29 | 87 | 103 | 26 |



Based on data above, mean of pre-test were 83.97 in pretest to 96.25 in post-test. It could be concluded that the students writing apprehension of experiment class was reduced from pre-test to post-test.

## B. Testing Normality and Homogeinity

## 1. Normality Test

In this study, researcher used One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test to test the normality.
a. Testing of Normality Writing Ability of Pre- Test Control and Experiment Class

Table 4.7 Testing of Normality One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

|  |  | Control | Experiment |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| N |  | 35 | 36 |
| Normal Parameters ${ }^{\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b}}$ | Mean | 60.1714 | 60.5278 |


|  | Std. Deviation | 7.48915 | 5.53165 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Most Extreme | Absolute | .174 | .094 |
| Differences | Positive | .174 | .094 |
|  | Negative | -.091 | -.068 |
|  |  | 1.028 | .561 |
| Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z | .241 | .911 |  |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) |  |  |  |

a. Test distribution is Normal.
b. Calculated from data.

Based on the calculation used SPSS program, the asymptotic significance normality of control class was 0.241 and experiment class 0.911 . Then the normality both of class was consulted with table of Kolmogorov- Smirnov with the level of significance $5 \%(\alpha=0.05)$. Because asymptotic significance of control $=0.854 \geq \boldsymbol{\alpha}=0.05$, and asymptotic significance of experiment $=0.949 \geq \boldsymbol{\alpha}=0.05$. It could be concluded that the data was normal distribution.
b. Testing of Normality Writing Apprehension for Pre-test of Control Class and Experiment 4.8 Testing of Normality One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

|  |  | Control | Experiment |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| N |  | 35 | 36 |
| Normal Parameters ${ }^{\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b}}$, | Mean | 85.9143 | 83.9722 |
|  | Std. Deviation | 16.76195 | 10.30530 |
| Most Extreme | Absolute | .072 | .104 |
| Differences | Positive | .072 | .104 |
|  | Negative | -.057 | -.063 |
| Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z | .429 | .622 |  |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .993 | .834 |

a. Test distribution is Normal.
b. Calculated from data.

Based on the calculation used SPSS program, the asymptotic significance normality of control class was 0.993 and experiment class 0.834 . Then the normality both of class was consulted with table of Kolmogorov- Smirnov with the level of significance 5\% ( $\alpha=0.05$ ). Because asymptotic significance of control $=0.993 \geq \boldsymbol{\alpha}=0.05$, and asymptotic significance of experiment $=0.834 \geq \boldsymbol{\alpha}=0.05$. It could be concluded that the data was normal distribution.
c. Testing of Normality Writing Ability for Post-test of Control Class and Experiment
4.9 Testing of Normality One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

|  |  | Control | Experimnet |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| N |  | 35 | 36 |
| Normal Parameters ${ }^{\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b}}$ | Mean | 63.0000 | 71.1111 |
|  | Std. Deviation | 5.99510 | 6.33709 |
| Most Extreme | Absolute | .141 | .117 |
| Differences | Positive | .141 | .110 |
|  | Negative | -.071 | -.117 |
| Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z | .833 | .703 |  |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .492 | .706 |

a. Test distribution is Normal.
b. Calculated from data.

Based on the calculation used SPSS program, the asymptotic significance normality of control class was 0.492 and experiment class 0.706 . Then the normality both of class was consulted with table of Kolmogorov- Smirnov with the level of significance 5\% ( $\alpha=0.05$ ). Because asymptotic significance of control $=0.492 \geq \boldsymbol{\alpha}=0.05$, and asymptotic significance of experiment $=0.706 \geq \boldsymbol{\alpha}=0.05$. It could be concluded that the data was normal distribution.
d. Testing of Normality Writing Apprehension for Post-test of Control Class and Experiment

### 4.10 Testing of Normality One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

## One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

|  |  | Control | Experiment |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| N |  | 35 | 36 |
| Normal Parameters ${ }^{\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b}}$ | Mean | 92.2000 | 96.2500 |
|  | Std. Deviation | 12.84019 | 11.64811 |
| Most Extreme | Absolute | .106 | .087 |
| Differences | Positive | .106 | .087 |
|  | Negative | -.071 | -.075 |
| Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z | .627 | .524 |  |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .826 | .946 |

a. Test distribution is Normal.
b. Calculated from data.

Based on the calculation used SPSS program, the asymptotic significance normality of control class was 0.826 and experiment class 0.946 . Then the normality both of class was consulted with table of Kolmogorov- Smirnov with the level of significance 5\% ( $\alpha=0.05$ ). Because asymptotic significance of control $=0.826 \geq \boldsymbol{\alpha}=0.05$, and asymptotic significance of experiment $=0.946 \geq \boldsymbol{\alpha}=0.05$. It could be concluded that the data was normal distribution.

## 2. Homogeneity Test

In this study, researcher used Levene Test Statistic to test the homogeneity of variance.

### 4.11 Test of Homogeneity of Variances

| Levene Statistic | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| .916 |  | 7 | 276 |

Based on the calculating used SPPS 17.0 program, the data showed the significance was 0.307. The significant of the levene test statistic was higher than $0.05(0.307 \geq 0.05)$. It meant that the scores were not violated the homogeneity.

## 3. Testing Hypothesis

The researcher used One - Ways Anova to test the hypothesis with significance level $\alpha=$ 0.05. The researcher used manual calculation and SPSS 17.0 Program to test the hypothesis using One - ways Anova. The criteria of $H_{0}$ is accepted when $\mathrm{F}_{\text {value }} \leq \mathrm{F}_{\text {table }}$, and the $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{o}}$ is refused when $F_{\text {value }} \geq F_{\text {table }}$. Then the criteria $H_{a}$ is accepted when $F_{\text {value }} \geq F_{\text {table, }}$ and $H_{a}$ is refused when $F_{\text {value }} \leq F_{\text {table }}$. Or The criteria of $H_{0}$ was accepted when the significant value $\geq 0.05$, and $H_{o}$ was refused when the significant value $\leq 0.05$.

To make sure the manual calculation, SPSS 17.0 statistic program was conducted in this research.

Table. 4.12 One-Way ANOVA manual calculation

|  | Sum of <br> Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| Between Groups | 27608.834 | 3 | 9202.945 | 97.829 | .000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Within Groups | 12981.906 | 138 | 94.072 |  |  |
| Total | 40590.739 | 141 |  |  |  |

Based on the SPSS 17.0 statistic program calculation, the result showed that Degree of Freedom Between Groups $(\mathrm{DFb})=3$ and Degree of Freedom Within Groups (DFw) $=138$ $\left(\mathrm{F}_{\text {table }}=2.75\right)$. Then $\mathrm{F}_{\text {value }}$ was 97.829 . It showed $\mathrm{F}_{\text {value }}$ was higher than $\mathrm{F}_{\text {table }}(97.829 \geq 2.75)$. So, $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{o}}$ was refused and $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{a}}$ was accepted. There was significant differences among groups after doing the treatment, with $\mathrm{F}_{\text {value }}=97.829$ and the significant level was lower than alpha $(\boldsymbol{\alpha})(0.00 \leq$ $0.05)$.

Knowing that there was a significant difference among groups after doing the treatment, researcher needed to test the hypotheses. Because ANOVA was only to know that there was significant differences among groups, not to know where the differences among groups are, to answer the research problems and test the hypotheses, researcher applied Post Hoc Test.

Table 4.13 Post Hoc

| (I) Subjects | (J) Subjects | Mean Difference (IJ) | Std. Error | Sig. | 95\% Confidence Interval |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| CG Writing Ability | EG Writing Ability | -8.11111* | 2.30236 | . 001 | -12.6636 | -3.5586 |
|  | CG Writing App | $-29.20000^{*}$ | 2.31852 | . 000 | -33.7844 | -24.6156 |
|  | EG Writing App | -33.25000** | 2.30236 | . 000 | -37.8025 | -28.6975 |
| EG Writing Ability | CG Writing Ability | 8.11111** | 2.30236 | . 001 | 3.5586 | 12.6636 |
|  | CG Writing App | $-21.08889^{*}$ | 2.30236 | . 000 | -25.6414 | -16.5364 |
|  | EG Writing App | -25.13889** | 2.28609 | . 000 | -29.6592 | -20.6186 |
| CG Writing App | CG Writing Ability | $29.20000^{*}$ | 2.31852 | . 000 | 24.6156 | 33.7844 |
|  | EG Writing <br> Ability | $21.08889^{*}$ | 2.30236 | . 000 | 16.5364 | 25.6414 |
|  | EG Writing App | -4.05000 | 2.30236 | . 081 | -8.6025 | . 5025 |
| EG Writing App | CG Writing Ability | $33.25000^{*}$ | 2.30236 | . 000 | 28.6975 | 37.8025 |
|  | EG Writing Ability | $25.13889^{*}$ | 2.28609 | . 000 | 20.6186 | 29.6592 |
|  | CG Writing App | 4.05000 | 2.30236 | . 081 | -. 5025 | 8.6025 |

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

The criteria of $H_{o}$ is accepted when the significant value is higher than alpha ( $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ ) (0.05), and $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ is refused when the significant value is lower than alpha $(\boldsymbol{\alpha})(0.05)$.

1. First, based on the calculation above used manual calculation and SPSS program of Post Hoc Test, Experiment Group of writing ability showed the significant value (0.01) was lower than the alpha (0.05). It meant that there was significant effect of clustering technique on students writing ability. Thus, Ha that state Using clustering technique gives
significant effect for experimental class in writing report text at eleventh grade students at MAN Model Palangka Raya was accepted and Ho that state using clustering technique does not have a statistically significant effect of the eleventh grade students of MAN Model Palangka Raya was rejected.
2. Second, on the calculation above used manual calculation and SPSS program of Post Hoc Test, Experiment Group of writing apprehension showed the significant value (0.01) was lower than the alpha (0.05). It meant that there was significant effect of clustering technique on students writing apprehension. Therefore, Ha that state using clustering technique give significances effect for experiment class in writing apprehension of the eleventh grade students of MAN model Palangka Raya was accepted and H0 that state using clustering technique does not have a statically significant effect on writing apprehension of the eleventh grade students of MAN Model Palangka Raya was rejected.
3. Third, on the calculation above used manual calculation and SPSS program of Post Hoc Test, Experiment Group of writing ability and apprehension showed the significant value (0.00) was lower than the alpha (0.05). It meant that there was significant effect of clustering technique on students writing ability and apprehension. Therefore, Ha that state using clustering technique give significances effect for experiment class in writing apprehension of the eleventh grade students of MAN model Palangka Raya was accepted and H0 that state using clustering technique does not have a statically significant effect on writing apprehension of the eleventh grade students of MAN Model Palangka Raya was rejected.

## 4. Interpretation of The F-Ratios

Based on the result of the research, researcher interpreted that:

1. Teaching using clustering technique was more effective on students' writing ability than teaching writing without giving the clustering technique. It was shown that the result showed significant value was lower than alpha ( 0.00 lower $\leq 0.05$ ).
2. Teaching using clustering technique was more effective on students writing apprehension than teaching writing without giving clustering technique. It was shown that the result showed significant value was lower than alpha ( 0.01 lower $\leq 0.05$ ).
3. There was any different effect between teaching writing using clustering technique using on students' writing ability and apprehension, It was based on the calculation used SPSS 17.0 statistic program, the result showed significant value was higher than alpha ( $0.81 \geq 0.05$ ).
