CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATION

This chapter presents: (1) findings and (2) interpretation.

4.1 Findings

The findings of this research cover: (1) data descriptions; (2) prerequisite analysis; and (3) result of hypothesis testing.

4.1.1 Data Descriptions

In data descriptions, two analyses were conducted. They were distributions of frequency data and descriptive statistics.

4.1.1.1 Distributions of Frequency Data

In the distribution of data frequency, score, frequency, and percentage were analyzed. The scores were acquired from: (a) pretest scores of descriptive writing achievement in experimental group, (b) posttest scores of descriptive writing achievement in experimental group and control group.

(a) Students' Pretest Scores in Exsperimental Group

In distribution of data frequency the interval score, frequency and percentage were presented. The result of the pretest scores in exsperimental group is described in table 6 below:

Table 6: Frequency Data of Students' Pretest Scores in Experimental Group

Score	Frequency	Percentage (%)
31.00	1	3.1
32.00	1	3.1
37.00	1	3.1
38.00	1	3.1

39.00	4	12.5
41.00	3	9.4
43.00	2	6.3
46.00	1	3.1
47.00	2	6.3
49.00	4	12.5
50.00	1	3.1
51.00	1	3.1
52.00	1	3.1
56.00	1	3.1
57.00	1	3.1
59.00	1	3.1
63.00	2	6.3
66.00	1	3.1
68.00	1	3.1
Total	32	100

Based on the table above, it was found that there were one student (3.1%) who got 31, one student (3.1%) got 32, one students (3.1%) got 37, one student (3.1%) got 38, four students (9.4%) got 50, one student (3.1%) got 52, one student (3.1%) got 54, four students (12.5%) got 39, three students (9.4%) got 41, two students (6.3%) got 43, one student (3.1%) got 46, two students (6.3%) got 47, four students (12.5%) got 49, one student (3.1%) got 50, one student (3.1%) got 51, one student (3.1%) got 52, one student (3.1%) got 56, one student (3.1%) got 57, one student (3.1%) got 59, two students (6.3%) got 63, one student (3.1%) got 66, one student (3.1%) got 68.

Furthermore, there were 4 categories of students' writing achievement score. The classification writing achievementof the students' pretest score in experimentall group can be seen from the following table below:

Table 7: The Classification of Descriptive Writing Achievement Categories Students' Pretest Score in Experimental Group

The Range of Score	Number of Students	Percentage (%)	Writing Achievement Categories
86-100	0	0	Excellent
71- 85	0	0	Good
56 -70	7	21.8	Average
0-55	25	78.2	Poor
Total	32	100	

Based on the table above, it was found that the total number of sample was 32 students. There were seven students (21.8 %) in average category, twenty five students (78.2 %) in poor category.

(b) Students' Posttest Scores in Experimental Group

In distribution of data frequency, the result of the posttest scores in exsperimental group is described in table 8 below:

Table 8: **Frequency Data of Students' Posttest Scores in Experimental Group**

Score	Frequency	Percentage (%)
49.00	1	3.1
53.00	1	3.1
54.00	2	6.3
55.00	1	3.1
56.00	2	6.3

58.00	2	6.3
59.00	1	3.1
60.00	1	3.1
65.00	1	3.1
66.00	3	9.4
68.00	2	6.3
69.00	1	3.1
70.00	10	31.3
73.00	1	3.1
77.00	3	9.4
Total	32	100

Based on the table above, it was found that there were one student (3.1%) got 49, one student (3.1%) got 53, two students (6.3%) got 54, one student (3.1%) got 55, two students (6.3%) got 56, two students (6.3%) got 58, one student (3.1%) got 59, one student (3.1%) got 60, one student (3.1%) got 65, three students (9.4%) got 66, two students (6.3%) got 68, one student (3.1%) got 69, ten students (31.3%), got 70, one students (3.1%) got 73, three students (9.4%) got 77.

Furthermore, there were 4 categories of students' writing achievement score. The classification of writing achievement of the students' posttest score in experimental group can be seen from the following table below:

Table 9: **The Classification of Descriptive Writing Achievement Categories Students' Posttest Score in Experimental Group**

The Range of Score	Number of Students	Percentage (%)	Writing Achievement Categories

86-100	0	0	Excellent
71- 85	4	12.5	Good
56 -70	23	72.0	Average
0-55	5	15.6	Poor
Total	32	100	

Based on the table above, it was found that the total number of sample was 32 students. There was four students (12.5 %) in good category, twenty three students (72.0 %) in average category (65.6 %), and five students (15.6%) in poor category.

(c) Students' Pretest Scores in Control Group

In distribution of data frequency, the result of the pretest scores in control group is described in table 10 below:

Table 10: Frequency Data of Students' Pretest Scores in Control Group

Score	Frequency	Percentage (%)
31.00	2	6.3
34.00	1	3.1
37.00	1	3.1
41.00	2	6.3
43.00	1	3.1
46.00	2	6.3
48.00	4	12.5
53.00	1	3.1
54.00	3	9.4
56.00	3	9.4
58.00	1	3.1
59.00	2	6.3

60.00	1	3.1
61.00	1	3.1
62.00	1	3.1
63.00	2	6.3
64.00	1	3.1
65.00	1	3.1
68.00	1	3.1
71.00	1	3.1
Total	32	100

Based on the table above, it was found that there were two students (6.3%) got 31, one student (3.1%) got 34, one student (3.1%) got 37, two students (6.3%) got 41, one student (3.1%) got 43, two students (6.3%) got 46, four students (12.5%) got 48, one student (3.1%) got 53, three students (9.4%) got 54, three students (9.4%) got 56, one student (3.1%) got 58, two students (6.3%) got 59, one students (3.1%) got 60, one students (3.1%) got 61, one student (3.1%) got 62, two students (6.3%) got 63, one student (3.1%) got 64, one student (3.1%) got 65, one student (3.1%) got 68, one student (3.1%) got 71.

Furthermore, there were 4 categories of students' writing achievement score. The classification of writing achievement of the students' pretest score in control group can be seen from the following table below:

Table 11: The Classification of Descriptive Writing Achievement Categories Students' Pretest Score in Control Group

The Range of Score	Number of Students	Percentage (%)	Writing Achievement Categories

86-100	0	0	Excellent
71- 85	1	3.1	Good
56 -70	14	43.8	Average
0-55	17	53.2	Poor
Total	32	100	

Based on the table above, it was found that the total number of sample was 32 students. There were one student (3.1%) in good category, fourteen students (43.8%) in average category, and seventeen students (53.2%) in poor category.

(d) Students' Posttest Scores in Control Group

In distribution of data frequency, the result of the posttest scores in control group is described in table 12 below:

Table 12: Frequency Data of Students' Posttest Scores in Control Group

Score	Frequency	Percentage (%)
40.00	1	3.1
43.00	2	6.3
47.00	2	6.3
50.00	2	6.3
52.00	2	6.3
54.00	3	9.4
58.00	1	3.1
59.00	1	3.1
60.00	2	6.3
61.00	2	6.3
62.00	1	3.1
63.00	1	3.1
64.00	5	15.6
65.00	1	3.1

67.00	2	6.3
68.00	2	6.3
71.00	1	3.1
75.00	1	3.1
Total	32	100

Based on the table above, it was found that there were one student (3.1%) got 40, two students (6.3%) got 43, two students (6.3%) got 47, two students (6.3%) got 50, two students (6.3%) got 52, three students (9.4%) got 54, one student (3.1%) got 58, one student (3.1%) got 59, two students (6.3%) got 60, two students (6.3%) got 61, one student (3.1%) got 62, one student (3.1%) 63, five students (15.6%) got 64, one student (3.1%) got 65, two students (6.3%) got 67, two students (6.3%) got 68, one student (3.1%) got 71, one student (3.1%) got 75 .

The classification of writing achievementof the students' posttest score in control group can be seen from the following table below:

Table 13: **The Classification of Descriptive Writing Achievement Categories Students' Posttest Score in Control Group**

The Range of Score	Number of Students	Percentage (%)	Writing Achievement Categories
86-100	0	0	Excellent
71- 85	2	6.3	Good
56 -70	18	56.3	Average
0-55	12	37.6	Poor
Total	32	100	

Based on the table above, it was found that the total number of sample was 32 students. There were two students (6.3%) in good category, eightteen students (56.3%) in average category, and twelve students (37.6%) in poor category.

4.1.1.2 Descriptive Statistics

In the descriptive statistics, the total of sample (N), minimum and maximum scores, mean scores, standard deviation were analyzed. The score were acquired from; (1) pretest scores in experimental, (2) posttest scores in experimental group, (c) pretest scores in control group, and (4) posttest in control group.

(a) Students' Pretest Scores in Experimental Group

The result analysis of descriptive statistics of students' pretest in experimental group is described in table 14 below:

Table 14: **Descriptive Statistic on Students' Pretest Scores in Experimental Group**

Students' Pretest	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. D
Score	32	31.00	68.00	47.3125	9.45085

In descriptive statistics of students' pretest scores in experimental group, it showed that the total number of sample was 32 students. The minimum Pretest scores was 31.00, the maximum score was 68.00, the mean score was 47.3125 and the standard deviation was 9.45085.

(b) Students' Posttest Scores in Experimental Group

The result analysis of descriptive statistics of students' posttest in experimental group is described in Table 15 below:

Table 15: Descriptive Statistic on Students' Posttest Scores in Experimental Group

Students'	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. D
Posttest Score	32	49.00	77.00	65.1250	7.71572

In descriptive statistics of students' posttest scores in control group, it showed that the total number of sample was 32 students. The minimum posttest score was 49.00, the maximum score was 77.00, the mean score was 65.1250 and the standard deviation was 7.71572.

(c) Students' Pretest Scores in Control Group

The result analysis of descriptive statistics of students' pretest in Control group is described in Table 16 below:

Table 16: Descriptive Statistic on Students' Pretest Scores in Control Group

Students' Pretes	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. D
Score	32	31.00	71.00	52.4375	10.61933

In descriptive statistics of students' pretest scores in Experimental group, it showed that the total number of sample was 32 students. The minimum pretest scores was 31.00, the maximum score was 71.00, the mean score was 52.4375 and the standard deviation was 10.61933.

(d) Students' Posttest Scores in Control Group

The result analysis of descriptive statistics of students' posttest in Control group is described in table 17 below:

Table 17: Descriptive Statistic on Students' Posttest Scores in Experimental Group

Students'	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. D

Posttest Score	32	40.00	75.00	58.4687	8.75098

In descriptive statistics of students' posttest scores in Control group, it showed that the total number of sample was 32 students. The minimum Posttest scores was 40.00, the maximum score was 75.00, the mean score was 58.4687 and the standard deviation was 8.75098.

4.1.2 Prerequisite Analysis

In prerequisite analysis, there were two analyses conducted done. They were normality test and homogeneity test.

4.1.2.1 Normality Test

In measuring normality test, *1 Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov* was used. The normality test was used to measure students' pretest and posttest in control and experimental group.

(a) Students' Pretest Scores in Control and Experimental Groups

The computations of normality used the computation in SPSS 20. The result of analysis is figured out in table 18 below:

Table 18: The Result of Normality Test of Students' Pretest in Experimental and Control Groups

No	Students' Pretest	N	Kolmogronov Smirnov	Sig.	Result
1	Control Group	32	0.684	0.737	Normal
2	Experimental Group	32	0.660	0.777	Normal

Based on the table above, the result showed that the significance value of the students' pretest in control group was 0.737, while the experimental group was

0.777. Therefore, it could be stated that the students' pretest score in experimental and control groups were considered normal since the result of the 1-sample kolmogronov smirnov were higher than 0.05.

(b) Students' Posttest Scores in Control and Experimental Groups

The computations of normality used the computation in SPSS 20. The result of analysis is figured out in table 19 below:

Table 19: The Result of Normality Test of Students' Posttest in Control and Experimental Groups

No	Students' Posttest	N	Kolmogronov Smirnov	Sig.	Result
1	Control Group	32	0.746	0.633	Normal
2	Experimental Group	32	0.999	0.271	Normal

Based on the table above, the result showed that the significance value of the students' posttest in control group was 0.746, while the experimental group was 0.999. From the score, it could be stated that the students' posttest score in experimental and control groups were considered normal since the result of the 1-sample kolmogronov smirnov were higher than 0.05.

4.1.2.2Homogeneity Test

In measuring homogeneity test Levene statistics was used. Levene statistics is a formula that isused to analyze the homogeneity of the data. The homogeneity test was used to measure students' pretest scores in experimental and control groups, and students' posttest scores in experimental and control groups.

(a) Students' Pretest Scores in Control and Experimental Group

Table 20: Homogeneity Test of Students' Pretest Scores in Control and Experimental groups

No	Students' Pretest	N	Levene Statistic	Sig.	Result
1	Control Group	32	0.832	0.365	Homogen
2	Experimental Group	32			Homogen

Based on table above, it was found that the p-output is 0.365. Therefore, it could be stated that the obtained score from students' pretest in experimental and control groups are homogenous, because it is higher than 0.05.

(b) Students' Posttest Scores in Control and Experimental Group

Table 21: Homogeneity Test of Students' Posttest Scores in Control and Experimental group

No	Students' Pretest	N	Levene Statistic	Sig.	Result
1	Control Group	32	0.445	0.507	Homogen
2	Experimental Group	32			Homogen

Based on table above, it was found that the p-output was 0.507. Therefore, it could be stated that the obtained score from students' posttest in experimental and control groups are homogenous, because it is higher than 0.05.

4.1.3 The Result of Hypotheses Testing

In this study, Independent sample t-test was used to measure a significant difference on the tenth grade students' descriptive writing achievement taught by using Guided Writing strategy and those who were not at SMA Muhammadiyah 6 Palembang. Two Way ANOVA was used to measure a significant difference on the tenth grade students' descriptive achievement in exellent, good, average, and

poor category between those who are taught by Guided Writing strategy and those who are not at SMA Muhammadiyah 6 Palembang.

4.1.3.1 Result Analysis of Independent Sample T-test from Students' Posttest Scores in Control and Experimental Groups.

In this research, independent sample t-test was used to measure the significant difference on students' recount writing scores between those who are taught by Guided Writing strategy and those who were not at SMA Muhammadiyah 6 Palembang. The analysis result of independent sample t-test was figured out in table 22 below.

Table 22: Result Analysis of Independent Sample T-test from Students' Posttest Scores in Control and Experimental Groups

Using Guided Writing strategy and those who were taught by using teacher's method	Independent Sample t-Test					Ho	Ha
	Group	Mean	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)		
	Control	58.4688	-3.227	62	0.002	Rejected	Accepted
	Experimental	65.1250					

From the table analysis, it was found that the p-output was 0.002 and the t-obtained was -3.227. Since the p-output was lower than 0.05. It can be stated that there was a significant difference on students' descriptive writing score taught by Guided Writing strategy and those who were not at SMA Muhammadiyah 6 Palembang.

4.1.3.2 Result Analysis in Measuring Significant Difference Using Two-Way ANOVA from Students' Posttest in Experimental and Control Group

In this research, two-way ANOVA was used to measure the significant difference on students' descriptive writing scores in good, fair, and poor category

between those who are taught by Guided Writing strategy and those who were not at SMA Muhammadiyah 6 Palembang. The analysis result of two-way ANOVA was figured out in table 22 below.

Table 22: Result Analysis of Two-way ANOVA Sample T-test from Students' Posttest Scores in Experimental Group

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable:Score

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	3776,011[a]	4	944,003	48,333	,000
Intercept	74582,684	1	74582,684	3818,617	,000
Strategy	1453,730	1	1453,730	74,431	,000
Teaching	3,296	1	3,296	,169	,683
Strategy * Teaching	33,207	1	33,207	1,700	,197
Error	1152,349	59	19,531		
Total	249335,000	64			
Corrected Total	4928,359	63			

a. R Squared = ,766 (Adjusted R Squared = ,750)

Based on analysis of two-way ANOVA from students' posttest scores in control group with 32 students and experimental group with 32 students in (good, average and poor) categories. It could be seen that there were 6 students includes in good category, 41 students included in average category and 17 students included in poor category.

The statistical analysis in measuring significant difference more than two variable using two-way ANOVA found that the p-output was 0,197. From the p- output it can be stated that there is no significant interaction effect of writing category on student's writing skill achievement taught using GWS and conventional strategy because p-output was higher than 0,05. It means that there is no differences both

categories good, average, and poor are same, Guided Writing Strategy and teacher's strategy can be applied in both of categories.

4.2 Interpretation

Based on of findings stated previously, some interpretations could be drawn. Before conducting this research, I interviewed the teacher of English at SMA Muhammdiyah 6 Palembang. Based on the interview, it was acquired that the students got some problems in learning English especially writing skill. After conducting the research, it was found that the data of the students' pretest and posttest in experimental and control group were normal and homogenous. In analyzing the normality test, 1-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used. From the result, it could be stated that the students' pretest and posttest scores in experimental and control groups were categorized normal since the significance of normality test was higher than 0.05. Then, I analyzed the homogeneity of the sample data from pretest and posttest between experimental and control groups. In analyzing the homogeneity test, Levene statistics was used. From the result, it could be stated that the students' pretest scores in experimental and control groups and the students' posttest scores in control and experimental groups were homogenous. It is emphasized that the abilities of the students were the same.

From the result of independent sample t-test, it was found that there was significant difference between the students' posttest score of experimental group who were taught by using guided writing strategy and the control group who were taught by using strategy that was used by the teacher of English at SMA Muhammdiyah 6 Palembang. Moreover, from the result of two-way ANOVA, it

was found that there were no significant differences on students' descriptive writing scores in excellent, good, average, and poor category between those who were taught by guided writing strategy and those who were not at SMA Muhammadiyah 6 Palembang.

There were differences found on students' attitudes of experimental group toward the material during treatment in 12 meetings excluding pretest and posttest. In the first and second meetings, the students were still confused about guided strategy. Therefore, I managed the students in doing the treatment. Besides, I also demonstrated guided writing strategy during the treatment. Until the third meetings, the students were still confused in understanding the material. The student did not know how to start and how to write descriptive text. Between fourth and seventh meeting, they slowly could manage to start understanding the text. Finally, on the eighth to twelve meeting they could they could write descriptive text well based on the topic given by the teacher. They felt that it was easy to understand descriptive text, because they could share the information from the texts and they could activate their prior knowledge.

Based on the result in the research, guided writng strategy was effective to be applied to the tenth grade students of SMA Muhammadiyah 6 Palembang. Guided writing strategy is a strategy in writing. Guided writing strategy significantly improved the students' ability in teaching and learning English. Khatri (2014) states that the effectiveness of guided writing in teaching composition from outcome of average increment shows that experimental group perfomed better than that control group as whole. I also found that guided writing

strategy can make students to be actively in learning process. It is supported by Dyan (2010) explain that guided writing strategy is strategy that the students showed great interest to be actively involved and participating in teaching and learning process.

Finally, it was infered thst the implementation of guided writing strategy showed significant difference on students' reading comprehension at SMA Muhammadiyah 6 Palembang. Guided writing strategy succesfully motived the students in learning descriptive text in writing and made the students interested and active in learning English. It could be assumed that guided writing strategy is effective to teach writing to the students.