**CHAPTER IV**

**RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

1. **Data Description**

This research was conducted in five meetings in SMA Pangudi Luhur Bandar Lampung. On Monday, July 23rd, 2018 the researcher administered the pre-test. The researcher gave the pre-test and post-test to experimental class (XI IPA ) and control class (XI IPS 1).

The researcher gave the pre-test, on Tuesday, July 24th, 2018 in experimental class and July 26th, 2018 in control class. In experimental class which consisted of 24 students and in the control class which consisted of 24 students. When the researcher was gave the pre-test all the students followed the test.

The first treatment was done on Friday, July 27th, 2018 at 01.30 pm -03.00.pm in experimental class and on Monday, July 30th, 2018 at 12.30 pm - 02.00 pm in control class. There was one student absent in the experimental class and there was two students absent in control class.

The researcher gave the second treatment on Tuesday, 31st,2018 in experimental class at 01.30 pm – 03.00 pm and on Friday, August, 3rd, 2018 in control class at 2.30 pm – 04.00 pm. In the second meeting there was no student absent in experimental class and control class.

Then, on Tuesday, August, 7th, 2018 the researcher gave the third treatment in experimental class the treatment at 1.30 pm – 3.00 pm and on Thursday, August 9th 2018, at 12.30 pm – 2.00 pm in control class. All students in experimental and control class followed the treatment.

For the last meeting, the researcher gave the post test to the students in experimental class on Tuesday, August 14th, 2018 and on Thursday 16th, 2018 in control class. All of students in experimental class and control class followed the test.

1. **Result of the Research**
2. **Result of Pre-test**

The pre-test was administrated in order to know students’ writing ability before the treatments were given. It can be seen from the pre-test score of students’ report text writing ability in the control class and experimental class. At the first meeting the researcher conducted pre-test in order to find out the previous students report text writing ability. The pre test was given on Tuesday, July 24th, 2018 at 1.30 pm – 2.30 pm for the XI IPA as the experimental class and on Thursday, July 26th, 2018 at 12.30 pm – 01.30 pm for XI IPS 1 as the control class.

The mean of pre-test in experimental class was 66.58, standard of deviation was 9.315, N was 24, median was 67.00, variance was 88.775, minimum score was 50 and maximum score was 80. It can be seen in appendix 15.

The mean of pre-test in control class was 62.42, standard deviation was 11.209, N was 24, median was 65.00, variance was 125.647, minimum score was 40, and maximum score was 76. It can be seen in appendix 15.

1. **Result of Post-test**

After conducting three meeting of treatment the researcher conducted the post test to the sample. The researcher conducted post-test in order to see whether the students’ score increased or not. The post test was conducted on Tuesday, August 14th, 2018 at 01.30 pm – 02.30 pm for the XI IPA as the experimental class and on Thursday, August 16th , 2018 at 12.30 pm -01.30 pm for class XI IPS 1 as the control class.

The mean of post test in experimental class was 73.13, standard of deviation was 7.104, N was 24, median was 75.00, variance was 50.462, minimum score was 58.00, and maximum score was 85.00. It showed students’ report text writing ability after they got treatments. It can be seen in appendix 16.

The mean of post test in control class was 70.88, standard deviation was 7.555, N was 24, median was 75.00, variance was 57.071, minimum score was 55.00, maximum score was 80.00. It can be seen in appendix 16

1. **Data Analysis**.
2. **Result of Normality Test**

The Normality was used to measure whether the data in experimental class and control class has the normal distribution or not. In this research, the researcher used Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro Wilk/ Liliefors normality test by using SPSS 16.0 (*Statistical Package for Social Science).*

The hypothesis for the normality test was formulated as follows:

Ho : the data are normally distributed

Ha : the data are not normally distributed.

While the criteria of acceptance or rejection of normality test were as follows:

 Ho is accepted if sig > α = 0.05

Ha is accepted if sig < α = 0.05

Table 4

Normality of the Experimental and Control Class

|  |
| --- |
| Tests of Normality |
|  | Class | Kolmogorov-Smirnova | Shapiro-Wilk |
|  | Statistic | Df | Sig. | Statistic | df | Sig. |
| Pre | Ex | ,129 | 24 | ,182 | ,953 | 24 | ,110 |
| Con | ,111 | 24 | ,200\* | ,966 | 24 | ,290 |
| Post | Ex | ,082 | 24 | ,200\* | ,987 | 24 | ,524 |
| Con  | ,140 | 24 | ,059 | ,924 | 24 | ,059 |

Related on the Table 4, it can be seen that Sig. (pvalue) for pre test experimental class was 0.182, for post test experimental class was 0.200, for pre test control class was 0.200 and for post test control class was 0.59 and α = 0.05. It means that Sig. (pvalue) >α and Ho is accepted. The conclusion is the data are in the normal distribution. It is calculated based on the gain of the experimental and control class. (see appendix 17)

1. **Result of Homogeneity Test**

 After the researcher got the conclusion of normality test, the researcher did the homogeneity test in order to know whether the data is homogenous or not. In this research, the researcher used statistical computation by using SPSS (*Statistical Package for Social Science).* The test of homogeneity employing Levene’s Test.

While the criteria of acceptance or rejection of homogeneity test were as follow:

Ho is accepted if sig > α = 0.05

Ha is accepted if sig < α = 0.05

 The hypotheses for the homogeneity test were formulated as follows :

 Ho = The variances of the data are homogenous

 Ha = The variances of the data are not homogenous

 Table 5

 Homogeneity of Experimental and Control Class

|  |
| --- |
| Test of Homogeneity of Variances |
|  | Levene Statistic | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
| Pre | 1.340 | 1 | 46 | .251 |
| post | 5.977 | 1 | 46 | .200 |

Based on the results obtained in the test of homogeneity of variances in the column, it can be seen that *Sig.* (Pvalue) = 0.200*>*α = 0.05. It demonstrated that Ho was accepted because *Sig.* (Pvalue) *>*α = 0.05. It means that the variance of the data was homogenous.

**2. Result of Hypothetical Test**

Based on the previous explanation that the normality and homogeneity test were satisfied. Therefore, the researcher used the following t-test by independent t-test for hypothetical of test.

The hypotheses as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| HaHo | :: | There is significance influence of using scaffolding technique towards students’ report text writing ability at the first semester of eleventh grade of SMA Pangudi Luhur Bandar Lampung in the academic year of 2018/2019.There is no significance influence of using scaffolding technique towards students’ report text writing ability at the first semester of eleventh grade of SMA Pangudi Luhur Bandar Lampung in the academic year of 2018/2019. |

The criteria of acceptance or rejection of the hypothesis for Hypothetical test was:

Ha is accepted if *Sig.* < α 0.05

Ho is accepted if *Sig. ≥* α 0.05

Table 6

The Result of Independent Sample Test

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | t-test for Equality of Means |
| F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |
| Lower | Upper |
| Score | Equal variances assumed | 5.977 | .200 | 6.518 | 46 | .017 | 6.335 | .972 | 4.399 | 8.271 |
| Equal variances not assumed |  |  | 6.486 | 44.805 | .017 | 6.335 | .977 | 4.384 | 8.286 |

Based on the result obtained in the independent sample t-test in the Table 6 that the value of significant generated Sig. (Pvalue) = 0.017< α = 0.05. So, Ho is rejected and Ha is accepted. Referring to the computation, it could be concluded that there was a significant influence of using scaffolding technique towards students report text writing ability at the first semester of the eleventh grade of SMA Pangudi Luhur Bandar Lampung in the academic year of 2018/2019.

**3. Discussion**

The present research has shown that scaffolding technique could influence students’ writing ability especially in report text. Based on the result of research,, the researcher did pre-test to know the student’ ability before treatment. The scores show that the mean of pre-test in experimental class was 66.58 in which there only eight students got scores higher than 75 and 16 students got scores lower than 75. While in control class the mean of pre-test was 62.42 which there were five students got scores higher than 75 and 19 students got scores lower than 75.

In order to know the influence of using scaffolding technique towards students’ report text writing ability the researcher did three treatments. In the first treatments held on July 27th 2018. The second treatment on July 31st 2018 and the third treatment on August 9th 2018.

At the beginning class, the students were given scaffolding technique in experimental class. The material was three topics report text for three meetings.. Before doing scaffolding technique, the researcher explained to the students about report text and the researcher how to used procedure scaffolding technique in report text.

At the first treatment the students looked nervous and embarrassed. They seemed to be worried to write up in class which implemented scaffolding technique. They did not know what scaffolding and how to do it. So, the researcher introduced scaffolding technique it self before starting activity. The researcher gave explanation about scaffolding technique and continued by explained the definition of report text. The topic in first meeting was about describing animal (tiger).

At the second treatment, it was better than the first, because the students did not look nervous anymore to do, they felt enjoyable. In the second treatment, the students were given treatment by using similar technique that was scaffolding technique. Before giving scaffolding technique, the researcher explained the material about report text about describing place (beach).

In the last treatment, there were many improvements in students report text writing ability when they written. In the third treatment, the researcher explained report text about describing plant (rose). The students were more active and interesting in discussion process than the first and second meeting. They were not afraid and they assumed that report text not difficult.

After conducting the treatments, the researcher did post-test to measure the improvement of report text writing ability in both classes after treatments done. The scores show that the mean of post-test in experimental class was 73.13 in which there were 15 students got scores higher than 75 and there were 9 students got scores lower than 75. While in control class the mean of pre-test was 70.88 which there were 10 students got scores higher than 75 and there were 14 students got scores lower than 75.

There were differences in the students’ outcome when before and after the students were taught by using scaffolding technique. Before the researcher using scaffolding technique, the students so very bored and still confused what they want to write and when the researcher taught using scaffolding technique, she made the students more excited, active and very enthusiastic to work collaboratively in the teaching learning process. So they could express their ideas to made writing report text.

Based on the analysis of the data and the testing hypothesis, the result of calculation was found that the null hypothesis (Ho) was rejected and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) was accepted. The hypothetical test result show that Sig. (2-tailed) was 0.017. It was lower than α=0.05. It mean that was a significant influence of using scaffolding technique towards students report text writing ability at the first semester of the eleventh grade of SMA Pangudi Luhur Bandar Lampung in the academic year of 2018/2019.