CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATION

This chapter presents: (a) findings and (b) the interpretations.

A. Findings

The findings of the study to analyze: (1) data descriptions, (2) prerequisite analysis, and (3) results of hypothesis testing.

1. Data Descriptions

In data descriptions, there are two analyses to be done, they are (1) distributions of data frequency, and (2) descriptive statistics. The scores are obtained from students' pre-test and post-test in both group (control and experiment).

1.1 Distribution of Data Frequency

In distributions of frequency data, the students' scores were got from: (a) pretest scores in control group, (b) post-test scores in control group, (c) pre-test scores in experimental group, and (d) post-test scores experimental group (see appendix H and I).

a. Students' Pre-test Score in Control Group

The distribution of pretest scores of the students in the control group were classified into the categories as in table 6.

Table 6
The Distribution Pretest in Control Group

Score Interval	Category	Pretest Control Group	
		Frequency	**Percentage**
81-100	Excellent	0	0 %
66-80	Good	3	9.09 %
56-65	Fair	18	54.54 %
47-55	Poor	9	27.27 %
Below 46	Very poor	3	9.09 %
Total		33	100 %

Table 6 showed that in the pretest, three students (9.09 %) got the score between 46 or below in category very poor, nine students (27.27 %) got the score between 47-55 in category poor, eighteen students (54.54 %) got the score between 56-65 in category fair, and three students (9.09 %) got the score between 66-80 in category good.

b. Students' Post-test Score in Control Group

The distribution of students' posttest scores in control group were classified into the categories in table 7

Table 7
The Distribution Posttest in Control Group

Score Interval	Category	Posttest Control Group	
		Frequency	**Percentage**
81-100	Excellent	0	0 %
66-80	Good	8	24.24 %
56-65	Fair	21	63.63 %
47-55	Poor	1	3.03 %
Below 46	Very poor	3	9.09 %
Total		33	100 %

Table 7 explained that in the posttest, three students (9.09 %) got the score between 46 or below in category very poor, one students (3.03 %) got the score between 47-55 in category poor, twenty one students (63.63 %) got the score between 56-65 in category fair, and eight students (24.24 %) got the score between 66-80 in category good.

c. Students' Pre-test Score in Experimental Group

The distribution of students' pretest scores in experimental group were classified into the categories in table 8

Table 8
The Distribution Pretest in Experimental Group

Score Interval	Category	Pretest Experimental Group	
		Frequency	**Percentage**
81-100	Excellent	0	0 %
66-80	Good	3	9.09 %
56-65	Fair	16	48.48 %
47-55	Poor	13	39.39 %
Below 46	Very poor	1	3.03 %
Total		33	100 %

Table 8 showed that, one student (3.03 %) got the score between 46 or below in category very poor, thirteen students (39.39 %) got the score between 47-55 in category poor, sixteen students (48.48 %) got the score between 56-65 in category fair, and three students (9.09 %) got the score between 66-80 in category good.

d. Students' Post-test Score in Experimental Group

The distribution of students' pretest scores in experimental group were classified into the categories in table 9

Table 9
The Distribution Posttest in Experimental Group

Score Interval	Category	Posttest ExperimentalGroup	
		Frequency	**Percentage**
81-100	Excellent	3	9.09 %
66-80	Good	17	51.51 %
56-65	Fair	12	36.36 %
47-55	Poor	1	3.03 %
Below 46	Very poor	0	0 %
Total		33	100 %

Table 11 explained that, one student (3.03 %) got the score between 47-55 in category poor, twelve students (36.36 %) got the score between 56-65 in category fair, and seventeen students (51.51 %) got the score between 66-80 in category good, and three students (9.09 %) got the score between 81-100 in category excellent.

1.2 Desriptive Statistics

In descriptive statistics, the total of sample (N), minimum score, maximal score, mean score, standard deviation were analyzed. Descriptive statistics are got from students' pretest score in control group, students' posttest score in control group, students' pretest score in experimental group and students' posttest score in experimental group.

a. Students' Pre-test Score in Control Group

In descriptive statistics, it showed that the total number of sample is 33 students. The minimum score was 45,00, the maximum score was 73,00, the mean score was 59.1212, and the standard deviation was 6.79042. The result analysis of descriptive statistics in control group is described in the table 10 (see appendix N).

Table 10
Descriptive Statistics on Students' Pre-test Score in Control Group

Students' Pre-test Scores	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
	33	45.00	73.00	59.1212	6.79042

b. Students' Post-test Score in Control Group

In descriptive statistics, it showed that the total number of sample is 33 students. The minimum score was 52,00, the maximum score was 72,00, the mean score was 62.36363, and the standard deviation was 5.51599. The result analysis of descriptive statistics in control group is described in the table 11 (see appendix O)

Table 11
Descriptive Statistics on Students' Post-test Score in Control Group

Students' Posttest Scores	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
	33	52,00	72,00	62,3636	5,51599

c. Students' Pre-test Score in Experimental Group

In descriptive statistics, it showed that the total number of sample is 33 students. The minimum score was 45,00, the maximum score was 70,00, the mean score was 56.7576, and the standard deviation was 6.77325. The result analysis of descriptive statistics in control group is described in the table 12 (see appendix P).

Table 12
Descriptive Statistics of Students' Pre-test Score in Experimental Group

Students' Pretest Scores	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
	33	45.00	70,00	56.7576	6.77325

d. Students' Post-test Score in Experimental Group

In descriptive statistics, it showed that the total number of sample is 33 students. The minimum score was 55,00, the maximum score was 83,00, the mean score was 67,7576, and the standard deviation was 6,70835. The result analysis of descriptive statistics in control group is described in the table 13 (see appendix Q)

Table 13
Descriptive Statistics of Students' Post-test Score in Experimental Group

Students' Posttest Scores	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
	33	55,00	83,00	67,7576	6,70835

2. Prerequisite Analysis

In the pre-requisite analysis, normality and homogeneity were analyzed

2.1 Normality Test

In the normality test, the total of sample (N), kolmogrov smirnov, significant and result were analyzed. The scores were got from: (a) students' pretest scores in control group, (b) students' posttest scores in control group, (c) students' pretest scores in experimental group, and (d) students' posttest scores in experimental group

a. Students' Pre-test Score in Control and Experimental Groups

After acquiring the data from the scores of the 33 students in control group and experiment group, it was found the p-output from students' pretest scores in control group was 0.866 and experimental group was 0.877. From the result of the p-output, it can be stated that the students' pretest experiment and control group were normal. Since, it was higher than 0.05. The result of analysis is figured out in table 14 (see appendix R)

Table 14
The Result of the Normality in Pretest between Experimental and Control Groups

No	Students' Post-test	N	Kolmogronov Smirnov	Sig.	Result
1	Control Group	33	0.866	0.441	**Normal**
2	Experimental Group	33	0.877	0.425	**Normal**

b. **Students' Post-test Score in Control and Experimental Groups**

After acquiring the data from the scores of the 33 students in control group and experiment group, it was found the p-output from students' posttest scores in control group was 1.042 and experimental group was 1.223. From the result of the p-output, it can be stated that the students' pretest control and experiment group were normal. Since, it was higher than 0.05. The results analysis is figured out in the Table 15 (see appendix S)

Table 15
The Result of the Normality in Posttest between Experimental and Control Groups

No	Students' Post-test	N	Kolmogronov Smirnov	Sig.	Result
1	Control Group	33	1.042	0.228	**Normal**
2	Experimental Group	33	1.223	0.101	**Normal**

2.2 Homogenity Test

Homogeneity test is used to measure the scores obtained whether it is homogeneous or not. Basrowi (2007:106) states that the score is categorized homogeneous when the p-output was higher than mean significant difference at 0.05 levels. In measuring homogeneity test, Levene Statistics found in SPSS is used. The homogeneity test is used to measure students' pretest score in control and experimental groups, and students' posttest score in control and experimental groups.

a. Students' Pre-test Score in Control and Experimental Group

Based on the result of analyzing the data of pre-test control and experimental groups, it was found that the p-output was 0.615, it means that the students' pretest in control and experimental group was homogeny because p-output was higher than 0.05. the results of homogenety test is illustrated in the Table 16 (see appendix T)

Table 16
The Result of the Homogeneity in Pretest between Experimental and Control Groups

No	Students' Pre-test	N	Levena Statistics	Sig.	Result
1	Control Group	33	0.256	0.615	**Homogen**
2	Experimental Group	33			

b. Students' Post-test Score Control and Experimental Groups

Based on the result of analyzing the data of posttest control and experimental groups, it was found that the p-output was 0.573, it means that the students' posttest in control and experimental group was homogeny because p-output was higher than 0.05. The analysis is described in the following table 17 (see appendix U):

Table 17
The Result of the Homogeneity in Posttest between Experimental and Control Groups

No	Students' Post-test	N	Levena Statistics	Sig.	Result
1	Control Group	33	0.320	0.573	Homogen
2	Experimental Group	33			

3. **Results of Hypothesis Testing**

In this study, independent t-test was conducted to measure the significant difference on students' writing achievement before they were taught by using Ask, Reflect, Text (ART) strategy and strategy used by teacher of SMA Nurul Iman Palembang. From the table analysis, it was found that the p-output is 0.162 and t-value is 1.416. Since the p-output was higher than 0.05 level and t-table (1.998) was higher than t-value, at the significant level $p > 0.05$. So that, the null hypothesis (Ho) was accepted and alternative hypothesis (Ha) was rejected. The analysis result of independent sample t-test is figured out in Table 18 (see appendix V)

Table 18
The Result of Independent Sample T-Test in pretest between Experimental and Control Groups

Ask, Reflect, Text (ART) Strategy	Independent Sample t-Test			Ho
	T	df	Sig. 2-tailed	
	1.416	64	.162	Accpeted

After they were taught by using ART strategy , there was significant difference on students' writing achievement. It showed from the table analysis, it was found that the p-output is 0.001 and t-value is 3.568. Since the p-output was lower than 0.05 level and t-value was higher than t-table (1.998) at the significance level $p < 0.05$, so that the null hypothesis (Ho) was rejected and alternative hypothesis (Ha) was accepted. The analysis result of independent sample t-test is figured out in Table 19 (see Appendix W)

Table 19
The Result of the Independent Sample T-Test in Posttest between
Experimental and Control Groups

Ask, Reflect, Text (ART) Strategy	Independent Sample t-Test			Ho
	T	df	Sig. 2-tailed	
	3.568	64	0.001	**Rejected**

B. Interpretation

From the result shown in the finding above, it can be seen that most of the students' pretest score in experimental group of SMA Nurul Iman Palembang had fair category (48.48 %) in writing skill, because most of them were difficult in finding and generating their ideas. According to Veit and Gould (2010, p. 325), when their teacher asks to write something on their paper, they had no ideas what they would write about. In addition, they couldn't write their narrative story

because their teacher never asked them to write narrative text, they also had poor grammar andd vocabulary. That is why, most of their score were fair.

Furthermore, the writer conducted Ask, reflect, Text (ART) strategy for the experimental group, the writer found that the eleventh grade students showed their enthusiastic and their motivation in learning English significantly improved or incresead. Hidi and Boscolo (2007, p. 5) say that motivation is inherent in writing as an authentic activity. It was because the students were active during teaching and learning process. In addition, it was also proved from their posttest score in experimental group. The result shown that, the eleventh grade students had good category (51.51 %) in their posttest, because most of the students got improvement on vocabulary, and the students felt confident when they delivered their opinions and thoughts. From the explanation, it could be stated that Ask, Reflect, Text (ART) strategy was useful strategy for the students to improve their narrative story writing.

The writer analyzed the normality of the sample data from pretest and posttest between control and experimental group to prove whether the sample of data was in normality or not. It could be stated that the p-output of students' pretest and posttest in control and experimental were normal. It was because the students had basic knowledge of English where they had ever learnt English in Elementary School (SD) and Junior High School (SMP) and also some of them ever took English course. It is line with Aulia (2011, p.56) who states that the students' writing achievement was in moderate and high category since the

parents provide learning facilities such as text books, internet, and additional course (e.g English course).

The writer measured the homogeneity of the sample data from pretest and posttest between control and experimental group to prove whether the sample of the data was in homogeneity or not. It can be interpreted that the p-output of students' pretest and posttest in control and experimental was homogeneous

From the result analysis of measuring significant difference from students' posttest scores in control and experimental group, it can be stated that there was a significant difference on the eleventh grade students' narrative writing achievement of SMA Nurul Iman Palembang between those who are taught by using ART strategy and those who are not. It is in line with what found by Dunn (2011) who said that there was significant improvement on the eighth grade students writing ability in narrative essay by using Ask, Reflect, Text (ART) strategy. In addition, ART strategy can be used for disability students. Dunn, Tudor, Scattergood & Closson (2011) suggest that a targeted intervention like ART can help both students without disabilities and struggling writers improve their skills, and can also engage other students.

From the interpretation above, it showed that Ask, Reflect, Text (ART) strategy is a useful strategy for students in developing their narrative writing skill. ART strategy brings some advantages for the students and also for the teacher. Students felt excited to write narrative text. They felt that by using ART strategy, they enhanced their writing skill. The factors were because this strategy provided some pictures for students to make them easier in writing narrative, some

vocabulary were given to the students to help them in composing narrative text. In addition, they did in pairs.

Moreover, the students felt that this strategy really supported them in developing their story writing skill. It is supported by Dunn (2011, p.386) who states that ART strategy helps students who struggled with writing narrative stories. It also helps students in producing more elaborate text as well as improving their story-writing skills. Furthemore, this strategy also helped the teachers to make a direct process for students in making narrative text. This is in line with Dunn (2011, p.386) who says that ART strategy provides teachers with a straightforward process to guide students in producing narrative text.