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**CHAPTER 1**

**INTRODUCTION**

 In this chapter, the writer presents (a) background of the study; (b) problem of the study; (c) objective of the study; (d) significances of the study; (e) hypothesis; (f) criteria for testing the hyphothesis.

1. **Background of the Study**

 In Indonesia, many people learn the International language. One of the International languages is English. It is taught at school from the elementary level up to the university as foreign language. It has become a required subject that needs to be taught to all students. So, it has an important role in communication to interact with another people in the world.

 Basically, there are four language skills in English such as listening, speaking, reading and writing (Saleh 1992: 27 as cited by Sari 2013: 1). Writing as a part of the language skills besides listening, reading, speaking. According to Zamel (2007: 207), writing is a process which the people can explore and discover their thoughts and ideas in written form. Besides that, writing system is a system of written symbols which represent the sounds, syllables, or word of language (Richards, 1985: 409).

From statement above, it can be assumed that writing is a very important subject because we have to share idea from our brain in writing. It is not easy to choose the words and combine them into a good paragraph. Beside that we have to pay attention in the grammatical sentence. So it is normal, if the students think that writing is difficult subject because they have to pay attention many things such as; idea, concept, vocabulary and grammar. Based on Curriculum of junior high school which recommended by the government, there are some texts which have to be mastered by the junior high school students, one of the texts is descriptive text.

 According to Sari (2013: 2), there are three reason that the students have difficulties in writing; they are: (1) the students are lack of vocabulary mastery so they are not able to express their ideas in appropriate English words; (2) the students are lack of grammar mastery so they are not able to write grammatical sentence; (3) the students are lack of motivation in learning writing so they have a bad performance in writing.

 When the writer observed teaching learning process at eight grade students of MTs Negeri 2 Palembang, the writer found some problems faced by students especially in writing, they are: (1) writing is unenjoyable activity which was caused by teachers’ technique in teaching learning process, the teachers only focused on English guidebook that seemed to be monotonous, so the students got bored during the teaching learning process and they were not interested in writing composition; (3) the students have lack of vocabulary, especially in choosing the words and combining them into a good paragraph. So, the students are still in doubt and confused to start writing well; (3) the students felt difficult to choose an ideas and combine them into a good sentence arrangement. If this condition continued, the students’ competences are not able to fulfill in teaching learning process. To solve the problems above, the writer is interested to apply inquiry technique in teaching of writing skill to improve students’ writing skill at MTs Negeri 2 Palembang .

 According to Roestiyah (2008: 76), inquiry can develop *self concept* on students’ selves, so the students can understand about basic concept (steps) and the students can propose their ideas and make report from observation result. By applying inquiry technique, students are encouraged to discover for themselves what should they describe about the object. For example, the students found the information about the object being observed by themselves. After that, the students wrote the data in descriptive paragraph form after they got the data.

 From definition above, it can be assumed that by applying inquiry technique, the students got the information from the object being observed by themselves, and the students could express their ideas into good writing. So, inquiry technique can be done by introducing topics and processing good writing. In other words, students are not only as receiver through teacher's explanation but they are active to find the information from observation result and the teacher as a facilitator and motivator to students in teaching learning process.

 From statement above, the writer is interested in doing research study entitles **“IMPROVING STUDENTS’ WRITING SKILL BY USING INQUIRY TECHNIQUE AT THE EIGHTH GRADE STUDENTS OF MTS NEGERI 2 PALEMBANG”.**

1. **Problem of the Study:**

 Is there any significant difference on students’ writing achievement between the students who were taught by using inquiry technique and those who were taught by teachers’ technique to the eighth grade students of MTs Negeri 2 Palembang?

1. **Objective of the Study**

 The objective of this study is to find out whether or not there is a significant difference on students’ writing achievement between the students who were taught by using inquiry technique and the students who were not taught by using inquiry technique to the eighth grade students of MTs Negeri 2 Palembang.

1. **Significances of the Study**

 By writing the thesis entitled “ Improving Students’ Writing Skill by Using Inquiry Technique at the Eighth Grade Students of MTS Negeri 2 Palembang”. Hopefully, the writer can have some significant result. Possible significant results that can be expected :

1. To give information to the English teacher that inquiry technique makes to the students more active to explore their idea in teaching learning process especially in writing.
2. To develop of cognitive, affective, and psychomotor in learning aspects.
3. By doing the research, the writer can have the experience and enlarge her knowledge in teaching process.
4. **Hypothesis**

 According to Riduwan (2008: 162), state that Hypothesis is simply put a prediction of the possible outcomes of a study. There are two hypotheses to be tasted, and they are: null hypothesis and alternative hypothesis as follows:

1. Null hypothesis (Ho) : There is no significant difference on students’ writing achievement between the students who were taught by using inquiry technique and the students who were not taught by using inquiry technique to the eighth grade students of MTs Negeri 2 Palembang.
2. Alternative hypothesis (Ha) : There is significant difference on students’ writing achievement between the students who were taught by using inquiry technique and the students who were not taught by using inquiry technique to the eighth grade students of MTs Negeri 2 Palembang.
3. **The Criteria for Testing the Hyphotesis**

 The criteria used for testing hypothesis are follows as :

1. If the p-output (Sig.2-tailed) is lower than 0.05, the null hyphotesis (Ho) is rejected, and the alternative hyphotesis (Ha) is accepted. It means that there is means significant difference or influence.
2. The alternative hypothesis (Ha) will be accepted if the result t-test calculation is higher than t-table. It means that (Ho) is rejected.

**CHAPTER II**

**LITERATURE REVIEW AND PREVIOUS RELATED STUDIES**

 In this chapter, the writer presents (a) the definition of writing; (b) the concept of writing process; (c) descriptive writing; (d) the definition of inquiry technique; (e) the advantages of inquiry technique; (f) the profile of school; (g) previous related studies.

1. **The Definition of Writing**

 Writing is a way for communication to express our feels, ideas, thoughts in written form. According to Hogue (1996: 2), writing to explain something or give information about something with people in writing form. Moreover, writing is not only require mastery of grammatical and rhetorical devices but also of conceptual and judgemental elements (Heaton 1990: 135). Beside that, Triagan (1986: 15) as cited by Zhaminang (2013: 2), adds that writing is an activity which expression of idea, message or information in written form. Furthermore, according to Basturmen cited by Cenrikawaty (2008: 7), mentions that writing is a way to express the ideas, emotion, feels, and opinion in written form.

 Writing is considered as a difficult skill because it involves many aspects. Some of them refer to language use is the ability to write correctly and appropriate sentences; mechanical skills refer to the ability to use punctuation correctly and grammatical sentence; the content refers the ability to think creatively and develop thought including all relevant information; stylistic skill refers to the ability to manipulate sentences and use language effectively; judgment skill refers to the ability to select, organize and order relevant information.

 From definition above, it can be assumed that writing is a process of expressing ideas, thoughts, feels in order to communicate to other people in written form but we have to pay attention of grammatical sentence.

1. **The Concept of Writing Process**

 Reading and writing are symbiotic mutually beneficial processing. Through reading, the students are able to get ideas and information; the students are able to investigate the structure of various written form. For example, the students are interested in football athletes, they could read biographies of Bambang Pamungkas and Markus Horizon and the students are able to know a good writing process. According to Tompkins (1994: 7), the writing process is a way of discovering idea as well as a way expressing them, we can express our think, ideas, information in our mind that we got around us then write it in a paragraph.

 Furthermore, according to Oshima and Hogue as cited by Holandyah (2007: 3), There are four main stages in writing process: Prewriting , Planning (outlining) writing, Revising draft, and Writing the final copy to hand in. In outlining, according to Oshima and Hogue (1996: 21), state that outline :

An outline is like an architect’s plan house. An architect plans a house before it is built to make sure that all the parts will fit. Like an architect, you should plan a paragraph before you write it to make sure that all your ideas will fit. Learning to outline will improve your writing for there reasons. First, It will help you organize your ideas. Second, It will help you write more quickly. Finally, your grammar will improve because you will be able to concentrate on it, not on your thoughts or organization. (Oshima and Hogue, 1996: 21)

 Furthermore, an outline is a plan and organize the main topic and supporting detail in a paragraph (Hutchinson 2005: 12 ). In the concept of writing process especially planning (outlining) according to Oshima and Hogue as cited by Holandyah (2007: 8), there are five steps in planning or outlining :

|  |
| --- |
| Topic sentence |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| $1^{st}$Supporting detail | $$2^{nd} Supporting detail$$ | $3^{rd}$ Supporting detail | Concluding sentence |

According to Seen and Skinner (1992: 9) as cited by Sari, adds that there are five the concepts of writing process:

1. Prewriting includes all the planning steps that you can take before you write the first draft. During prewriting you find a subject, develop it, organize the details.
2. Drafting is expressing your ideas in written form.
3. Revising is looking carefully at what you have written and reworking it to be as clear, smooth, and strong as it can be.
4. Editing means checking your final draft for mistakes in grammar, usage, spelling, and mechanics and correcting any errors you may find.
5. Publishing means presenting your finished word to others in appropriate way.
6. **Descriptive Writing**

 Writing is a way for communication to express our thought, and ideas in written form. There are four kinds of paragraph in writing as we know: narrative paragraph; expository paragraph; descriptive paragraph; persuasive paragraph.According to Schacter (1998: 5), descriptive paragraph describes a person, place, or thing in a way that enables the reader to visualize it in written form. Beside that Longman (2007: 2), adds that the writer uses sensory details such as sights, sounds, smells, tastes, feels, and textures to create vivid images reader’s mind in descriptive paragraph.

 Furthermore, Tompkins (1994: 108), mentions descriptive is a description of event, characters from literature, results of experiments, observation of classroom animals, art prints, historical events and personalities, and current events. Beside that descriptive paragraph explains how someone or something looks or feels (Zemack and Rumisek 2003: 30). Zaida (2009: 9), adds that descriptive paragraph to describe person, place, or thing in written form. This is the example of descriptive paragraph:

**My Grandmother**

My Grandmother is a very gentle, loving, and caring person. She never raises her voice at anyone. She has lived with me for as long as I can remember. She takes care of me when mom and dad go to work. She is a very neat and tidy person. She has very dry grey hair which she usually pulls up into a bun. She has dark brown eyes that twinkle whenever she sees me. I hardly ever see them wet. She likes to tell stories. She usually tells me brief stories of her childhood and expresses them very well with her tire, old, wrinkled hands. Sometimes, she also tells story about my grandfather who has passed away. My dear grandmother always says good things about him. She once told me that he was the nicest person she had ever met. So, I really love mygrandmother. (Zaida, 2009: 10)

Based on the example above, it can be assumed that descriptive paragraph can give the sense to reader directly. The readers are able to understand what the character of someone in that paragraph by imagine what they read descriptive appeals to the senses, so it tells how something looks, feels, tastes, and sounds. A good description is a word picture which the readers can imagine of the object, place, or person in their mind; In descriptive paragraph the writer have to put more details the object, the reader will imagine what you are describing clearly.

1. **The Definition of Inquiry Technique**

 According to Kuhlthau, Collier Carol (2007: 22), mention that inquiry is a technique that develop a conceptual understanding of the subject or topic from investigation. In this way, when the writer explore and formulate idea, but the writer is able to know the writing process well. In other words, inquiry is closely related to the writing process that prepare to students by giving something to talk and write about in writing. It is during the inquiry process that the students build construction such as writing, composing and creating in writing. Besides that Inquiry engages students in analyze, concrete data to help them develop ideas and content for writing (Graham and Perin 2007: 27). Beside that inquiry can develop *self concept* on students’ selves, so the students can understand about basic concept (steps) and the students can propose their ideas and make report from observation result (Roestiyah 2008: 76). Lane ( 2007: 1), adds that inquiry is a technique that actively students in the exploration of the content, issues, and questions surrounding area or concept.

 Moreover, according to Vancouver (2011 : 6), mentions that there are five steps in inquiry technique in writing:

1. Connect and wonder:

 It means that the students are able to identify subject or topic from investigation; the students are able to give predict and hypothesize about the object.

1. Investigate

 It means that the students are able to select information or data about the object; the students are able to difference main ideas from supporting details; the students are able to the sort information by topic and sub-topic.

1. Construct

 It means that the students are able to organize the information or data about object and develop the information into a good paragraph.

1. Express

 It means that the students are able to communicate using a variety of expressive formats, such as: software, and technology tools, music, art, drama, and writing.

1. Reflect

 It means that the students are able to reflect the central concepts of the material learned.

 Moreover, according to Trianto (2009: 166), the teacher has an important role in teaching learning process when the teacher applies inquiry technique, such as:

1. Motivator, to give stimulus for students more active and enthusiastic.
2. Facilitator, to present way out if the students have difficult.
3. Informant to the students about they make mistakes.
4. Administrator, responsible of all activities in the classroom.
5. Director, to guide the students to achieve the goals in teaching learning process.
6. Manager, to manage time, learning resource, and organization in the classroom.
7. Reward, to give respect on student achievement.

1. **The Advantages of Applying Inquiry Technique**

 According to Roestiyah (2008: 76), mentions that there are three advantages of inquiry, such as:

1. The situation becomes more stimulating to students in teaching learning process.
2. To help in using memory and transfer to a new learning situation.
3. Students are able to think intuitively and formulate of their hypothesis.
4. **The Profile of the School**

 MTs Negeri 2 Palembang was an institution of vocational education of teacher trainning areas, namely Education Teacher of Religious Affair (PGAN) about six years ago. But since 1978, it has been changed becoming an Islamic Junior High School where provide education in religious studies and general national curriculum. The located of MTs Negeri 2 Palembang is at Inspektur Marzuki Km 4,5 Rt 02 Rw 06 Pakjo Palembang. The headmaster is H. Kiagus Faisal S.Ag, M.Pd.I.

 The certificate of accreditation and modal from the ministry of religious affairs of the Republic of Indonesia; South Sumatra Province, Regional office number RI No. E/54/1998 dated 14 March 1998 for MTs Negeri 2 Palembang is rated A and MTs Negeri 2 Palembang became one of model an Islamic Junior High School at Palembang. Furthermore, MTs Negeri 2 Palembang has a vision, and mission. its vision is good attitude, excellence and achievement. scientific. The mission are education is oriented to the Islamic concept, creative and innovative.

 Having surveyed to the school, the writer got some data about teachers, students, and facilitations of the school. There are four tables which explain them. The first table, it is explained that MTs N 2 Palembang has a headmaster and four staffs with different gender and education degrees. H. Kiagus Faisal S.Ag, M.Pd.I. as a headmaster of MTs N 2 Palembang and he has S.2 education degree.

 Then, Rusmala Dewi, MM as a vice headmaster of curriculum affair, Dra. Meisabrina Cahaya Ningsih as a students’ affair , Drs. Iskandar as a public relation affair, Yusri Erlini, S.Pd as a facilitation affair. They are all S.1 education qualification. This table shows the headmaster and staffs of MTs N 2Palembang.

**Table 1**

**Headmaster and Staffs**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Name** | **Position** | **M** | **F** | **Education degree** |
| 1 | H.Kiagus Faisal M.Pd I | Headmaster | M |  | S.2 |
| 2 | Rusmala Dewi M.M | Vice headmaster of Curriculum affair |  | F | S.2 |
| 3 | Dra. Meisabrina Cahaya S.Pd | Students’affair |  | F | S.1 |
| 4 | Drs. Iskandar | Public Relation affair | M |  | S.1 |
| 5 | Yusri Erlini, S.Pd | Facilitation affair |  | F | S.1 |

 The second table is the number of teacher in teaching at the appropriate teachers’ education background. There are three Civics teachers; fourteen Religion teachers; six Indonesian teachers; six English teachers; three Sport teachers; four Arabic teachers; five Math teachers; two Art teachers; two Computer teachers; nine Biology teacher; five Social teachers; two Counseling teachers. All of them are S.1 education qualification. Besides that, there are seven teachers with S.2 education qualification. See the following table 2:

**Table 2**

**The Total of Teachers in Teaching at the Appropriate Teacher’s Education Background (skill)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Teacher** | **The total of the teachers at the appropriate education background in teaching skill** | **Total** |
| **SMA** | **D.3** | **S.1** | **S.2** |
| 1 | Civil |  |  | 3 |  | 3 |
| 2 | Religion |  |  | 11 | 3 | 14 |
| 3 | Indonesian |  |  | 6 |  | 6 |
| 4 | History |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | English |  |  | 5 | 1 | 6 |
| 6 | Sport |  |  | 3 |  | 3 |
| 7 | Arabic |  |  | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| 8 | Math |  |  | 5 |  | 5 |
| 9 | Art |  |  | 2 |  | 2 |
| 10 | Computer |  |  | 2 |  | 2 |
| 11 | Biology |  |  | 8 | 1 | 9 |
| 12 | Social |  |  | 5 |  | 5 |
| 13 | Counseling |  |  | 1 | 1 | 2 |
|  | Total | 54 | 7 | 61 |

( *Source : Administration Of Mts N 2 Palembang*)

 The third table is the total number of the rooms. There are 28 rooms consisting of 10 classrooms for seventh grade students; 10 classrooms for eighth grade students; 8 classrooms for nineth grade students with the total number are 28 classrooms. Then, there are 10 other rooms consisting headmaster room; teachers’ room; library room; computer room; biology laboratory; TU room; 23 toilets; an UKS room; a BK room and a mushola. See the following table 3:

**Table 3**

**The Type of the Rooms**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Type of the Rooms** | **Total** |
| 1 | Class room | 28 |
| 2 | Headmaster room | 1 |
| 3 | Teachers’ room | 1 |
| 4 | Library | 1 |
| 5 | Computer room | 1 |
| 6 | TU | 1 |
| 7 | Toilet  | 23 |
| 8 | UKS | 1 |
| 9 | Counseling (BK) | 1 |
| 10 | Mushola | 1 |

(*Source : Administration of MTs N 2 Palembang*)

 The fourth table is the total of students in 2013-2014 period. There are 814 students consisting of 302 seventh grade students with the total 144 of male students and 158 for the female students. 287 students for eighth grade students with the total 113 of male students and 174 of female students. Then also, 200 students for nineth grade students with the total 98 of male students and 127 of female students. See the following table 4:

**Table 4**

**The Data of Students 2013-2014**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Class** | **Number of Students** | **Total** |
| **M** | **F** |
| 1 |  VII | 144 | 158 | 302 |
| 2 |  VIII | 113 | 175 | 287 |
| 3 | IX | 98 | 127 | 225 |
|  | Total | 335 | 459 | 814 |

 **(***Source: Administration of MTs N 2 Palembang)*

The last table, shows the number of education qualification; status; gender. There are seven persons of S.2 degree and 54 persons of S.1. They are males and females of civil servant status. See the following table 5:

**Table 5**

 **Qualification of Education, Status, Gender, and Total**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Education Degree** | **Number and Teacher Status** | **Total** |
| **Civil Servant** | **Non-Civil Servant** |
| **M F** | **M F** |
| 1 | S.2 |  7 0 | 0 0 | 7 |
| 2 | S.1 | 9 37 | 4 7 | 54 |
| 3 | D.3 |  0 0 | 0 0 | 0 |
|  | Total |   |   | 61 |

 Source: Administration of MTs Negeri 2 Palembang

1. **Previous Related Studies**

 There have been four researchers doing the research about inquiry technique and writing, there are: Yuni Cenrikawaty (2008), Mawar Rosa Indah Sari(2009), Ricka Febriyanti (2010), Ayi Sarihayati (2011).There are similarities and differences between those previous studies and the writer’s present of thesis.

The similarities of the theses between the writer’s study and related previous studies are: the same technique and writing form. Beside that the differences of these studies are: (1) the population and sample; (2) genre; (3) location.

 Yuni Cenrikawaty (2008) “ Improving the Students’ Ability in Writing Analytical Expository Text Through Contextual Teaching and Learning (CTL)” at the Second Grade Students of SMA N 1 Ranah Pesisir Padang. The purpose of this research was to find out whether Contextual Teaching and Learning (CTL) can increase students’ ability in writing analytical expository text. The result of the study showed that there was improvement on students’ writing analytical expository text through CTL based on cycles which used by researcher.

 Mawar Rosa Indah Sari (2009) “Teaching Narrative Writing by Using Outline to the Tenth Year Students of SMA N 15 Palembang”. The objective of this study was to know the effectiveness of teaching narrative writing by using outline to the tenth year students of SMA N 15 Palembang. The result of study showed that the students who taught narrative by using outline more effective in improving the tenth year students’ writing achievement at SMA N 15 Palembang which seems that there were significant difference between the students’ scores in pretest and posttest.

 Ricka Febriyanti (2010) “ The Application of Inquiry of Contextual Teaching and Learning in Teaching Preposition of Place to the Seventh Year Students of SMP Bina Cipta Palembang”. The objective of the study was to find out whether or not teaching preposition of place through inquiry was more effective to students of seventh grade students of SMP Bina Cipta Palembang. The result of the study showed that the students who taught preposition of place by using inquiry got higher value of t score than the students who were not. The gained t was higher than the value of the t-table which was effective in teaching preposition of place to the seventh year students of SMP Bina Cipta Palembang.

 Ayi Sarihayati (2011) “Pembelajaran Menulis Karangan Eksposisi dengan Metode *Inquiry* Di Kelas V MI Islamiyah Pamoyanan Kecamatan Plered Kabupaten Purwakarta”. The result of her research showed that inquiry technique could improve students’ writing ability. It can be seen from the average obtained increased. Thus it can be said application of inquiry methods can improve Exposition writing of learning in MI Islamiyah Pamoyanan Kecamatan Plered Kabupaten Purwakarta.

**CHAPTER III**

**METHODS AND PROCEDURES**

 In this chapter, the writer presents (a) method of research; (b) variables of the study; (c) operational definition; (d) population and sample; (e) technique for collecting data; (f) validity and reliability of the test; (g) technique for analyzing data; (h) Teaching procedure by inquiry technique.

1. **Method of the Research**

 In doing this research, the writer used an experimental method. The design selected for this study was quasi-experimental research design. It means a design does not random in selecting sample of the research (Fraenkel and Wallen, 1990: 242). In this study, nonequivalent control group design was used. There were two groups such as experimental and control group which both were given pretest and posttest, but only experimental group was given treatment by using inquiry technique. According to Sugiono (2012: 77), the form of this design as follows:

$O\_{1}$ X $O\_{2}$

..................

$O\_{3}$ $O\_{4}$

In which

.............. : dash line present that the experimental and control group

 that have not been equated by randomization

 : Pretest of experimental group

 : Posttest of experimental group

 : Pretest of control group

 : Posttest of control group

 X : Treatment by using inquiry technique

 In this research, the writer conducted an experiment by doing an actual teaching to the experimental group. Before the treatment, a pretest was administrated to both groups. They were to be assigned to descriptive writing, based on their knowledge before. But only one group was given treatment.

 The treatment was given by using inquiry technique in experimental group. Furthermore, the students had three meeting in one week. So, there were 14 meetings with 2x40 minutes of duration in teaching learning process, included pre-test and post-test. The writer prepared 12 lesson plans with different materials during in research. At the end of whole meeting, the students were given a posttest to determine the effect of the treatment and to see the progress of them.

1. **Variable of the Study**

 According to Arikunto (2006: 118), a variable is the object of research or something which is being focused on the research. There are two kinds of in this research, they are ; independent variable and dependent variable. Furthermore, Sugiyono (2010: 4), mentions that independent variable is a variable which has influence of dependent variable. Beside that the dependent variable is a variable which influenced by independent variable. In this study, the independent variable of this research is inquiry technique in writing. Dependent variable of this research is the students’ writing skill.

1. **Operational Definition**

This study is related to Improving Students Writing Skill by Using Inquiry technique. Therefore, to avoid misunderstanding, it is necessary to define some terms they are; improving, writing, inquiry technique.

 *Improving* is derived from world to improve which means to make or become better; *Writing* is a way for communication to express our feeling, and ideas in written form; *Inquiry technique* is a technique that found the information about the object being observed by students’selves. After that, it wrote the data in descriptive paragraph form.

1. **The Population and Sample**
	* 1. **Population**

 According to Holandyah (2013: 167), Population is whole number of objects which are going to be investigated in a research study. In this research, the population is all of eight grade students of MTS N 2 Palembang in academic of 2013-2014 with a total number of 287 students. Table 6 shows the population of the study.

**TABLE 6**

**The Population of Study**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Class** | **Total of Students** |
| 1 | VIII.Olimpiade  | 25 |
| 2 | VIII. Axcel | 25 |
| 3 | VIII. A Plus | 23 |
| 4 | VIII.A  | 31 |
| 5 | VIII.B | 31 |
| 6 | VIII.C | 30 |
| 7 | VIII.D | 32 |
| 8 | VIII.E | 30 |
| 9 | VIII.F | 35 |
| 10 | VIII.G | 25 |
|  | Total | 287 |

(*Source : MTS NEGERI 2 PALEMBANG 2013-2014)*

* + 1. **Sample**

 According to Arikunto (2006: 131), sample is a part of population, which is used to be observed. In this study, the writer used convenience sampling method to select the sample. According to Fraenkel and Wallen (1990: 75), mention that convenience sample is a group of individuals who chosen by principal. The writer decided VIII A and VIII.C as the sample because the principal asked the writer to help the teacher to compare both of them. The table 7 below showed the sample of the study.

 **TABLE 7**

**The Sample of the Study**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No** |  **Class**  | **Total** |
| 1 | VIII. A (Experimental group) | 31 |
| 2 | VIII. B (Control group) | 31 |
| TOTAL | 62 |

 Based on the table above, the writer divided them into two groups. 31 students of VIII A as experimental group and 31 students of VIII B as control group. From each the group was given pretest and posttest but only one group was given treatment in VIII A as experimental group.

 Before the writer taught writing by using inquiry technique in experimental group, the writer gave pretest to the students of experimental and control groups. Table 8 shows the students’ result in pretest of experimental and control groups (*See* Appendix C).

1. **Technique for Collecting Data**

 In this research, the writer used written test to students (*See* Appendix A). According to Arikunto (1996: 51), a test is a tool or procedure used to determine or measure a person’s ability, knowledge and performance in a given domain.

 A test used by the writer as her instrument in writing test, was used twice ; for pretest and posttest. First, the pretest is administered to find out the students’ writing skill before applying inquiry technique as a treatment in experimental group. The posttest will be given after treatment has been given in order to find out the progress of the students’ writing achievement. In scoring students’ writing skill, the writer employed the scale described by Weigle (2002: 117). According to Weigle (2002: 117), there are five components for scoring the students’ writing, they are: content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanic. Let us see the following diagram below:

**TABLE 9**

**The Component for Scoring the Students’ Writing**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| COMPONENT | INDICATOR | SCORE | STATEMENT |
| Content | 1. Excellent to very good
 | 30 – 27 | Knowledgeable substantive, thorough development of thesis, relevant to assigned topic |
| 1. Good to average
 | 26 – 22  | Some knowledge of subject, adequate range, limited development of thesis. Mostly relevant to topic but lack detail. |
| 1. Fair to poor
 | 21 – 17 | Limited knowledge of subject, little substance, inadequate development topic. |
| 1. Very poor
 |  16 – 13  | Does not show knowledge of subject. non subjective. |
| Organization | 1. Excellent to very good
 |  20 – 18 | Fluent expression, ideas clearly stated/supported, succinct, well organized, logical sequencing, cohensive. |
| 1. Good to average
 |  17 – 14 | Somewhat choppy-loosely organized but main ideas stand out, limited support, logical but incomplete sequencing. |
| 1. Fair to poor
 |  13 – 10 | No fluent-ideas confused or disconnected, lack logical sequencing and development |
| 1. Very poor
 |  9 – 7 | Does not communicate,not organization, or not enough to evaluate. |
| Vocabulary | 1. Excellent to very good
 |  20 – 18 | Sophisticated range, effective word or idiom choice and usage, word from mastery, appropriate register. |
| 1. Good to average
 |  17 – 14 | Adequate range, occasional errors of word or idiom form, choice, usage but meaning not obscured. |
| 1. Fair to poor
 |  13 – 10 | Limited range, frequent errors of word or idiom form, choice, usage, meaning confused or obscured. |
| 1. Very poor
 |  9 – 7 | Essentially translation, little knowledge of english vocabulary, idioms, word form, or not enough to evaluate. |
| Language use | 1. Excellent to very good
 | 25 – 22 | Effective complex constructions, few errors of agreement, tense, number, word order or function, articles, pronouns, prepositions. |
| 1. Good to average
 | 21 – 18 | Effective but simple construction, minor problems in complex construction, several errors of agreement, tense, number, word order or function, articles, pronouns, prepositions but meaning seldom obscured. |
| 1. Fair to poor
 | 17 – 11 | Major problems in sample or complex construction, frequent errors of negation, agreement, tense, number, word order function, articles, pronouns, prepositions. |
| 1. Very poor
 | 10 – 5 | Virtually no mastery of sentence construction rules. Dominated by errors, does not communicate, or not enough to evaluate. |
|  Mechanics | 1. Excellent to very good
 | 5 | Demonstrates mastery of conventions, few errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing. |
| 1. Good to average
 | 4 | Occasional errors of spelling, punctuation capitalization, paragraphing but meaning not obscured. |
| 1. Fair to poor
 | 3 | Frequent errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization paragphing, poor handwriting, but meaning not obscured. |
| 1. Very poor
 | 2 | No mastery of conventions, dominated by errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing, handwriting illegiable, or not enough to evaluate. |

 In this research, the writer used writing scoring format by Weigle (2002: 117) in the instrument, because the components are complete and more detail, so that the teacher can give score easily. After that the writer gives category of writing. The writing category is extended to judge students’ writing achievement. So, the categories of writing from 40 to 100. The highest score is 100 and the lowest score is 40. The scoring is described as follows:

**TABLE 10**

**The Categories of Writing**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **NO** | **Scoring** | **Category** |
| 1 | Excellent to very good | 80-100 |
| 2 | Good | 69-79 |
| 3 | Average | 55-66 |
| 4 | Poor | 41-55 |
| 5 | Failed | <40 |

 (Source : Leo 2007: 7)

* 1. **Validity and Reliability of the Test**

A test is considered good if it is valid and reliable. In order to find its validity and reliability, the writer did the try out the test item before doing experiment.

* + 1. **Validity of the Test**

 A test as the instrument of collecting the data should be valid and reliable. According to Fraenkel and Wallen (1990: 127), validity refers to the extent to which an instrument gives us the information we want. In giving the test to the students, the writer should consider about the validity of the test.

 In this study, the writer focused on the content validity of the test. Since the writer conducted a research on writing skill, the test given should represent the content of writing to be measured such as content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanic. In order to create a valid test, the writer created the test based on the syllabus.

 The result analysis in content validity is described in table of specification test (Holandyah 2013 : 52). In the table of specification test, it includes: objectives of the test, material of title, test indicators, type of test, number of item and the total number:

**TABLE 11**

**Test of Specification Table**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Objective | Material | Indicator | Type of Test | Number of Item | Total Number |
| The students are able to write a descriptive paragraph related to the topic by using inquiry technique | * A cockroach
* A sprout
* Mobile phone
* Agrasshopper
* A frog
* Flood
* A butterfly
* A tiger
* Gurame fish
* Bee
 | The students are able :* To complete the form of short essays in descriptive text.
* To arrange sentences into meaningful text in descriptive form.
* To make descriptive paragraph.
 |  written test  | 1 | 1 |

* + 1. **Reliability of the Test**

 According to Fraenkel and Wallen (1990: 127), mention that Reliability is the consistency of scores or answers, how consistent they are for each individual from one administration of an instrument to another from one set item to another.

 In this study, the writer used inter-rater reliability to find out the result reliability test, because writing is concluded as subjective test. The raters on writer’s research were Teddy Arif Muljadi S.Pd, he is a teacher of SDN 179 Palembang, and second rater was Niko Eka Apriansyah S.Pd, he is a teacher of SMA Muhammadiyah 6 Palembang. To make sure that the test is reliable, before using the test items for the pretest and posttest, the writer tried out the test to check the reliability of the test. The writer took 50 students of eight grade students in MTs Negeri 1 Palembang on 20 Agustus 2013, and MTs Negeri 2 Palembang on 26 Agustus 2013 as the subject of reliability test.

 Before the raters gave scores for the students, the instrument of scores earlier was given to the raters based on weigle’s book in scoring writing.According to Weigle (2002: 117) there are five components of scoring in writing test; they are content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanic. After that, scores that given by raters were calculated by using spearman rank (Rank order) formula to find the differences between two sets of rangkings, using the formula:

 

In which:

 (Rho) : Spearman rank-order correlation

 : The sum of the quared differences

N : Number of sample

(Hartono 2008:71)

 The test score is considered reliable whenever the reliability coefficient of test should be at least 0.70 and preferably higher (Fraenkel and Wallen, 1990: 136). The analysis result of reliability. It is shown in table 12 (*See* Appendix B).



$$ρ=1-\frac{6x2340}{50\left(50^{2}-1\right)}$$

$$ρ=1-\frac{14040}{50\left(2499\right)}$$

$$ρ=1-\frac{14040}{124950}$$

$$ρ=1-0,112$$

$$ρ=0,888$$

 From the result of rank order correlation above (0.888), it was stated that the score was higher than 0.70. It means that the assessment results was very reliable.

* 1. **Technique for Analyzing Data**

 For analyzing the data in this research, the writer used sample t-test. The test used to determine how great difference between two groups. To measure significant difference was found from testing students’ posttest scores between two groups by using independent sample t-test (Holandyah 2013: 25). The significant difference was found whenever the p-output was lower than significant difference at 0.05 level. The Data obtained by using SPSS 16 software. The technique can be successful in improving students’ achievement if the t-value of t-obtained was higher than t-table 2042 (df=30).

* 1. **Teaching Procedure by Using Inquiry Technique**

 This is the teaching procedure used by writer in implementation inquiry technique to the eighth grade students of MTs Negeri 2 Palembang.

1. **Pre- activities :**
* The writer gives greeting to the students
* The writer check the students’ attendance
* The writer asks to the students to pray together.
1. **Whilst activities :**
* The writer gives some questions related to the topic by using picture.
* The writer shows to the students an example of descriptive text.
* The writer gives explanation about descriptive text to students
* The writer explains to the students about the concept of writing process especially oulining.
* The students are able to identify subject, object or topic from investigation.
* The students are able to give predict and hypothesize about the subject , object or topic.
* The students are able to determine main ideas and supporting detail and sort information by topic and sub-topic in writing paragraph.
* The students are able to develop a descriptive paragraph.
* The writer asks students to submit result of their writing form.
* The writer asks students to communicate of their result writing.
1. **Post activity :**
* The writer gives evaluation to their writing.
* The writer gives feedback to their students.

**CHAPTER IV**

**FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATION**

In this chapter, the writer presents (a) findings of the study; (b) interpretations of the study.

1. **Findings of the Study**

 The findings of the study were to find out: (1) data descriptions; (2) prerequisite analysis; (3)results of hypothesis testing.

* + 1. **Data Descriptions**

 In data descriptions, it deals with distribution of frequency data and descriptive statistics.

**1.1 Distribution of Frequency Data**

 In distribution of frequency data, the students’ scores of frequency, and percentage of students’ pretest and posttest scores in experimental and control groups were presented.

1. **Students’ Pretest Scores in Experimental Group**

 Based on the result of students’ pretest scores in the experimental group, there were 3.2 % or 1 student got score 38.00 , 3.2% or 1 student got score 40.00, 16.1% or 5 students got score 41.00, 3.2% or 1 student got score 42.00, 3.2 % or 1 student got score 4.700, 12.9% or 4 students got score 50.00, 6.5% or 2 students got score 52.00, 3.2% or 1 students got score 60.00, 6.5% or 2 student got score 62.00, 6.5% or 2 students got score 65.00, 16.1% or 5 students got score 72.00. 3.2% or 1 students got score 75.00. 16.1% or 5 students got score 77.00. The frequency data of students’ scores in experimental group was shown in table 13.

 **Table 13**

 **Distributing the Frequency Data of Students’ Pretest**

**Scores in Experimental Group**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Score**  | **Frequency** | **Percentage %** |
| 38 | 1 | 3.2 |
| 40 | 1 | 3.2 |
| 41 | 5 | 16.1 |
| 42 | 1 | 3.2 |
| 47 | 1 | 3.2 |
| 50 | 4 | 12.9 |
| 52 | 2 | 6.5 |
| 60 | 1 | 3.2 |
| 62 | 2 | 6.5 |
| 65 | 2 | 6.5 |
| 72 | 5 | 16.1 |
| 75 | 1 | 3.2 |
| 77 | 5 | 16.1 |
| Total | 31 | 100.0 |

 From the result analysis of frequency data of students’ pretest scores in experimental group, it was found that in the pretest experimental group there were 1 students who got the lowest score 38.00 (3.2%) and 5 students were the highest score 77.00 (16.1 %).

1. **Students’ Posttest Scores in Experimental Group**

 Based on the result of students’ posttest scores in the experimental group, it showed that there were 6.5 % or 2 students got score 62.00, 3.2% or 1 student got score 66.00, 6.5 % or 2 students got score 67.00, 38.7% or 12 students got score 70.00, 12.9% 4 students got score 72.00, 3.2 % or 1 students got score 74.00, 9.7% or 3 students got score 75.00, 3.2% or 1 student got score 77.00, 3.2% or 1 student got score 78.00, 3.2% or 1 student got score 80.00, 3.2% or 1 student got score 81.00, 3.2% or 1 student got score 82.00, 3.2% or 1 student got score 87.00. The frequency data of students’ posttest scores in experimental group was shown in table 14.

 **Table 14**

 **Distributing the Frequency Data of Students’ Posttest**

**Scores in Experimental Group**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Score**  | **Frequency** | **Percentage %** |
| 62 | 2 | 6.5 |
| 66 | 1 | 3.2 |
| 67 | 2 | 6.5 |
| 70 | 12 | 38.7 |
| 72 | 4 | 12.9 |
| 74 | 1 | 3.2 |
| 75 | 3 | 9.7 |
| 77 | 1 | 3.2 |
| 78 | 1 | 3.2 |
| 80 | 1 | 3.2 |
| 81 | 1 | 3.2 |
| 82 | 1 | 3.2 |
| 87 | 1 | 3.2 |
| TOTAL | 31 | 100.0 |

 From the result analysis of frequency data of students’ posttest scores in experimental group, it was found that in the posttest experimental group there were 2 student who got the lowest score 62.00 (6.5 %) and 1 students were the highest score 87.00 (3.2 %).

1. **Students’ Pretest Scores in Control Group**

 Based on the result of students’ pretest scores in the control group, there were 3.2 % or 1 student got score 38.00, 19.4% or 6 student got score 40.00, 6.5% or 2 students got score 41.00, 16.1 % or 5 students got score 42.00, 16.1 % or 5 students got score 45.00, 3.2% or 1 student got score 47.00, 19.4% or 6 students got score 50.00, 6.5 % or 2 students got score 52.00, 3.2 % or 1 student got score 55.00, 6.5 % or 2 students got score 65.00. The frequency data of students’ pretest scores in control group was shown in table 15.

 **Table 15**

 **Distributing the Frequency Data of Students’ Pretest**

**Scores in Control Group**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Score**  | **Frequency** | **Percentage %** |
| 38 | 1 | 3.2 |
| 40 | 6 | 19.4 |
| 41 | 2 | 6.5 |
| 42 | 5 | 16.1 |
| 45 | 5 | 16.1 |
| 47 | 1 | 3.2 |
| 50 | 6 | 19.4 |
| 52 | 2 | 6.5 |
| 55 | 1 | 3.2 |
| 65 | 2 | 6.5 |
| Total | 31 | 100.0 |

 From the result analysis of frequency data of students’ pretest scores in control group, it was found that in the pretest control group there were 1 students who got the lowest score 38.00 (3.2 %) and 2 students were the highest score 65.00 (6.5%).

1. **Students’ Posttest Scores in Control Group**

 Based on the result of students’ posttest scores in the control group, there were 3.2 % or 1 student got score 43.00, 6.5 % or 2 student got score 44.00, 3.2 % or 1 student got score 46.00, 6.5 % or 2 students got score 47.00, 29.0% or 9 students got score 50.00, 3.2% or 1 student got score 51.00, 16.1% or 5 students got score 52.00, 3.2 % or 1 student got score 54.00, 9.7 % or 3 students got score 55.00, 3.2 % or 1 student got score 60.00, 9.7 % or 3 student got score 62.00,3.2 % or 1 student got score 63.00, 3.2 % or 1 student got score 65.00. The frequency data of students’ posttest scores in control group was shown in table 16.

**Table 16**

 **Distributing the Frequency Data of Students’ Posttest**

 **Scores in Control Group**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Score**  | **Frequency** | **Percentage %** |
| 43 | 1 | 3.2 |
| 44 | 2 | 6.5 |
| 46 | 1 | 3.2 |
| 47 | 2 | 6.5 |
| 50 | 9 | 29.0 |
| 51 | 1 | 3.2 |
| 52 | 5 | 16.1 |
| 54 | 1 | 3.2 |
| 55 | 3 | 9.7 |
| 60 | 1 | 3.2 |
| 62 | 3 | 9.7 |
| 63 | 1 | 3.2 |
| 65 | 1 | 3.2 |
| Total | 31 | 100.0 |
|  |  |  |

 From the result analysis of frequency data of students’ posttest scores in control group, it was found that in the posttest control group there was 1 students who got the lowest score 43.00 (3.2 %) and 1 students were the highest score 65.00 (3.2%).

**1.2 Descriptive Statistics**

In descriptive statistics, the sample, the score of minimal, maximal, mean, and standard deviation of students’ pretest and posttest scores in experimental and control groups were presented:

1. **Students’ Pretest Scores in Experimental Group**

 The result analysis of descriptive statistics from students’ pretest scores in experimental group found that there were 31 students who were in experimental group. The lowest score was 38.00, the highest score was 77.00, mean score was 58.3871, and standard deviation was 14.23301. The descriptive statistics of students’ pretest scores in experimental group was shown in table 17.

**Table 17**

 **Descriptive Statistics of Students’ Pretest Scores in Experimental Group**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Pretest Score in Experimental Group | **N** | **Minimum** | **Maximum** | **Mean** | **Std. D** |
| 31 | 38.00 | 77.00 | 58.3871 | 14.23301 |

1. **Students’ Posttest Scores in Experimental Group**

 The result analysis of descriptive statistics from students’ posttest scores in experimental group found that there were 31 students who were in experimental group. The lowest score was 62.00, the highest score was 87.00, mean score was 72.1290, and standard deviation was 5.46347. The descriptive statistics of students’ posttest scores in experimental group was shown in table 18.

**Table 18**

 **Descriptive Statistics of Students’ Posttest Scores in Experimental Group**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Posttest Score in Experimental Group | **N** | **Minimum** | **Maximum** | **Mean** | **Std. D** |
| 31 | 62.00 | 87.00 | 72.1290 | 5.46347 |

1. **Students’ Pretest Scores in Control Group**

 The result analysis of descriptive statistics from students’ pretest scores in control group found that there were 31 students who were in control group. The lowest score was 38.00, the highest score was 65.00, mean score was 46.1613, and standard deviation was 6.79753. The descriptive statistics of students’ pretest scores in control group was shown in table 19.

 **Table 19**

 **Descriptive Statistics of Students’ Pretest Scores in Control Group**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Pretest Score in Control Group | **N** | **Minimum** | **Maximum** | **Mean** | **Std. D** |
| 31 | 38.00 | 65.00 | 46.1613 | 6.79753 |

1. **Students’ Posttest Scores in Control Group**

 The result analysis of descriptive statistics from students’ posttest scores in control group found that there were 31 students who were in control group. The lowest score was 43.00, the highest score was 65.00, mean score was 52.4194, and standard deviation was 5.80674. The descriptive statistics of students’ posttest scores in control group was shown in table 20.

 **Table 20**

 **Descriptive Statistics of Students’ Posttest Scores in Control Group**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Posttest Score in Control Group | **N** | **Minimum** | **Maximum** | **Mean** | **Std. D** |
| 31 | 43.00 | 65.00 | 52.4194 | 5.80674 |

* + 1. **Pre-requisite Analysis**

 In pre-requisite analysis, it deals with normality and homogeneity tests to see whether the obtained data was normal and homogeny.

* 1. **Normality Test**

 Normality test is used to measure whether the obtained data normal or not. The data can be classified into normal when the p-output is higher than mean significant difference at 0.05 levels. In measuring normality test, one sample Kolmogronov Smrinov is used. The normality test is used to measure students’ pretest scores in experimental and control groups, and students’ posttest scores in experimental and control groups.

* + - * 1. **Students’ Pretest Scores in Experimental and Control Groups**

 Based on result analysis using One-Sample Kolmogronov Smrinov Test, it was found that the p-output from students’ pretest scores in experimental and control groups were 0.237 and 0.259.

 From statement above, it can be assumed that the students’ pretest scores in experimental and control groups considered normal since it was higher than 0.05. The result analysis measuring normality test of students’ pretest scores in experimental and control groups was shown in table 21.

**Table 21**

**Normality Test of Students’ Pretest Scores**

**in Experimental and Control Groups**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Students’ Pretest** | **N** | **Kolmogronov Smrinov Z** | **Sig** | **Result** |
| 1 | Experimental Group | 31 | 1.032 | 0.237 | Normal |
| 2 | Control Group | 31 | 1.010 | 0.259 | Normal |

* + - * 1. **Students’ Posttest Scores in Experimental and Control Groups**

 Based on result analysis using One-Sample Kolmogronov Smrinov Test, it was found that the p-output from students’ posttest in experimental and control groups were 0.167 and 0.143. From the statement above, it can be assumed that the students’ posttest scores in experimental and control groups considered normal since it was higher than 0.05. The result of analysis measuring normality test of posttest in experimental and control groups was shown in table 22.

**Table 22**

**Normality Test of Students’ Posttest Scores**

**in Experimental and Control Groups**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Students’ Posttest** | **N** | **Kolmogronov Smrinov Z** | **Sig** | **Result** |
| 1 | Experimental Group | 31 | 1.114 | 0.167 | Normal |
| 2 | Control Group | 31 | 1.148 | 0.143 | Normal |

* 1. **Homogeneity Test**

In measuring homogeneity test, Levene Statistic found in SPSS 16 software is used. The homogeneity test is used to measure students’ pretest and posttest scores in experimental and control groups.

1. **Students’ Pretest Scores in Experimental and Control Groups**

 Based on result analysis measuring test of homogeneity by using Levene Statistic that test found the p-output 37.182. From the p-output, it can be stated that the students’ pretest scores in experimental and control groups considered homogen since it was higher than 0.05. The result of analysis measuring homogeneity test of students’ pretest scores in experimental and control groups was shown in table 23.

**Table 23**

**Homogeneity Test of Students’ Pretest Scores**

**in Experimental and Control Groups**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Students’ Pretest** | **N** | **Levene****Statistics** | **Sig** | **Result** |
| 1 | Experimental Group | 31 | 37.182 | 0.000 | Homogen |
| 2 | Control Group | 31 |

1. **Students’ Posttest Scores in Experimental and Control Groups**

 Based on result analysis measuring homogeneity test by using Levene Statistic that test found the p-output 0.182. From the the p-output, it can be stated that the students’ posttest scores in experimental and control groups considered homogen since it was higher than 0.05. The result of analysis measuring homogeneity test of students’ posttest scores in experimental and control groups was shown in table 24.

**Table 24**

**Homogeneity Test of Students’ Posttest Scores**

**in Experimental and Control Groups**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Students’ Posttest** | **N** | **Levene****Statistics** | **Sig** | **Result** |
| 1 | Experimental Group | 31 | 0.182 | 0.671 | Homogen |
| 2 | Control Group | 31 |

1. **Measuring the Progress of Students’ Writing Achievement in Control Group and Experimental Group.**

 To find out whether or not there was progress in writing students’ achievement before and after the treatment in experimental group, the writer composed the result of pretest and posttest in the control group and experimental groups by using paired sample t-test. The following tables show the result of paired sample t-test of each group :

**Table 25**

**Hypothesis Testing in Measuring the Progress**

**from Students’ Pretest to Posttest Scores in Control Group**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Teachers’ technique | **Paired Sample T-Test** | Ho |
|  T Df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|  4.461 30 | 0.000 | Rejected |

 From the analysis, it was found that tvalue for t-obtained was 4.461 with (df=30) and t-table 2.042. This is significant because the tvalue of t-obtained calculation was higher than the critical value of ttable 2.042 (df=30).

 From statement above, it can be assumed that there is progress between students’ pretest and posttest in control group.

**Table 26**

**Hypothesis Testing in Measuring Progress**

**from Students’ Pretest to Posttest Scores in Experimental Group**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Inquiry technique | **Paired Sample T-Test** | Ho |
|  T Df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|  5.075 30 | 0.000 | Rejected |

 From the analysis, it was found that tvalue for t-obtained was 5.075 with (df=30) and t-table 2.042. This is significant because the tvalue of t-obtained calculation was higher than the critical value of ttable 2.042 (df=30).

 From statement above, it can be assumed that there is progress between students’ pretest and posttest in experimental group.

1. **Measuring Significant Difference on Students’ Writing Skill Average Score Taught Using Inquiry Technique**

 The significant difference was found from testing students’ posttest scores in experimental group using independent sample t-test (Holandyah 2013: 25). The significant difference is found whenever the p-output was lower than mean significant difference at 0.05 level. The result analysis measuring using independent sample t-test found p-ouput 0.000.

 It can be stated that there was means sigcificant difference on students’ writing skill average scores taught inquiry technique since the p-output was lower than significant difference at 0.05 level. The result analysis in measuring significant difference on students’ writing skill taught using inquiry technique compared to students who were not taught by using inquiry technique was figured out in table 25.

**Table 27**

**Measuring Significant Difference of Students’ Posttest Scores in Experimental Group and Control**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Posttest experiment and control group | **Independent Sample T-Test** | Ho |
|  T Df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|  13.764 30 | 0.000 | Rejected |

 From the analysis, it was found that tvalue for t-obtained was 13.764 with (df=30) and t-table 2.042. This is significant because the tvalue of t-obtained calculation was higher than the critical value of ttable 2.042 (df=30)

 From statement above, it can be assumed that there is difference between pretest and posttest value from the experimental group and the control group. The views of the value of t-test (5.075 ) in the experimental group higher than the value of t-test (4.461) in control group.

1. **Interpretation**

 Based on the findings, some interpretations were made as follows. First, result of normality test of students’ pretest and posttest scores in experimental and control groups were higher than 0.05 (Basrowi, 2007:85 citied in Holandyah, 2013:70). It can be concluded that the students’ pretest and posttest scores in experimental and control groups were categorized normal. Then, result of homogeneity test of students’ pretest and posttest scores in experimental and control groups were higher than 0.05 (Basrowi, 2007:85 citied in Holandyah, 2013:70). It can be concluded that the students’ pretest and posttest scores in experimental and control groups were categorized homogen. Second, based on the progress analysis above, it can be seen that significant level of pretest and posttest of control group was 0.000. They are smaller than 0.05. it means that there is progress in students’ writing achievement in control group. Third, based on the progress analysis above, it can be seen that significant level of pretest and posttest of experimental group was 0.000. They are smaller than 0.05. Since the significant level of pretest and posttest of experimental group is smaller than 0.05, it can be concluded that there was progress of scores in experimental group.

 According to Aunurrahman as cited in Ramatini (2013: 57), mentions that learning is a process someone to get internal changes, start from low level of ability in the condition of pre-study until it is increase to high level of ability, because the students are involved in teaching process of learning. This process is a dynamic process which students are able to improve their achievement to get a higher level of ability through learning process done. However, using another method in teaching learning will improve. The last, based on the data of significant difference analysis, it can be seen that significant level of posttest of experimental group and posttest of control was 0.000. it is smaller than 0.05. it can be concluded that there was significant difference between students who were taught by using inquiry technique and who were not.

From the previous analysis it showed that the implementation of inquiry technique can result the progress of students’ writing ability. It was proved from the result of the analysis of paired sample t-test in experimental group and the result of the independent sample t-test analysis between two groups.

It is probably caused by excellenced from inquiry method where by using that method, the students can explore their idea in writing skill, it can develop their hypotheses and it makes them explore more carefully. This is in line with Roestiyah ( 2008: 76), who mentions that inquiry technique could improve students’ writing skill because situation becomes more stimulating for learning, it helps students in using memory and transfer to a new learning situation, encourage students to think intuitively and formulate their hypothesis.

 However, from the result of paired t-test in control group it showed that there is also progress of students’ score who were not by using inquiry . It is in line with the general concept of teaching learning processes based on Aunurrahman as cited by Ramatini (2013: 57), mentions that learning is a process someone to get internal changes, start from low level of ability in the condition of pre-study, until it is increase to high level of ability, because the students are involved in teaching process of learning by using any kind of teaching method.

 But, the progress in control group is not bigger than the progress who were taught by using inquiry technique. And it can be seen also from the result of significant difference between posttest score of two group where there was significant difference between the two posttest score.

 It is probably caused by the weakness of method that used by teacher at the school where the teacher assigned the students to composed the paragraph directly by giving topic only, and the impact of that process resulting in lack of ability of students to develop their ideas in written form and the lack of ability of students could be covered with inquiry technique that the steps of inquiry by Vancouver (2011 : 6) could apply in writing process.

**BAB V**

**CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS**

In this chapter, the writer draws the conclusions based on the findings presented a previous chapter and this chapter also offer some suggestions.

1. **Conclusion**

 Based on the result of the data analysis and interpretation were made as follows. First, the writer concluded that it was effective in teaching descriptive paragraph by using inquiry technique to eighth grade students of MTs Negeri 2 Palembang. The students who were taught by using inquiry technique got better scores than students who were not taught by using inquiry technique.

 The second, it could be seen from the data obtained in this study that there was a significant difference between the students’ writing achievement before and after the treatment. Besides, the test result of the experimental group was higher score than the control group. It could be stated that teaching descriptive paragraph by using inquiry technique is more suitable implemented at MTs Negeri 2 Palembang that the situation is more stimulating to students in teaching learning process and it makes active to students in the exploration of the content, issues, and questions surrounding area or concept.

1. **Suggestions**

 Based on the study that has been done, the writer would like to give some suggestions to the teachers of English, and students. The following suggestions are offered to english teachers:

1. The teachers can use this technique to teach other text types.
2. The English teacher should use inquiry technique in teaching descriptive paragraph writing.
3. The English teacher should encourage the students to write and express their ideas,experince,thought, and feelings by giving them motivation. And increasing the frequency of students’ writing activities.

Furthermore, the suggestions are offered to the students MTs Negeri 2 Palembang:

1. The students should increase their knowledge of english grammar,vocabulary, and other aspects of writing in order to have a good writing and can be understood well by reader.
2. Be active to learn by practicing writing more and more.
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