THE EFFECT OF USING OUTLINING TECHNIQUE ON STUDENTS' WRITING DESCRIPTIVE TEXT ABILITY AT X GRADE OF MAN 1 PADANGSIDIMPUAN

## A THESIS

Submitted to the State Institute for Islamic Studies Padangsidimpuan as a Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for the Graduate Degree of Education (S.Pd) in English

Written by:

ANITA LUSTIANA
Reg. Number. 133400004

ENGLISH EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

## TARBIYAH AND TEACHER TRAINING FACULTY THE STATE INSTITUTE FOR ISLAMIC STUDIES PADANGSIDIMPUAN <br> 2017



THE EFFECT OF USING OUTLINING TECHNIQUE ON STUDENTS' WRITING DESCRIPTIVE TEXT ABILITY AT X GRADE OF MAN 1 PADANGSIDIMPUAN

A THESIS

Submitted to the State Institute for Islamic Studies Padangsidimpuan as a Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for the Graduate Degree of Education (S.Pd) in English

Written by:

ANITA LUSTIANA
Reg. Number. 133400004

Advisor I
Rytuki
Rayendriani Fahmei Lubis, M.Ag NIP. 197105102000032001

ENGLISH EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
TARBIYAH AND TEACHER TRAINING FACULTY THE STATE INSTITUTE FOR ISLAMIC STUDIES PADANGSIDIMPUAN

2017

```
Term :a thesis
    a.n. Anita Lustiana
Item :7 (seven) examplars
```

Padangsidimpuan, $19^{\text {th }}$ October 2017
To:
Dean Tarbiyah and Teacher Training Faculty in-

Padangsidimpuan

Assalamu'alaikum Wr.Wb.

After reading studying and giving advice for necessary revision on the thesis belong to Anita Lustiana, entitled "The Effect of Using Outlining Technique on Students' Writing Descriptive Text Ability at X Grade of MAN 1 Padangsidimpuan", we approved that the thesis has been acceptable to complete the requirement to fulfill for graduate degree of Education (S.Pd) in English Department of Tarbiyah and Teacher Training Faculty of IAIN Padangsidimpuan.

Therefore, we hope that the thesis will soon be examined in front of the Thesis Examiners Team of English Education Department Tarbiyah and Teacher Training Faculty IAIN Padangsidimpuan. Thank you.

Wassalamu'alaikum Wr.Wb.

Advisor I


Rayendriani Fahmei Lubis, M.Ag NIP. 197105102000032001

Advisor II


Sojuangon Rambe, S.S., M. Pd NIP. 197908152006041003

## DECLARATION OF SELF THESIS COMPLETION

The name who signed here:
Name : ANITA LUSTIANA
Registrasi Number : 133400004
Faculty/ Department : Tarbiyah and Teacher Training Faculty/ TBI-1
The Title of Thesis : "The Effect of Using Outlining Technique on Students' Writing Descriptive Text Ability at X Grade of MAN 1 Padangsidimpuan"

I hereby declare that I have arranged and written the thesis by myself, without asking for illegal help from others except the guidance from advisors, and without doing plagiarism as it is required in students' ethic code of IAIN Padangsidimpuan article 14 verse 2.

I do this declaration truthfully. If there is deceitfulness and incorrectioness regarding to this declaration in the future, I will be willing to get punishment as it is required in students' Ethic Code of IAIN Padangsidimpuan, article 19 verse 4, that is to cancel academic degree disrespectfully, and other punishment regarding norms and legal law.

Padangsidimpuan, $16^{\text {th }}$ November 2017
Declaration Maker


Reg.Number. 133400004

## AGREEMENT PUBLICATION FINAL TASK

## FOR ACADEMIC CAVITY

As academic cavity of the State Institute for Islamic Studies Padangsidimpuan, the name who signed here:

| Name | $:$ ANITA LUSTIANA |
| :--- | :--- |
| Registrasi Number | $: 133400004$ |
| Faculty/ Department | : Tarbiyah and Teacher Training Faculty/ TBI-1 |
| Kind | $:$ Thesis |

To develop of science and knowledge, I hereby declare that I present Islamic Studies Padangsidimpuan Non Exclusive Royalty Right on my thesis with entitle:

## "THE EFFECT OF USING OUTLINING TECHNIQUE ON STUDENTS' WRITING DESCRIPTIVE TEXT ABILITY AT X GRADE OF MAN 1 PADANGSIDIMPUAN"

With all the sets of equipments (if needed). Based on the this non exclusive royalty right, the State Institute for Islamic Studies Padangsidimpuan has the right to save; to format, to organize in data base form, to keep and to publish thesis for as I am determined as a writer and owner of its creative right.

Above all, this statement is made true heartedly to be used propertly.

## EXAMINERS

## SCHOLAR MUNAQOSYAH EXAMINATION




## RELIGION MINISTRY REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA

 THE STATE INSTITUTE FOR ISLAMIC STUDIES PADANGSIDIMPUAN TARBIYAH AND TEACHER TRAINING FACULTY
## LEGALIZATION

| Thesis | :THE EFFECT OF USING OUTLINING TECHNIQUE ON |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | STUDENTS' WRITING DESCRIPTIVE TEXT ABILITY AT X |
|  | GRADE OF MAN 1 PADANGSIDIMPUAN |
|  | Written By |
| Reg. Number | $:$ ANITA LUSTIANA |
| Faculty/Department: $: 13 \mathbf{3 4 0} 0004$ |  |

The Thesis had been accepted as a partial fulfillment of the requirement for the graduate degree of Education (S.Pd) in English.

Padangsiompuan, $16^{\text {th }}$ November 2017

> an Dean

Vice Dear of Academic Fields


NIP: $19720 \$ 202000032002$

| Name | $:$ Anita Lustiana |
| :--- | :--- |
| Reg. No | $: 133400004$ |
| Faculty | $:$ Tarbiyah and Teacher Training |
| Department | : English Education (TBI-1) |
| Title of Thesis | $:$ The Effect of Using Outlining Technique on Students |
|  | Writing Descriptive Text Ability at X Grade of MAN 1 |
|  | Padangsidimpuan |


#### Abstract

This research focused on the The Effect of Using Outlining Technique on Students’ Writing Descriptive Text Ability at X Grade of MAN 1 Padangsidimpuan. The students' problems in writing were: 1) Students were lack of vocabulary ; 2) Students grammatically errors ; 3) Students were difficult to organize the text. Beside the students' problem, teacher's technique also became a problem in learning writing descriptive text. The teacher did not use suitable technique in teaching writing descriptive text. The purpose of this research was to examine whether there was significant effect of using Outlining technique on students' writing descriptive text ability at X grade of MAN 1 Padangsidimpuan..

The method used in this research was experimental research. Two classes were chosen as the sample. They were X MIA 1 as the control class that consisted of 40 students and X MIA 2 as the experimental class that consisted of 40 students. It was taken after conducting normality and homogeneity test. The data was derived from pre-test and post-test. To measure the data, the researcher used $t$-test formula.

After analyzing the data, the researcher found that mean score of experimental class after using Outlining Technique was higher than control class. Mean score of experimental class before using Outlining technique was 59.34 and mean score after using Outlining tehnique was 79.00. Meanwhile, the mean score of control class in pre-test was 63.7 and in post-test was 72.48 . Besides it, the score of $t_{\text {count }}$ was higher than $\mathrm{t}_{\text {table }}(3.18>2.00)$. It meant that the hypothesis alternative $\left(\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{a}}\right)$ was accepted. It was concluded that there was a significant effect of using Outlining technique on students' writing descriptive text ability at X grade of MAN 1 Padangsidimpuan.


Key Words: Outlining Technique, Writing ability, Descriptive Text

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT



Praised be to Allah swt., the most Creator and Merciful who has given me both pain to teach me about patience and pleasure to lead her to thank Him. He also has given love, health, time, knowledge, strength, and supporters me to finish the thesis. Besides, Shalawat and Salam be upon to the prophet Muhammad saw., that has brought the human from the darkness era into the lightness era.

It is a pleasure to acknowledgement the help and contribution to all of lecturers, institution, family, and friends who have contributed in different ways, hence this thesis is processed until it becomes a complete writing. In the process of finishing this thesis, I got a lot of guidance and motivation from many peoples. Therefore, in this chance I would like to express the deepest gratitude to the following people:

1. Mrs. Rayendriani Fahmei Lubis, M.Ag., as the first advisor and Mr. Sojuangon Rambe, S.S., M.Pd., as the second advisor that had guided, supported, advised, suggested, and helped the writer in different ways with great patience to finish this thesis as well.
2. The Rector of IAIN Padangsidimpuan, Prof. Dr. H. Ibrahim Siregar, MCL., who has given chance and time. Therefore, I could learn and got some knowledge from IAIN Padangsidimpuan.
3. Mrs. Hj. Zulhimma, S.Ag., M.Pd., as the Dean of Tarbiyah and Teacher Training Faculty and the vices.
4. Mrs. Rayendriani Fahmei Lubis, M.Ag., as the Chief of English Education Department who always support me and also all of her students in finishing the thesis and always be patient in facing students' problem.
5. Mrs. Eka Sustri Harida, M.Pd., Mrs. Fitri Rayani Siregar, M.Hum., Mr. Hamka, M.Hum., Mr. Zainuddin, S.S., M.Hum., the lecturers of TBI, all lecturers and all the academic cavities of IAIN Padangsidimpuan who had given so much knowledge and helped during studying in this beloved institution.
6. IAIN Padangsidimpuan Librarian (Yusri Fahmi, S.Ag., M.Hum.), and the staffs, for their cooperative and permission to use their books.
7. Mr. Sojuangon Rambe, S.S., M.Pd.,as the lovely Academic Advisor that has supported and motivated along the time.
8. Headmaster, English teacher (Mr. Jannes Sihombing, S.Pd. and Mr. Abdul Haris, S.Pd.), and students of MAN 1 Padangsidimpuan for their permission, welcoming, and contribution in doing this research.
9. My beloved parents (Bapak Suyatmin and Ibu Mini), who had supported emotionally and financially. They gave big suplay in my life with much love, hope, support, patience, and pray without hoping a return that guarded me to be better in all conditions.
10. My beloved brother (Andry Firmansyah), with his pray and support me to do the best.
11. My lovely friends; Annisa Nur Habibie A.R. Harahap. S.Pd., Ade Ira Safithri Hsb, Nindya Afyuni Silitonga, Andiriana Sormin, S.E., Ade Yanti, S.Pd., Nur Azizah, S.Pd., Yudhi Yalvin, Anni Mardiah, S.E., Aminah Adelini Hsb., and all of beloved friends in TBI 1, and also all of friends in IAIN Padangsidimpuan. Thank you for the holy friendship they gave in these precious years. Thank you for laughter and tear they share and for their spirits that motivated all the time. Thank you for love and honesty. Good luck for all of them.
12. All of the people who have helped in finishing my study that cannot mention one by one, thank you and good luck for you.

I realize that this thesis cannot be considered perfectly without critiques and suggestions from the readers. Therefore, it was a pleasure for me to get critiques and suggestions from the readers to make this thesis better.

Padangsidimpuan, $19^{\text {th }}$ October 2017
Researcher


ANITA LUSTIANA
Reg.Number. 133400004

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page
TITLE PAGE ..... i
LEGALIZATION ADVISORS SHEET ..... ii
AGREEMENT ADVISORS SHEET ..... iii
DECLARATION OF SELF THESIS COMPLETION ..... iv
AGREEMENT PUBLICATION OF FINAL TASK FOR ACADEMIC CIVITY ..... v
SCHOLAR MUNAQOSYAH EXAMINATION ..... vi
LEGALIZATION OF DEAN OF TARBIYAH AND TEACHER TRAINING FACULTY ..... vii
ABSTRACT ..... viii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT ..... ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS ..... xii
LIST OF TABLES ..... xiv
LIST OF FIGURES ..... xv
LIST OF APPENDIXES ..... xvi
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION
A. Background of the Problem ..... 1
B. Identification of the Problem ..... 5
C. Limitation of the Problem ..... 5
D. Formulation of the Problem ..... 6
E. Purpose of the Research ..... 6
F. Significances of the Research ..... 6
G. Definition of Operational Variables. ..... 7
H. Outline of the Thesis ..... 7
CHAPTER II LITERATURE REVIEW
A. Theoretical Description ..... 9

1. Outlining Technique ..... 9
a. Definition of Outlining Technique ..... 9
b. Outlining Model ..... 10
c. The Purpose of Outlining Technique ..... 11
d. Procedure of Outlining Technique ..... 12
2. Conventional Technique ..... 13
a. Definition of Conventional Technique ..... 13
b. The Purpose of Conventional Technique ..... 14
c. Classification of Conventional Technique ..... 14
d. The Procedure of Conventional Technique ..... 16
3. Writing Descriptive Text Ability ..... 17
a. Definition of Writing ..... 17
b. Types of Classroom Writing Performance ..... 18
c. Evaluation of Writing ..... 19
4. Descriptive Text ..... 22
a. Definition of Descriptive Text ..... 22
b. Generic Structure of Descriptive Text ..... 23
c. Language Features of Descriptive Text ..... 23
d. The Example of Descriptive Text ..... 24
B. Review of Related Findings ..... 25
C. Framework of Thinking ..... 26
D. Hypothesis of Research ..... 28
CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHODOLOGY
A. Place and Time of the Research ..... 29
B. Research Design ..... 29
C. Population and Sample ..... 31
D. Instrument of Collecting Data ..... 34
E. Validity of Instrument ..... 37
F. Procedures of the Research ..... 37
G. Technique of Analyzing Data ..... 40
CHAPTER IV RESEARCH RESULT
A. Description of Data ..... 42
B. Technique of Data Analysis ..... 59
C. Discussion ..... 62
D. Limitation of the Research ..... 64
CHAPTER V THE CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION
A. Conclusion ..... 65
B. Suggestion ..... 66
REFERENCES
CURRICULUM VITAE
APPENDIXES

## LIST OF TABLES

Page
Table 1 Research Design ..... 30
Table 2 The Population of the Grade X MIA Students of MAN 1 Padangsidimpuan ..... 31
Table 3 Sample of the Research ..... 32
Table 4 Rubric Score of Writing ..... 35
Table 5 The Score of Experimental Class in Pre-test ..... 42
Table 6 Frequency Distribution of Experimental Class in Pre-test ..... 43
Table 7 The Score of Control Class in Pre-test ..... 45
Table 8 Frequency Distribution of Control Class in Pre-test ..... 45
Table 9 The Score of Experimental Class in Post Test ..... 47
Table 10 Frequency Distribution of Experimental Class in Post-test ..... 47
Table 11 The Score of Control Class in Post-test. ..... 49
Table 12 Frequency Distribution of Control Class in Post-test. ..... 49
Table 13 The Comparison Score of Students' Writing Descriptive Text in Pre-test and Post-test (Experimental Class) ..... 51
Table 14 The Comparison Score of Students' Writing Descriptive text in Pre-test and Post-test (Control Class). ..... 53
Table 15 The Comparison Score of Students' Writing Descriptive Text in Experimental and Control Class (Pre-test) ..... 55
Table 16 The Comparison Score of Students' Writing Descriptive Text in Experimental and Control Class (Post-test) ..... 57
Table 17 Normality and Homogeneity in Pre-Test. ..... 59
Table 18 Normality and Homogeneity in Post-Test ..... 60
Table 19 Result of T-test from the Both Averages ..... 61

## LIST OF FIGURES

## Page

Figure 1 : The Result Score of Students' Writing Descriptive Text in Experimental Class (Pre-Test) ..... 44
Figure 2 : The Result Score of Students' Writing Descriptive Text in Control Class (Pre-test) ..... 46
Figure 3 : The Result Score of Students' Writing Descriptive Text in Experimental Class (Post-test) ..... 48
Figure 4 : The Result Score of Students' Writing Descriptive Text in Control Class (Post-test) ..... 50
Figure 5 : The Comparison Data of Students' Writing Descriptive text in Pre-test and Post-test (Experimental Class) ..... 52
Figure 6 : The Comparison Data of Students' Writing Descriptive Text in Pre-test and Post-test (Control Class) ..... 54
Figure 7 : The Comparison between Description Data of Students’ Writing Descriptive Text Ability in Experimental and Control Class (Pre-test) ..... 56
Figure 8 : The Comparison between Description Data of Students' Writing Descriptive Text in Experimental and Control Class (Post-test) ..... 58

## LIST OF APPENDIXES

Appendix 1 : Lesson Plan of Experimental Class
Appendix 2 : Lesson Plan of Control Class
Appendix 3 : Instrument for Pre-Test
Appendix 4 : Instrument for Post-Test

Appendix 5 : Score of Experimental Class and Control Class Pre Test
Appendix 6 : Result of Normality Test in Pre Test
Appendix 7 : Homogeneity Test (Pre-Test)
Appendix 8 : Score of Experimental Class and Control Class in Post Test
Appendix 9 : Result of Normality Test in Post Test
Appendix 10 : Homogeneity Test in Post-Test
Appendix 11 : T-test of the Both Averages in Pre-Test

Appendix 12 : T-test of the Both Averages in Post-Test
Appendix 13 : Indicator of Writing in Pre-Test and Post Test
Appendix 14 : Comparison Score Of Students' Writing Ability in Pre-Test and Post-Test

Appendix 15 : Chi-Square Table
Appendix 16 : Z-Table
Appendix 17 : Percentage Points of the t Distribution
Appendix 18 : Documentation

## CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

## A. Background of the Problem

Writing has important role in our language as a communication. Writing allows us to communicate across the distance, either the distant of place or the distant of time. It means that we can communicate with other people whenever and wherever they are by writing. But, written communication is not same as oral communication. In oral communication we are helped by nonlinguistic aspects such as intonation, mime, gesture, and others. While in written communication there is no nonlinguistic aspect, so as the result we must explicitly state the idea or information to the reader.

In English Language Learning, writing is one of the important skill that must be mastered by students besides speaking, listening, and reading. Writing has many advantages, they are:

First, increasing knowledge. Writing can increase our knowledge, we will find new things which previously unknown. When we write we will look for and comprehend some information or references which is relevant with our topic for supporting our writing. So, writing activity will enlarge our knowledge theoretically or even the relevant facts about the topic.

Second, expressing what exist in our mind. Writing provides us to produce and express our ideas, thoughts, and also feeling to the reader
through written form, such as in a paragraph, text, or even story. Writer also can communicate with the reader through written form, the reader can know the writer's feeling through writing.

Third, writing has advantage for our health. Writing is not only a media for expressing idea and feeling, but also a therapy for strengthening physic and freshening mental. Logically, when writing the writer is activating leftbrain which concern with analysis and rationality, so that the right-brain will free for intuiting and feeling. Some doctors recommend hand writing for old people as an effective cognitive drill to keep their mind to operate well. Basically, writing activates brain part meanwhile typing, include the part which operate thinking, language, and also work memory. Writing also has advantage psychologically. Writing will decrease our stress. We can express everything even our happiness or sadness in a writing freely without known by other people. ${ }^{1}$ So that, many people write their problem on diary to show their feeling and decrease their stress.

Based on the explanation above, writing has a lot of significances, it has advantages for our psychology and health. It can strengthen our physic and refresh our mental. So, writing is really important skill that must be mastered by the students. Student must pay attention and do not underestimate it. But, unfortunately, writing still become a problem in school, especially for

[^0]students in MAN 1 Padangsidimpuan. It can be seen based on private interview done by the researcher with one teacher of MAN 1 Padangsidimpuan ${ }^{2}$. He stated that there are many problems in English language learning, especially in writing:

First, students are lack of vocabulary. They spend much time to open dictionary in the process of writing. Moreover, sometimes when they did not bring dictionary, they spend time to ask their friends about the vocabulary. Students only use simple vocabulary that they know and use it redundantly on their writing.

Second, grammatically error. Usually, students do error in forming a sentence. They are usually error in using preposition and to be. Grammatical errors caused by their lack of understanding about grammar and it make students think that writing is difficult.

Third, students are difficult to organize the text. They spend considerable time to correct their compositions only to find the effective way to make a good writing. They are also seldom to get writing practice in the process of learning. So that, students of MAN 1 Padangsidimpuan feel that writing is difficult because they cannot construct good writing.

There are many techniques can be conducted in teaching writing in the classroom. Some of the popular techniques are brainstorming, clustering, free-

[^1]writing, outlining and others. Those various techniques are suitable and good for helping students to construct a good text.

One of the technique to teach writing is Outlining technique. An Outline is a visual and conceptual design of your writing. It breaks down the parts of your text in a clear, hierarchical manner. It helps you to organize your ideas, present your material in a logical form and show the relationship among ideas in your writing. ${ }^{3}$ Outlining provides a quick check on whether your paper will be unified. It also suggests right at the start whether your paper will be adequately supported, and it shows you how to plan a paper that is well organized. ${ }^{4}$ So, it can be concluded that Outlining technique is a technique which can be conducted in order to show the relationship among ideas in a writing, and it also helps students easier to construct or to create a text with well organization.

Based on the explanation above, the researcher is interest to introduce Outlining technique to teach writing in the classroom. Outline helps to prevent a writer from getting stuck when performing the actual writing of the essay. It can be the framework on which the whole essay that will be written. An Outline also provides a map of where to go with the essay. This reason finally guided the researcher to formulate the title "The Effect of Using Outlining

[^2]Technique on Students' Writing Descriptive Text Ability At X Grade of MAN 1 Padangsidimpuan.

## B. Identification of the Problem

Based on the background of the problem before, writing has important role in our language as a communication. Writing allows us to communicate across the distance, either the distant of place or the distant of time. It means that we can communicate with other people whenever and wherever they are by writing. The importance of writing has known by people in educational institution, especially English teachers and learners.

There are some problems on students writing that have mentioned on the background of the problem previously. First, Students are lack of vocabulary. They spend much time to open dictionary in the process of writing. Second, Grammatically errors caused by their lack of understanding about grammar. Third, Students are difficult to organize the text.

## C. Limitation of the problem

Based on the identification of problems above, the researcher focuses on the problem on the students' writing descriptive text ability at X grade Academic Year 2017/2018 MAN 1 Padangsidimpuan. The researcher chose Outlining technique to solve the problem in learning process.

## D. Formulation of The Problem

The formulations of the problem in this research are:

1. How is students' writing descriptive text ability before using Outlining technique at X grade of MAN 1 Padangsidimpuan?
2. How is students' writing descriptive ability after using Outlining technique at X grade of MAN 1 Padangsidimpuan?
3. Is there any significant effect of using Outlining technique on students' writing descriptive text ability at X grade of MAN 1 Padangsidimpuan?

## E. Purpose of the Research

Based on formulation of problem above, the purpose of this research are:

1. To examine the students' writing ability before using Outlining technique at X grade in MAN 1 Padangsidimpuan.
2. To examine the students' writing ability after using Outlining technique at X grade in MAN 1 Padangsidimpuan.
3. To examine whether there is or there is not any significant effect of using Outlining technique to students' writing ability at X grade in MAN 1 Padangsidimpuan.

## F. Significances of the Research

The significances of this research are:

1. As an input to the teacher in learning process to teach by using outlining technique at X grade of MAN 1 Padangsidimpuan. It will give the information to the teacher about their student's writing ability.
2. For the headmaster as one domain measurement of teaching progress.
3. This research is useful for the teacher as source of teaching and to improve their quality in teaching writing ability.
4. The result of this research is expected to be the information for the others researchers to make the further research.

## G. Definition of Operational Variables

The terms are used in this research are as follow

1. Outlining Technique

Outlining technique is a technique which is conducted in order to visualize and design writing. It breaks down the parts of the text to help to organize the ideas and show the relationship among ideas.
2. Writing Descriptive Text Ability

Writing descriptive text ability is an ability to write a descriptive text correctly as suitable with the generic structure. Writing descriptive text ability also can be defined as an ability to express ideas and organize them into statements and paragraphs that will be clear to a reader.

## H. The Outline of the Thesis

The systematic of this research is divided into five chapters. Each chapter consists of many sub chapters with detail as follow:

In chapter one, it consists of background of the problems, identification of the problems, formulation of the problem, limitation of the problem, purpose
of the research, significances of the research, definition of operational variables, and the outline of the thesis.

In chapter two, it consists of the theoretical descriptions, which the sub chapters consist of the theoretical description of outlining technique and explain about writing ability. Then, review related findings, conceptual of framework and hypothesis.

In chapter three, research methodology which consists of place and time of the research, research design, population and sample, instruments of collecting data, validity and reliability, procedures of research and the last is the techniques of analyzing data.

In chapter four, it consists of the result of the research, it explains about the analysis of data. This chapter consists of description of data, hypothesis testing, discussion of the research and limitation of research.

Finally, in chapter five consist of the conclusion and suggestion. It is about conclusion of the research result and suggestion for students, teacher, school, and other researchers that want to do research related to this research. That is the final of the thesis.

## CHAPTER II

## THEORETICAL DESCRIPTION

## A. Theoretical Description

## 1. Outlining Technique

## a. Definition of Outlining Technique

Outlining is an activity which can be conducted in prewriting to prevent the writing from getting stuck in a process of writing. It will help the writer to explore ideas related to the topic, and helps the writer to organize the text well.

According to Flora Debora, an outline is a visual and conceptual design of your writing. It breaks down the parts of your text in a clear, hierarchical manner. It helps you to organize your ideas, present your material in a logical form and show the relationship among ideas in your writing. ${ }^{1}$ Outlining provides a quick check on whether your paper will be unified. It also suggests right at the start whether your paper will be adequately supported, and it shows you how to plan a paper that is well organized. ${ }^{2}$ The scratch outline is a plan or blueprint to help you achieve a unified, supported, well-organized composition. ${ }^{3}$ In an outline, you think carefully about the point you are making, the

[^3]supporting items for that point, and the order in which you will arrange those items.

While technique is super-ordinate term to refer to various activities that either teachers or learners perform in the classroom. ${ }^{4}$ In other words, techniques include all tasks and activities which is conducted in the learning process.

Based on definition above, outlining technique can be defined as an activity which is conducted in the classroom in order to visualize and concept writing design in a logical form to show the relationship among ideas in a writing.

## b. Outlining Model

When you are planning a traditional essay consisting of an introduction, three supporting paragraphs, and a conclusion, a scratch outline is especially important. It may be only a few words, but it will be the framework on which your whole essay will be built.

An outline has three section: a beginning called the introduction, a middle called the body of the essay, an end called the conclusion.

The following is a simple outline form:
I. Topic sentence.
II. Suppor ting sentences
a. Main supporting sentence 1
b. Main supporting sentence 2
c. Main supporting sentence 3

[^4]III. Concluding sentence.

A more detailed outline would look like this:
I. Topic sentence.
II. Supporting sentence.
a. First main supporting sentence

1) Supporting detail 1
2) Supporting detail 2
3) Supporting detail 3
b. Second main supporting sentence
4) Supporting detail 1
5) Supporting detail 2
6) Supporting detail 3
c. Third main supporting sentence
7) Supporting detail 1
8) Supporting detail 2
9) Supporting detail 3
III. Concluding sentence ${ }^{5}$

The outline is a helpful guide you to use as you write your paragraph. In an outline you list the main points in the order in which you will write about them. This will help you to organize thoughts. To help you to stay with the topic, look at your outline as you write your paragraph.

## c. The Purpose of Outlining Technique

An outline is purposed to be a simple framework for presenting the main and supporting ideas for a particular subject or topic in order to make sense on your writing.

There are some purposes of outlining technique:

1) Generating idea
2) Forming a structure

[^5]3) Linking ideas
4) Clarifying a contribution
5) Creating coherence
6) Sifting and eliminating ideas
7) Finding direction
8) Contextualizing your work ${ }^{6}$

Outlining your essay before you write will gives your essay structure and keeps you from going all over your writing. It allows a more coherent and fluid final product, and it can also be the structure of an abstract if you're writing a scientific paper.

## d. Procedure of Outlining Technique

Making a detailed outline before you begin writing is a good way to make sure your ideas come across in a clear and logical order. A good outline can help you generate ideas, organize thoughts, help you save time, and write faster.

Let's review the steps in the writing process:

1) Choose the topic and then gather supporting ideas and details. There are several ways to gather ideas, including listing, clustering, free-writing, etc.
2) Organize your ideas. Group your ideas logically.
3) Make an outline. ${ }^{7}$

Planning an essay takes a little more work because there are many ideas and details to organize. Because an essay is longer than paragraph, so it requires more careful planning.

[^6][^7]
## 2. Conventional Technique

## a. Definition of Conventional Technique

Conventional techniques are thought to be traditional techniques. Conventional or traditional teaching concern with the teacher is being the controller of the learning environment. The teacher actually is the leader in the class.

According to Hudson that "conventional teaching is a technique that used by the teachers based mutual agreement in a school. ${ }^{8}$. Conventional technique is the technique used by teacher in common ways or lecture technique. Conventional teaching technique have been espoused for providing an opportunity for students' to learn directly from subject experts such methods can lack flexibility, do not ensure teaching consistency nor accommodate the diverse learning needs of students. ${ }^{9}$

Briefly, conventional technique can be defined as a technique which is conducted by the teacher to teach the material to students based on mutual agreement in a school. Conventional also means something that considered acceptable by society and perhaps not very interesting.

[^8]
## b. The Purpose of Conventional Technique

The Conventional or Lecture teaching technique is the oldest (traditional) teaching technique applied in educational Institution. This teaching technique is one way to communicate the information or subject matter by teacher with lecturing in teaching learning process.

Gattegno says that there are three purposes of Conventional (Lecture) technique, they are:

1) To convey the information or material in teaching learning process.
2) To increase the students' knowledge and language from teaching learning process in classroom.
3) To explain the subject matter or material based on design by teacher inclearly. ${ }^{10}$

Based on the quotation above, it can be seen that the purpose of Conventional technique are to convey a subject matter is logically arranged, and to increase the students' knowledge and language from explaining by teacher or teaching learning process in classroom. This teaching technique is one way to communicate the information or subject matter by teacher with lecturing in teaching learning process.

## b. Classification of Conventional Technique

In conventional technique there are many ways which can be conducted in teaching and learning process, such as: lecturer, project,

[^9]discussion, problem solving, homework, demonstrations and so on. ${ }^{11}$ From this technique, there is the technique which is often used by the teacher, that is lecturer technique. ${ }^{12}$

Lecturer technique is traditional technique. This technique had been used since long time. It is as an oral communication tool between teacher and students in interaction educative. Moreover in educative and traditional teaching it is like in rural that have weakness in learning facilities and teacher. ${ }^{13}$ In other words, lecturer technique can be defined as a technique which is used to by the teacher to have educative communication with the students. Teacher as the controller that control the process of learning.

There are some steps before showing this method, they are:
a) Preparation (Create the learning condition to students)
b) Implementation (Teacher convoys the material then given opportunity to students for connecting and comparing the material of lecturer that had accepted through catechizing)
c) Evaluation (Give a test to students for looking students' comprehension about material that had learned). ${ }^{14}$

The teacher needs to prepare all things before starting to learn. Preparing the lesson which is completed by the lesson plan and syllabus, preparing the learning condition by managing the class to be more enjoyable in learning process. Teacher also convoys the material

[^10]then give opportunity to students for connecting and comparing the material of lecturer that had accepted through catechizing. After that, teacher also must give test for looking students' comprehension about material that had been learned.

## c. The Procedure of Conventional Technique

In this technique, the teacher usually gives all of the explanation of the materials or it is a teacher centered. This traditional technique sometimes will make the students be easier to feel bored and difficult to understand the material in learning process. There are three steps in teaching by Conventional (Lecture) technique classroom, they are:

1) Opening Phase
a. Formulate goals to be achieved.
b. Determine the main points of the material to be explain.
c. Prepare tools.
2) Presentation Phase
a. Maintain continuous eye contact with students.
b. Present learning materials in systematic, no bounding to be easily captured by the students.
c. Respond to immediate students reponses.
d. Keep the class conducive and exciting to learn.
3) Closing Phase
a. Giving conclusion of subject matter
b. Evaluate the students' ability in learning process by given a test based on the subject matter that have been learned. ${ }^{15}$

Based on the explanations above, there are three steps procedure of
Conventional (Lecture) technique, they are: Opening phase, presentation
Phase, and Closing Phase. The first, in opening phase a teacher open the

[^11]class with formulate the objectives to be achieved, determine the main points of the material will be explain, and preparing the tools. The second, in implementing phase a teacher gives and explain the material. The third, in ending or closing phase a teacher gives a task or exercise for evaluating the students' comprehension or ability about the material that have been learned.

## 3. Writing Descriptive Text Ability

## a. Definition of Writing

Writing is a process of inventing ideas in a written form. Writing also a process of linking ideas to be the sentence or event text with several purposes to be deserved to the reader.

According to Oshima and Hogue writing is most likely to encourage thinking and learning when students view writing as a process. ${ }^{16}$ According to David Nunan, writing can be as physical act of committing words or ideas to some medium. On the other hand, writing is the mental work of inventing ideas, thinking about how to express them, and organizing them into statements and paragraphs that will be clear to a reader. ${ }^{17}$ According to John Langan, writing is a process of discovery that involves a series of steps, and those steps are

[^12]very often a zigzag journey. ${ }^{18}$ Very often, writers do not discover just what they want to write about until they explore their thoughts in writing.

Based on definitions above, writing can be defined as a process to express ideas and organize them into statements and paragraphs that will be clear to a reader.

## b. Types of Classroom Writing Performance

Consider the following five major categories of classroom writing performance:

1) Imitative, or writing down

Students will simply "write down" English letter, word, and possibly sentences in order to learn the conventions of the orthographic code.
2) Intensive, or controlled

Another form of controlled writing is s dicto-comp. here a paragraph is read at normal speed; then the teacher puts key words from paragraph in sequence on the blackboard and asks students to rewrite the paragraph from the best of their collection of the reading, using the words on the board.
3) Self-writing

The most silent instance of this category in classroom is note-taking, where students take notes during a lecture for the purpose of later recall. Diary or journal writing also fall into this category.
4) Display writing

For academically bound ESL students, one of academic skills that they need to master is a whole array of display writing technique.
5) Real writing

Three subcategories illustrate how reality can be injected:

[^13]a) Academic. The language experience approach gives groups of students opportunities to convey genuine information to each other.
b) Vocational/ technical. Quite variety of real writing can take place in classes of students studying English for advancement in their occupation.
c) Personal. In virtually any ESL class, diaries, letters, post cards, notes, personal messages, and other informal writing can take place, especially within the context of an interactive classroom. ${ }^{19}$

Based on the quotation above, it can be concluded that there are five categories of writing that is often conducted in the classroom. They are; imitative writing, intensive writing, self writing, display writing, and real writing. These all categories usually conducted based on students' need.

## c. Evaluation of Writing

Two different approaches for assessing writing ability can be adopted. Firstly, writing can be divided into discrete levels, e. g., grammar, vocabulary, spelling and punctuation, and these elements can be tested separately by the use of objective tests. Secondly, more direct extended writing tasks of various types could be constructed. These would have greater construct, content, face, and wash-back validity but would require a more subjective assessment. ${ }^{20}$ There are some forms of the direct testing of writing:

[^14]
## a) Essay test

Advantages:

1) The essay has traditionally been accorded high prestige as a testing technique which may explain a widespread reluctance to discard it despite the problems in marking that have been encountered.
2) The topics are extremely easy to set and it is a familiar testing technique to both the candidates and the user of test results.
3) It is a suitable vehicle for testing skill, such as the ability to develop an extended argument in a logical manner, which cannot be tested in other way.
4) The big advantage it shares with other tests of extended writing is that a sample of writing is produced which can provide a tangible point of reference for comparison in the future.
Disadvantages:
5) Free, open-ended writing is problematic. An ability to write on general open-ended topics may depend on the candidate's background or cultural knowledge, imagination or creativity.
6) The candidate may not have any interest in the topic is given and if a selection of topics is provided it is very difficult to compare performances especially if the production of different text types is involved.
7) Candidates tend to approach an open-ended question in different ways and examiners have to assess the relative merits of these different approaches.
8) Time pressure is often an unrealistic constraint, For most people the writing process is lengthier and may involve several drafts before a finish version is produces.
9) The inclusion of an extended writing component in an examination is time consuming in terms of the total amount of test time that is available for testing all the skill.

## b) Controlled writing task

Advantages:

1) The task is most effective when the candidate is asked to comment on particular trends shown in a graph, or to compare and contrast one set of figures with another.
Disadvantages:
2) Problems have arisen when, candidates are unable to cope with the mental challenge of taking this short of test and
give up rather than jump through the intellectual hoops necessary to get ito the writing task.
3) The difficulties generated by these information transfer type tasks may arise through educational or cultural differences in ability to interpret graphs or tables or line drawing.
c) Summary

Advantages:

1) Summary of the main points of a text in this fashion involves the ability to write a controlled composition containing the essential ideas of a piece of writing and omitting non-essentials.
Disadvantages:
2) The problem of specificity of the text candidate are expected to produce arises summary task as in other controlled writing tasks.
3) The main difficulty an integrated writing component of this type is making the marking reliable and consistent. ${ }^{21}$

Based on explanation above, there are some forms of testing writing which has advantages and disadvantages each other. They are; Essay test which can be conducted to test skill, such as the ability to develop an extended argument in a logical manner which cannot be tested in other way. Controlled writing task which is conducted to comment on particular trends shown in a graph, or to compare nd contrast one set of figures with another. Then, Summary test to test the ability to write a controlled composition containing the essential ideas of a piece of writing and omitting non-essentials.

[^15]
## 4. Descriptive Text

## a. Definition of Descriptive Text

Description is a written English text in which the writer describes an object. In this text, the object can be a concrete or abstract object. It can be a person, or an animal, or a tree, or a house, or camping. It can be about any topic. The purpose of text is to describe particular person, place, or thing. ${ }^{22}$ In other word, descriptive text is a kind of an English text to describe particular person, place, or things as clear as possible to the reader.

When you describe someone or something, you give your readers a picture in words. To make the word picture as vivid and real as possible, you must observe and record specific details that appeal to your readers' senses (sight, hearing, taste, smell, and touch). More than any type of essay, a descriptive paper needs sharp, colorful details. ${ }^{23}$ More detail you describe something will easier the reader to get picture of your description.

A good piece of descriptive writing has some logical plan of development. The writer tries to give a picture or impression of a person, place, or thing, but unlike the photographer or a painter, who has chemicals or pigments to work with, the writer has only words to

[^16]use. Therefore, to be effective, written descriptions should have an efficient, sensible, carefully thought-out, logical plan. ${ }^{24}$

Briefly, descriptive text can be defined as an English text which describes or give picture of something through words as real as possible.

## b. The Generic Structure Of Descriptive Text

Description is text containing two components:

1) Identification: is to identify the object to describe.
2) Description: describes parts, qualities, and characteristics of the parts of the object. ${ }^{25}$

In identification, we introduce the object that will be described generally. Then in the part of description we give detail information or characteristic of the object described. It may involve qualities, characteristics, daily life or physical appearance and others.

## c. Language Features of Descriptive text

There are four dominant grammatical aspects in descriptive text:

1) Focus on specific participants.
2) Use of attributive and identifying processes.
3) Frequent use of epithets and classifiers in nominal groups.
4) Use of simple present tense
[^17]A descriptive text can be identified based four language features; Descriptive text focuses on the specific participant, it focuses on the detail to be described. It uses attributive to describe things, use epithet, and use simple present tense.

## d. The Example of Descriptive Text

## CAT

Before I came to Jakarta, I used to hate cats. I imagined them to be very selfish, sneaky, and sly. However, I have found myself living in a home that has three cats.

Janu and Shinta are my host mother's cats. Janu is a funny male Persian cat with full of curiosity. He eats cat food every single hour, so he has a big belly. He moves his tail when he finds something exciting. But, he always moves his tail slowly when I call his name. He always sleeps beside me in every night. A good thing I like about him, Janu doesn't minds if I touch and tickle his fat belly.

Shinta is a queen of the house. She walks like a professional model. She doesn't like to be touched by me except my host mother. Even if I try to touch her, she runs away immediately from me. She always licks her fur to clean her body. She prefers to eat people's foods to cat foods. She never plays with the other cats. She spends almost every night on my host mother's bed.

The last cat is Kuro. I named him Kuro, meaning "black" in Japanese. He has black fur. He used to be a wild cat and was very skinny when I found him in the back yard. He has round adorable eyes. He always enjoys sitting on my foot. Janu seems to teach Kuro a lot things.

Even Janu teaches him how to get fat. Kuro has got fat like Janu lately. They are very good friends.

## B. Review of Related Findings

Many researcher were talking about students' writing ability and there were some researches that have been used outlining technique. Related to this research, some researches had been done as follow:

First, Amrullah, the conclusion of his research was there was any significant effect of outline technique toward students' ability in witing descriptive text at the eight grade of MTs An-Nur Palangka Raya. where the mean score of experimental class 74.25 and control class 68.97 with $\mathrm{t}_{\text {count }}$ higher than $\mathrm{t}_{\text {table }}(2.787>2.021) .{ }^{26}$ So, the implication of Outlining technique was get better achievement in teaching writing than conventional technique. It meant that the hypothesis was accepted.

Second, Lutvie Nirmala Fauzi, the conclusion of her research was that outline activity is effective to be used to teach writing. Where the mean score of

[^18]experimental class is 73.47 and control class is 67.85 with $\mathrm{t}_{\text {count }}$ higher than $\mathrm{t}_{\text {table }}$ $(3,01>2,00)$ level of significance $5 \% .{ }^{27}$ It means that outline activity had better implication to teach writing effectively.

Third, Gusti Herlambang, the conclusion of his thesis was that there was significant effect of using clustering technique in students' writing skill of descriptive text at the first grade SMP N 2 Rambah Hilir. Where the mean score of experimental class is 73.38 and control class is 66.64 with $t_{\text {count }}$ higher than $t_{\text {table }}$ $(1.718>1.671) .{ }^{28}$ So, the implication of clustering technique is better achievement in teaching writing than conventional technique.

Based on descriptions above, the researcher hoped that Outlining Technique can increase the students' writing descriptive text ability and can complete the previous research. So, the researcher wanted to do a research with the title "The Effect of Using Outlining Technique on Students' Writing Descriptive Text Ability at X Grade of MAN 1 Padangsidimpuan".

## C. Framework of Thinking

Conducting a technique in teaching writing is the important thing that must be considered by the teacher to success the writing process. The teacher must choose the suitable technique for the students to easier them in practicing writing in order to organize text well. The students will be more

[^19]enthusiasm writing and it will make them easy in composing or organizing the text. So, the researcher conducted a research based on the framework as below:


The researcher found the problem that student's were lack of vocabulary, did grammatical error and also difficult in organizing text. Therefore, in this case researcher used outlining technique to solve the problems. Before conducting outlining technique, researcher gave pre-test to control and experimental class. After that, researcher taught writing by using outlining technique to experimental class while the control class was taught by using conventional technique. Then, researcher gave post-test to both classes. The last, researcher compared the writing result of pre-test and post-test between experimental and control class to prove the hypothesis.

## D. Hypothesis of the Research

Hypothesis is the provisional result of the research. The hypotheses of this research are:

1. There is the significant effect of using Outlining technique on students' writing descriptive text ability at X grade of MAN 1 Padangsidimpuan $\left(\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{a}}\right) \cdot \mathrm{t}_{\text {count }}>\mathrm{t}_{\text {table }}$
2. There is no significant effect of using Outlining technique on students' writing descriptive text ability at X grade of MAN 1 Padangsidimpuan $\left(\mathrm{H}_{0}\right) . \mathrm{t}_{\text {count }}<\mathrm{t}_{\text {table }}$

## CHAPTER III

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

## A. Place and Time of the Research

The research was done at MAN 1 Padangsidimpuan. The school located on Sutan Soripada Mulia Street, No. 31 C Padangsidimpuan Utara. The time of this research was from $27^{\text {th }}$ October 2016 up to $19^{\text {th }}$ October 2017.

## B. Research Design

The kind of this research was quantitative research with experimental method. The research used two classes in this research. One of the class was taught by Outlining technique and called as Experimental class. Meanwhile the other class was taught by using conventional technique and called as Control class. It was done to know the effect of using treatment in experimental class.

The research used 'True Experimental design' that was described by Sugiyono where in this design a researcher can control all the variables outside that influence the process of experiment. The characteristic of this design is that the sample is taken randomly from a particular population. There are two kinds of true experimental design, namely Posttest Only Control Design and Pretest Control Group Design. ${ }^{1}$ The design used here was Pretest-Posttest Control Group Design. It meant there were two classes chosen

[^20]randomly, then given pre-test to know the basic condition of the two classes. Besides that, Zainal Arifin named this design as Randomized Pre test-Post test Control Group Design where one class is given special treatment. Next the both classess are given post test. The result of the test is compared to know the different effect of treatment to experimental class. ${ }^{2}$ The research design of this research can be seen in the following table:
Table 1
Research Design
(Pretest - Posttest Control Group Design)

| $\mathbf{R}$ | $\mathbf{O}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | $\mathbf{X}$ | $\mathbf{O}_{\mathbf{2}}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{R}$ | $\mathbf{O}_{\mathbf{3}}$ |  | $\mathbf{O}_{\mathbf{4}}$ |

Where:
$\mathrm{R} \quad=$ The Sample of the research
$\mathrm{O}_{1} \quad=$ Pretest in experimental class
$\mathrm{O}_{2} \quad=$ Posttest in experimental class
$\mathrm{X}=$ Treatment
$\mathrm{O}_{3}=$ Pretest in Control class
$\mathrm{O}_{4} \quad=$ Posttest in control class ${ }^{3}$
In this model, both of classes were given pre-test $\left(\mathrm{O}_{1}\right)$. Then, in experimental group was given a treatment $(\mathrm{X})$ and control class was not given a treatment. After giving a treatment, both of classes were given post-test $\left(\mathrm{O}_{2}\right.$ and $\left.\mathrm{O}_{4}\right)$.

[^21]
## C. Population and Sample

1. Population

The population of this research was all of the X MIA class of MAN 1 Padangsidimpuan. It consisted of 4 classes with 158 students. It could be seen in the following table:

Table 2
The Population of the Grade $X$ MIA Students of MAN 1 Padangsidimpuan

| No. | Class | Students |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | X MIA 1 | 40 |
| 2 | X MIA 2 | 40 |
| 3 | X MIA 3 | 39 |
| 4 | X MIA 4 | 39 |
| Total |  | $\mathbf{1 5 8}$ |

Sources: Total of Students at X Grade MIA of MAN 1 Padangsidimpuan Academic Year 2017-2018.
2. Sample

In this research, the researcher chose two classes as a sample. They were divided into experimental class and control class. To take the representative sample from the populations, researcher used simple random sampling. As explained in research design that in Pretest-Posttest Control Group Design, the researcher took the sample randomly. In random sampling, each member of the sampling frame had an equal chance of being chosen to participate in the study. Simple random sampling involved picking a certain number of participants out of the total
number of possible participants in the sampling frame. Sugiyono said that simple random sampling is a technique to take sample from the population that is done randomly without paying attention to the strata in the population. This way is done when the members of population is homogenous. ${ }^{4}$ To know the homogeneity of the samples, researcher did homogeneity and normality test.

Table 3
Sample of the Research

| Sample | Class | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Experimental Class | X MIA 2 | 40 |
| Control Class | X MIA 1 | 40 |
| Total |  | $\mathbf{8 0}$ |

Before using simple random sampling, the researcher used normality and homogeneity test, as follow:

1) Normality test

Normality test is used to know whether the data of research is normal or not. The researcher uses normality test with using ChiQuadrate, as follow:

$$
x^{2}=\sum\left(\frac{f_{0}-f_{h}}{f_{h}}\right)
$$

[^22]Where:
$x^{2}=$ Chi-Quadrate
$\mathrm{f}_{0}=$ Frequency Is gotten from the sample/result ofobservation (questioner)
$\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{h}} \quad=$ Frequency is gotten from the sample as image from frequency is hoped from the population ${ }^{5}$

To calculate the result of Chi-Quadrate, it is used significant level $5 \%(0,05)$ and degree of freedom as big as total of frequency is lessened $3(\mathrm{dk}=\mathrm{k}-3)$. If result $\mathrm{x}^{2}$ count $<\mathrm{x}_{\text {table }}^{2}$. So, it can be concluded that data is distributed normal.

The reseracher found that $\mathrm{x}^{2}{ }_{\text {count }}=0.86$ while $\mathrm{x}_{\text {table }}^{2}=11.070$ cause $\mathrm{x}^{2}{ }_{\text {count }}<\mathrm{x}_{\text {table }}^{2}(0.86<11.070)$ with degree of freedom ( dk ) $=6-1=5$ and significant level $\alpha=5 \%$. So distribution of X MIA 1 class (pre-test) is normal. The reseracher also found that $\mathrm{x}^{2}$ count $=$ -0.35 while $\mathrm{x}_{\text {table }}^{2}=11.070$ cause $\mathrm{x}^{2}$ count $<\mathrm{x}_{\text {table }}^{2}(-0.35<11.070)$ with degree of freedom $(\mathrm{dk})=6-1=5$ and significant level $\alpha=$ 5\%. So distribution of X MIA 2 class (pre-test) is normal.
2) Homogenity test

Homogenity test is used to know whether control class and experimental class have the same variant or not. If both of classes are same, it is can be called homogeneous. Homogeneity is the similarity of variance of the group will be compared. So, the

[^23]homogeneity test has function to find out whether the data homogenous or not. It uses Harley test, as follow:
$$
\mathrm{F}=\frac{\text { The biggest variant }}{\text { The smallest variant }}
$$

Where:
$\mathrm{n}_{1}=$ Total of the data that bigger variant
$\mathrm{n}_{2}=$ Total of the data that smaller variant ${ }^{6}$

Hypothesis is rejected if $\mathrm{F} \leq \mathrm{F} \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{a}\left(\mathrm{n}_{1}-1\right)\left(1=\mathrm{n}_{2}-1\right)$, while if $\mathrm{F}_{\text {count }}$ >
$\mathrm{F}_{\text {table }}$ hypothesis is accepted. It determined with significant level $5 \%$ (0.05) and dk numerator was ( $\mathrm{n}_{1}-1$ ), while dk deminators is $\left(\mathrm{n}_{2}-1\right)$.

Based on the explanation above, the researcher had given pre-test to three classes (X MIA 1, X MIA 2, and X MIA 3), to know whether the samples are homogenous and normal or not. After calculating the data, the researcher had found that the three classes were homogenous and normal (see appendix 6 and 7). So, the researcher chose two classes as the sample. These two classes had same total of students. They were X MIA 1 and X MIA 2. The both classes consisted of 40 students.

## D. Instrument of Collecting Data

Instrument is a tool that can be used by the researcher to collect the valid and reliable data. In this research, the researcher used achievement test. This test included the cognitive test. Achievement test measure the current

[^24]status of individuals on school-taught subject. Standardized achievement test are available for individual curriculum areas such as writing. ${ }^{7}$

The indicator of writing ability can be seen in five aspects. There were grammar, vocabulary, mechanic, fluency and form. The function of the test was to measure students in writing. In arranging the test researcher used the indicator writing as had been validated from Raja's script. The indicator of writing as follows:

Table 4
Rubric Score of Writing

| Indicators | Score |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Grammar | 20 | 15 | 10 | 5 |
| Vocabulary | 20 | 15 | 10 | 5 |
| Mechanic | 20 | 15 | 10 | 5 |
| Fluency | 20 | 15 | 10 | 5 |
| Form (organization) | 20 | 15 | 10 | 5 |

a. Grammar

The criteria of scoring are as determined by ranges of the scores as following:

| No | Indicator | Score |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Few (if any) noticable errors of grammar or word order | 20 |
| 2 | Some error of grammar or word order which do not <br> however, interview with comprehension | 15 |
| 3 | Error of grammar or word order frequent: efforts of <br> interpretation sometimes required an reader's part | 10 |
| 4 | Errors of grammar or word order so severe as to make <br> comprehension virtually impossible | 5 |

[^25]b. Vocabulary

| No | Indicator | Score |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Use of vocabulary and idiom rerely (it at all) <br> distinguishable from that of educative native writer | 20 |
| 2 | Use writing or inappropriate word fairly frequently <br> expression of ideas maybe limited because of in <br> adequate vocabulary | 15 |
| 3 | Limited vocabulary so frequent errors clearly hinder <br> expression of ideas | 10 |
| 4 | Vocabulary limitation so extreme as to make <br> comprehension virtually impossible | 5 |

c. Mechanic

| No | Indicator | Score |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Few (if any) noticeable lapses in punctuation or <br> spelling | 20 |
| 2 | Occasional lapses in punctuation or spelling which do <br> not, however interfere with comprehension | 15 |
| 3 | Frequent error in spelling or punctuation sometimes to <br> obscurity | 10 |
| 4 | Error in spelling or punctuation so severe as to make <br> comprehension virtually impossible | 5 |

d. Fluency

| No | Indictaor | Score |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Choice of structures and vocabularies consistently <br> appropriate: like that of educated native writer | 20 |
| 2 | Patchy, with some structures or vocabulary items <br> noticeably inappropriate to general style | 15 |
| 3 | Structures of vocabulary items sometime not only in <br> appropriate but also misused little sense of easy of <br> communication | 10 |
| 4 | Communication often impaired by completely <br> inappropriate/misused structures or vocabulary items | 5 |

e. Form (organization)

| No | Indicator | Score |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Highly organized clear progression of ideas well <br> linked: like educated native writer | 20 |
| 2 | Some lack of organization re-reading required for <br> clarification of ideas | 15 |
| 3 | Individual ideas maybe clear, but very difficult to <br> deduce connection between them | 10 |
| 4 | Lack of organization so severe that communication is <br> seriously impaired | 5 |

## E. Validity of Instrument

Validity was the most important quality of a test. It was the degree to which a test measures what it was supposed to measure and consequently permitted appropriate interpretations of the test. To make the test became valid so the researcher applied construct validity. Construct validity is used to know whether the test valid or not by using expert judgement such as English teacher. Researcher used it to make the test became valid.

## F. The Procedures of Research

In collecting data the researcher uses test to students. The kind of the test was essay test. The test divided into two kind; pre-test and post test. The procedures as bellow:
a. Pre-test

It was a test that was given before doing the treatment to the students. It was needed to know the students' ability in experiment
and control class before the researcher gave the treatment to experiment class. It was also used to find out the homogeneity and normality level of the sample. The researcher used some steps in giving pre-test. They were:

1) Prepared an instruction of essay test.
2) Distributed the test paper to both class; experiment and control class.
3) Explained what the students need to do.
4) Gave the time to the students to do the instruction.
5) Collected the test paper.
6) Checked the answer of students and counted the students' score.
b. Treatment

After giving the pre-test, the students were given treatment. The experimental class taught by using Outlining technique, while the control class taught by conventional strategy. The researcher had some procedure in treatment class. They were:

1) Opened learning activity with greeting. Then, asked students to take a pray. Next, researcher explained about the descriptive text.
2) Explained the descriptive text by using Outlining technique.
3) Gave a model of description text and discusses about it with students.
4) Asked students to construct a text which is suitable with the example given by using outlining technique.
5) Asked the students to perform their writing in front of the class.
6) Made summary or conclusion about important information from the text and the lesson.
7) Closed the class by taking a pray.

## c. Post-test

After giving treatment, the researcher conducted a post-test. This post-test was the final test in the research for measuring the treatment, whether there was an effect or not Outlining technique on students' writing ability. After conducting the post-test, the researcher analyzed the data. The researcher had some procedure. They were:

1) Prepared an instruction of essay test.
2) Distributed the paper of the test to students of experimental class and control class.
3) Explained what the students need to do.
4) Gave the time to the students to answer the questions.
5) Collected the test paper.
6) Checked the answer of students and counted the students' score.

## G. Technique of Analyzing Data

The techniques of analyzing data which was used by the researcher were:
a. Requirement test

1) Normality Test

To know the normality, the researcher used Chi-Quadrate formula. The formula was as follow:

$$
x^{2}=\Sigma\left(\frac{f_{0}-f_{h}}{f_{h}}\right)
$$

Where:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\mathrm{x}^{2} & =\text { Chi-Quadrate } \\
\mathrm{f}_{0} & = \\
& \text { Frequency is gotten from the sample/result of } \\
& \text { observation (questioner) } \\
\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{h}} & =
\end{array}
$$

2) Homogenity Test

To find the homogeneity, the researcher used Harley test. The formula was as follow:

$$
\mathrm{F}=\frac{\text { The biggest variant }}{\text { The smallest variant }}
$$

Where:
$\mathrm{n}_{1}=$ Total of the data that bigger variant
$\mathrm{n}_{2}=$ Total of the data that smaller variant

Hypothesis is rejected if $\mathrm{F} \leq \mathrm{F} \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{a}\left(\mathrm{n}_{1}-1\right) \quad\left(1=\mathrm{n}_{2}-1\right)$, while if $\mathrm{F}_{\text {count }}>\mathrm{F}_{\text {table }}$ hypothesis is accepted. It determined with significant level $5 \%$ ( 0.05 ) and dk numerator was ( $\mathrm{n}_{1}-1$ ), while dk deminators is $\left(n_{2}-1\right)$.
b. Hypothesis test

To know the differences between experimental class and control class, the data will be analyzed by using $t$-test formula. The formula is as follow:

$$
T t=\frac{M_{1}-M_{2}}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\sum x_{1} 2+\sum_{x 2} 2}{n_{1}+n_{2}-2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{n_{1}}+\frac{1}{n_{2}}\right)}}
$$

Where:
$\mathrm{T} \quad=$ The value which the statistical significance
$\mathrm{M}_{1} \quad=$ The average score of the experimental class
$\mathrm{M}_{2}=$ The average score of the control class
$\mathrm{x}_{1}{ }^{2} \quad=$ Deviation of the experimental class
$\mathrm{x}_{2}{ }^{2}=$ Deviation of the control class
$\mathrm{n}_{1} \quad=$ Number of experimental
$\mathrm{n}_{2} \quad=$ Number of control ${ }^{8}$

[^26] Cipta, 2006), p. 354 .

## CHAPTER IV

## THE RESEARCH RESULT

To analyze the data, the researcher has collected data through pre test and post test in the both of classes, experimental class and control class. To find out the effect of using Outlining Technique on Students' Writing Text ability, the researcher has calculated the data by using quantitative analysis. The researcher used the formulation of t -test to test the hypothesis. Next, the researcher described the data as follow:

## A. Description of Data

## 1. Description Data of Pre-test

## a. Pre-test Score of Experimental Class

The researcher took class X MIA 2 as the experimental class. Based on students' answers in pre-test the researcher has calculated the students' score in appendix 6 and 7. Then, the researcher drawn the table sum in the following:

Table 5
The Score of Experimental Class in Pre-test

| Total | 2195 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Highest score | 80 |
| Lowest score | 30 |
| Mean | 59.34 |
| Median | 56.70 |
| Modus | 58.54 |
| Range | 50 |
| Interval | 8 |
| Standard deviation | 14.24 |
| Variant | 226.27 |

Based on the table above the total score of experimental class in pretest was 2195 , mean was 59.34 , median was 56.70 , modus was 58.54 , range was 50 , interval was 8 , standard deviation was 14.24 , and variant was 226.27. The researcher got the highest score was 80 and the lowest score was 30 . Then, the calculation of the frequency distribution of the students' score in experimental class can be applied into table frequency distribution as follow:

Table 6
Frequency Distribution of Experimental Class in Pre-test

| No | Interval | MidPoint | F | Percentages |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $30-37$ | 33.5 | 6 | $15 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | $38-45$ | 41.5 | 5 | $12.5 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | $46-53$ | 49.5 | 5 | $12.5 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | $54-61$ | 57.5 | 10 | $25 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | $62-69$ | 65.5 | 7 | $17.5 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | $70-77$ | 73.5 | 4 | $10 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | $78-85$ | 81.5 | 3 | $7.5 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| $i=8$ |  |  |  |  |  | - | 40 | $100 \%$ |

From the table above, it can be concluded that the most students are in interval $54-61$ ( 10 students/25\%). The least of students is $78-$ 85(3 students $/ 7.5 \%$ ). Clear description of the data is presented in histogram on the following figure:


Figure 1. Histogram the Result Score of Students' Writing Descriptive Text In Experimental Class (Pre-Test)

Based on the figure above, the frequency of students' score from 30 up to 37 was $6 ; 38$ up to 45 was $5 ; 46$ up to 53 was $5 ; 54$ up to 61 was 10; 62 up to 69 was $7 ; 70$ up to 77 was $4 ; 78$ up to 85 was 3 . The histogram shows that the highest interval (78-85) was 3 students, and the lowest interval (30-37) was 6 students.

## b. Pre-Test Score of Control Class

In pre-test of control class, the researcher calculated the result that had been gotten by the students in answering the test. The score of pretest control class can be seen in the following table:

## Table 7

The Score of Control Class in Pre-Test

| Total | 2300 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Highest score | 85 |
| Lowest score | 30 |
| Mean | 63.7 |
| Median | 59.74 |
| Modus | 62.53 |
| Range | 55 |
| Interval | 9 |
| Standard deviation | 14.85 |
| Variant | 258.97 |

Based on the table above the total score of control class in pre-test was 2300 , mean was 63.7 , standard deviation was 14.85 , variant was 258.97, range was 55 , interval was 9 , median was 59.74 and modus was 62.53. The researcher got the highest score was 85 and the lowest score was 30. It can be seen on appendix 6 and 7 . Then, the computed of the frequency distribution of the students' score of control class can be applied into table frequency distribution as follow:

Table 8
Frequency Distribution of Control Class in Pre-Test

| No | Interval | Mid Point | Frequency | Percentages |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $30-38$ | 34 | 5 | $12.5 \%$ |
| 2 | $39-47$ | 43 | 6 | $15 \%$ |
| 3 | $48-56$ | 52 | 5 | $12.5 \%$ |
| 4 | $57-65$ | 61 | 11 | $27.5 \%$ |
| 5 | $66-74$ | 70 | 8 | $20 \%$ |
| 6 | $75-83$ | 79 | 3 | $7.5 \%$ |
| 7 | $84-92$ | 88 | 2 | $5 \%$ |
| $i=9$ |  |  |  |  |

From the table above, it can be concluded that the middle interval (57 - 65) had the biggest frequency (11 students/27.5\%). The highest
interval ( $84-92$ ) had 2 students and the lowest interval was $(30-38)$ with 5 students.

In order to get description of the data clearly and completely, the researcher presents them in histogram on the following figure:


Figure 2.Histogram the Result Score of Students' writing descriptive text in Control Class (Pre-test)

Based on the figure above, the frequency of students' score from 30 up to 38 was $5 ; 39$ up to 47 was $6 ; 48$ up to 56 was $5 ; 57$ up to 65 was 11 ; 66 up to 74 was $8 ; 75$ up to 83 was $3 ; 84$ up to 92 was 2 .

## 2. Description Data of Post-test

## a. Post-Test Score of Experimental Class

The calculation of the result that had been gotten by the students in answering the question (test) after the researcher did the treatment by using Outlining technique can be seen in the following table:

Table 9
The Score of Experimental Class in Post Test

| Total | 2920 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Highest score | 90 |
| Lowest score | 60 |
| Mean | 79 |
| Median | 75 |
| Modus | 75.95 |
| Range | 30 |
| Interval | 5 |
| Standard deviation | 8.30 |
| Variant | 70.26 |

Based on the above table the total score of experiment class in post-test was 2920 , mean was 79 , standard deviation was 8.30 , variant was 70.26 , median was 75 , range was 30 , modus was 75.95 , and interval was 5 . The students' highest score was 90 and the lowest score was 60 . It can be seen on appendix 9 . Then, the calculation of the frequency distribution of the students' score of experiment class can be applied into table frequency distribution as follow:

Table 10
Frequency Distribution of Experimental Class in Post-test

| No | Interval | Mid Point | Frequency | Percentages |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $60-64$ | 62 | 5 | $12.5 \%$ |
| 2 | $65-69$ | 67 | 6 | $15 \%$ |
| 3 | $70-74$ | 72 | 8 | $20 \%$ |
| 4 | $75-79$ | 77 | 10 | $25 \%$ |
| 5 | $80-84$ | 82 | 5 | $12.5 \%$ |
| 6 | $85-89$ | 87 | 4 | $10 \%$ |
| 7 | $90-94$ | 92 | 2 | $5 \%$ |
| $i=5$ |  | - | 40 | $100 \%$ |

From the table above, it can be concluded that the middle interval (75-79) had the biggest frequency (10students/ 25\%). The highest interval (90-94) had 2 students and the lowest interval was $(60-64)$ with 5 students. The researcher presented them in histogram as follow:


Figure 3. Histogram the Result Score of Students' writing descriptive text in Experimental Class (Post-test)

Based on the figure above, the frequency of students' score from 60 up to 64 was $5 ; 65$ up to 69 was $6 ; 70$ up to 74 was $8 ; 75$ up to 79 was 10 ; 80 up to 84 was $5 ; 85$ up to 89 was $4 ; 90$ up to 94 was 2 . Then, the interval which had highest frequency was 75-79 and the interval which had lowest frequency was $90-94$.

## b. Post-Test Score of Control Class

As the control class, the researcher took class X MIA 1. The result that had been gotten by the students in answering the question (test) after the researcher taught the writing by using conventional technique can be seen in the following table:

Table 11
The Score of Control Class in Post-Test

| Total | 2740 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Highest score | 85 |
| Lowest score | 50 |
| Mean | 72.48 |
| Median | 69.30 |
| Modus | 71.10 |
| Range | 35 |
| Interval | 6 |
| Standard deviation | 9.06 |
| Variant | 69.49 |

Based on the above table the total score of control class in post-test was 2740 , mean was 72.48 , standard deviation was 9.06 , variant was 69.49 , median was 69.30 , range was 30 , modus was 71.10 , and interval was 6 . The researcher got the highest score was 85 and the lowest score was 50 . It can be seen on appendix 9 and 10 . Then, the computed of the frequency distribution of the students' score of control class can be applied into table frequency distribution as follow:

Table 12
Frequency Distribution of Control Class in Post-test

| No | Interval | Mid Point | Frequency | Percentages |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $50-55$ | 52.5 | 4 | $10 \%$ |
| 2 | $56-61$ | 58.5 | 6 | $15 \%$ |
| 3 | $62-67$ | 64.5 | 7 | $17.5 \%$ |
| 4 | $68-73$ | 70.5 | 10 | $25 \%$ |
| 5 | $74-79$ | 76.5 | 8 | $20 \%$ |
| 6 | $80-85$ | 82.5 | 5 | $12.5 \%$ |
| $i=6$ |  | - | 40 | $100 \%$ |

From the table above, it can be concluded that the middle interval (68-73) had the biggest frequency (10 students/ 25\%). The highest interval ( $80-85$ ) had 5 students and the lowest interval was $(50-55$ ) with 4 students. For the clear description of the data, the researcher presents them in histogram on the following figure:


Figure 4.Histogram the Result Score of Students' writing descriptive text in Control Class (Post-test)

Based on the figure above, the frequency of students' score from 50 up to 55 was $4 ; 56$ up to 61 was $6 ; 62$ up to 67 was $7 ; 68$ up to 73 was 10; 74 up to 79 was 8 ; 80 up to 85 was 5 . Then, the interval which had highest frequency was $68-73$ (10 students) and the interval which had lowest frequency was $50-55$ (4 students).

## 3. Description of the Data Comparison between Pre-Test and Post-Test of Experimental and Control Class

## a. The Comparison Data between Pre-test and Post-test Experimental Class

In pre test, the researcher did not apply treatment to experimental and control class. By giving pre test to both of classes, the researcher knew the students' ability in writing descriptive text before giving the treatment.

Based on the description data in pre test of experimental and control class, there was comparison score between pre-test experimental class before and after gave a treatment by using Outlining technique. It can be seen in the following table:

Table 13
The Comparison Score of Students' Writing Descriptive Text in Pre-test and Post-test (Experimental Class)

| No. | Interval | Frequency |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pre-test | Post-test |
| 1 | $30-37$ | 6 | 0 |
| 2 | $38-45$ | 5 | 0 |
| 3 | $46-53$ | 5 | 0 |
| 4 | $54-61$ | 10 | 5 |
| 5 | $62-69$ | 7 | 6 |
| 6 | $70-77$ | 4 | 18 |
| 7 | $78-85$ | 3 | 9 |
| 8 | $86-93$ | 0 | 2 |

From the table above, it can be seen that the interval $54-61$ had the highest frequency in pre test, it was 10 students. While in post test the highest frequency was on interval $70-77$, it was 18 students. The lowest frequency in pre test was on interval $86-93$, it was 0 . While the lowest
frequency in post test was on interval $30-37,38-45$, and $46-53$, it was 0 .

In order to get description of the data clearly and completely, the researcher presents them in histogram on the following figure:


Figure 5.Histogram the Comparison Data of Students' Writing Descriptive text in Pre-test and Post-test (Experimental Class)

Based on the figure above, the frequency of students' score in pre test of experimental class from 30 up to 37 was $6 ; 38$ up to 45 was $5 ; 46$ up to 53 was $5 ; 54$ up to 61 was $10 ; 62$ up to 69 was 7 ; 70 up to 77 was 4 ; 78 up to 85 was 3 . Meanwhile, the frequency of students' score in post test from 30 up to 37 was $0 ; 38$ up to 45 was $0 ; 46$ up to 53 was $0 ; 54$ up to 61 was $5 ; 62$ up to 69 was $6 ; 70$ up to 77 was $18 ; 78-85$ was $9 ; 86$ up to 93 was 2 . Then, the interval which had highest frequency in pre test
was 54-61 (10 students) and the interval which had lowest frequency was 78-85 (3 student). In post test of experimental class, the interval which had highest frequency was $70-77$ (18 students) and the interval which had lowest frequency was 86-93 (2 student).
b. The Comparison Data between Pre-test and Post-test Control Class

Based on the description data in pre-test and post-test of control class, there was the comparison score between pre-test control class before and after gave a treatment by using Conventional technique. It can be seen in the following table:

Table 14
The Comparison Score of Students' Writing Descriptive text ability in Pre-test and Post-test (Control Class)

| No. | Interval | Frequency |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pre-test | Post-test |
| 1 | $30-38$ | 5 | 0 |
| 2 | $39-47$ | 6 | 0 |
| 3 | $48-56$ | 5 | 4 |
| 4 | $57-65$ | 11 | 13 |
| 5 | $66-74$ | 8 | 10 |
| 6 | $75-83$ | 3 | 11 |
| 7 | $84-92$ | 2 | 2 |

From the table above, it can be it can be seen that the interval 57 65 had the highest frequency in pre test (11 students) and post test (13 students). The lowest frequency in pre test was on interval $84-92$, it was 2 students. While the lowest frequency in post test was on interval $30-$ $38,39-47$, and $48-56$, it was 0 .

For the clear description of the data, the researcher presents them in histogram on the following figure:


Figure 6.Histogram the Comparison Data of Students' Writing Descriptive Text in Pre-test and Post-test (Control Class)

Control class in pre-test from 30 up to 38 was $5 ; 39$ up to 47 was 6; 48 up to 56 was $5 ; 57$ up to 65 was $11 ; 66$ up to 74 was $8 ; 75$ up to 83 was 3; $84-92$ was 2 . Meanwhile, the frequency of students' score of control class in post-test from 30 up to 38 was $0 ; 39$ up to 47 was $0 ; 48$ up to 56 was $4 ; 57$ up to 65 was $13 ; 66$ up to 74 was $10 ; 75$ up to 83 was 11 ; 84 up to 92 was 2 . Then, the interval which had highest frequency in pre test was 57-65 (11 students) and the interval which had lowest frequency was $84-92$ ( 2 students). In post test of control class, the interval which had highest frequency was 57-65 (13 students) and the interval which had lowest frequency was $84-92$ (2 student).

## c. The Comparison Data between Pre-test Experimental and Control Class

By giving pre test to both of classes the researcher knew the students' ability in writing descriptive text before giving the treatment. In
pre test, the researcher did not apply treatment to experimental and control class. The comparison data of pre-test between experimental and control class can be seen on the following table:

Table 15
The Comparison Score of Students' Writing Descriptive Text in Experimental and Control Class (Pre-test)

| No. | Interval | Frequency |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Control | Experimental |
| 1 | $30-38$ | 5 | 6 |
| 2 | $39-47$ | 6 | 5 |
| 3 | $48-56$ | 5 | 9 |
| 4 | $57-65$ | 11 | 13 |
| 5 | $66-74$ | 8 | 2 |
| 6 | $75-83$ | 3 | 3 |
| 7 | $84-92$ | 2 | 2 |

From the table above, it can be seen that the interval $57-65$ has the highest frequency in control and experimental class. In control class it was 11 students, and in experimental class was 13 students. The lowest frequency in control and experimental class was on interval $84-92$, it was 2 students.

For the clear description of the data is presented in the histogram comparison data pretest between experimental and control class on the following figure:


Figure 7.Histogram the Comparison between Description Data of Students' Writing Descriptive Text in Experimental and Control Class (Pre-Test)

Based on the figure above, the frequency of students' score of control class in post test from 50 up to 55 was $4 ; 56$ up to 61 was $6 ; 62$ up to 67 was $7 ; 68$ up to 73 was $10 ; 74$ up to 79 was $8 ; 80$ up to 85 was 5 ; 86 up to 91 was 0 . Meanwhile, the frequency of students' score of experimental class in post test from 50 up to 55 was 0 ; 56 up to 61 was 5 ; 62 up to 67 was $6 ; 68$ up to 73 was $8 ; 74$ up to 79 was $10 ; 80$ up to 85 was 9; 86 up to 91 was 2 . Then, the interval which had highest frequency of control class was 68-73 (10 students) and the interval which had lowest frequency was 86-91 (0student). Meanwhile, the interval which had highest frequency of experimental class was $74-79$ (10 students) and the interval which had lowest frequency was $50-55$ (0 student).

## d. The Comparison Data between Post-test Experimental and Control Class

The researcher got the comparison data between post-test score in experimental and control class after giving the treatment. The comparison data can be seen on the following table:

Table 16
The Comparison Score of Students' Writing Descriptive Text in Experimental and Control Class (Post-test)

| No. | Interval | Frequency |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Control | Experimental |
| 1 | $50-55$ | 4 | 0 |
| 2 | $56-61$ | 6 | 5 |
| 3 | $62-67$ | 7 | 6 |
| 4 | $68-73$ | 10 | 8 |
| 5 | $74-79$ | 8 | 10 |
| 6 | $80-85$ | 5 | 9 |
| 7 | $86-91$ | 0 | 2 |

From the table above, it can be seen that the interval 68-73 has the highest frequency in pre test, it was 10 students in control class. While the highest frequency in experimental class was on interval $74-79$, it was 10 students. The lowest frequency in control class was on interval 86 - 91, it was 0 . While the lowest frequency in experimental class was on interval $50-55$, it was 0 .

For the clear description of the data is presented in the histogram comparison between description data post test of experimental and
control class on the following figure:


Figure 8.Histogram the Comparison between Description Data of Students' Writing Descriptive Text in Experimental and Control Class (Post-Test)

Based on the figure above, the frequency of students' score of control class in post test from 50 up to 55 was $4 ; 56$ up to 61 was $6 ; 62$ up to 67 was $7 ; 68$ up to 73 was $10 ; 74$ up to 79 was $8 ; 80$ up to 85 was 5 ; 86 up to 91 was 0 . Meanwhile, the frequency of students' score of experimental class in post test from 50 up to 55 was 0 ; 56 up to 61 was 5 ; 62 up to 67 was $6 ; 68$ up to 73 was $8 ; 74$ up to 79 was $10 ; 80$ up to 85 was 9; 86 up to 91 was 2 . Then, the interval which had highest frequency of control class was 68-73 (10 students) and the interval which had lowest frequency was 86-91 (0student). Meanwhile, the interval which had highest frequency of experimental class was $74-79$ (10 students) and the interval which had lowest frequency was $50-55$ (0 student).

From the description of comparison data above, it can be conluded that the students' scores of experimental class by using Outlining

Technique was higher than the students' score of control class by using Conventional technique.

## B. Technique of Data Analysis

## 1. Requirement Test

## a. Normality and Homogeneity of Experimental and Control Class in PreTest

Table 17
Normality and Homogeneity in Pre-Test

| Class | Normality <br> Test |  | Homogeneity <br> Test |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{x}_{\text {count }}^{2}$ | $\mathrm{x}_{\text {table }}^{2}$ | $\mathrm{f}_{\text {count }}$ | $\mathrm{f}_{\text {table }}$ |
| Experimental Class | -0.35 | 11.070 | $1.14<4.10$ |  |
| Control Class | 0.86 | 11.070 |  |  |

Based on the table above, the score of experiment class Lo $=-0.35<$ $\mathrm{Lt}=11.070$ with $\mathrm{n}=40$ and control class $\mathrm{Lo}=0.86<\mathrm{Lt}=11.070$ with $\mathrm{n}=$ 40, and real level $\alpha 0.05$. Cause $\mathrm{Lo}<\mathrm{Lt}$ in the both class. So, $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{a}}$ was accepted. It means that experiment class and control class were distributed normal. It can be seen in appendix 6 .

The coefficient of $\mathrm{F}_{\text {count }}=1.14$ was compared with $\mathrm{F}_{\text {table }}$. Where $\mathrm{F}_{\text {table }}$ was determined at real $\alpha 0.05$, and the different numerator $\mathrm{dk}=\mathrm{N}-1=40-1=$ 39 and denominator $\mathrm{dk} \mathrm{N}-1=40-1=39$. So, by using the list of critical value at F distribution is got $\mathrm{F}_{\mathbf{0 . 0 5}}=4.10$. It showed that $\mathrm{F}_{\text {count }} 1.14<\mathrm{F}_{\text {table }}$ 4.10. It showed that both experimental and control class were homogeneous. The calculation can be seen on the appendix 7 .

## b. Normality and Homogeneity of Experimental and Control Class in Post-Test

Table 18
Normality and Homogeneity in Post-Test

| Class | Normality <br> Test |  | Homogeneity <br> Test |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{x}^{2}{ }_{\text {count }}$ | $\mathrm{x}_{\text {table }}$ | $\mathrm{f}_{\text {count }}$ | $\mathrm{f}_{\text {table }}$ |
| Experimental Class | 4.23 | 11.070 | $1.01<4.10$ |  |
| Control Class | 4.84 | 11.070 |  |  |

The previous table shows that the score of experimental class $\mathrm{Lo}=$ $4.23<\mathrm{Lt}=11.070$ with $\mathrm{n}=40$ and control class $\mathrm{Lo}=4.84<\mathrm{Lt}=11.070$ with $\mathrm{n}=40$, and real level $\alpha 0.05$. Because $\mathrm{Lo}<\mathrm{Lt}$ in the both class, it means $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{a}}$ was accepted. It meant that experiment class and control class were distributed normal. The calculation can be seen in appendix 8 .

The coefficient of $\mathrm{F}_{\text {count }}=1.01$ was compared with $\mathrm{F}_{\text {table }}$. Where $\mathrm{F}_{\text {table }}$ was determined at real $\alpha 0.05$, and the different numerator $\mathrm{dk}=\mathrm{N}-1$ $=40-1=39$ and denominator $\mathrm{dk} \mathrm{N}-1=40-1=39$. So, by using the list of critical value at F distribution is got $\mathrm{F}_{\mathbf{0 . 0 5}}=4.10$. It showed that $\mathrm{F}_{\text {count }} 1.01$ $<\mathrm{F}_{\text {table }} 4.10$. So, the researcher concluded that the variant from the data of the writing descriptive text at X grade of MAN 1 Padangsidimpuan in experimental and control class was homogenous. The calculation can be seen on the appendix 9.

## 2. Hypothesis Test

After calculating the data of post-test, researcher has found that posttest result of experimental and control class is normal and homogenous. The data would be analyzed to prove the hypothesis. It used formula of t-test.

Hypothesis of the research was "Outlining technique has significant effect on students' writing descriptive text at X grade of MAN 1 Padangsidimpuan". The calculation can be seen on the appendix 11 and 12 . The result of t-test was as follow:

Table 19
Result of T-test from the Both Averages

| Pre-test |  | Post-test |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{t}_{\text {count }}$ | $\mathrm{t}_{\text {table }}$ | $\mathrm{t}_{\text {count }}$ | $\mathrm{t}_{\text {table }}$ |
| -1.98 | 2.00 | 3.18 | 2.00 |

The test hypothesis have two criteria. First, if $\mathrm{t}_{\text {count }}<\mathrm{t}_{\text {table }}, \mathrm{H}_{0}$ is accepted. Second, $\mathrm{t}_{\text {count }}>\mathrm{t}_{\text {table }}, \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{a}}$ is accepted. Based on researcher calculation in pre test, researcher found that $t_{\text {count }}-1.98$ while $t_{\text {table }} 2.000$ with opportunity $(1-\alpha)=1-5 \%=95 \%$ and $d k=n_{1}+n_{2}-2=40+40-2=78$. Cause $\mathrm{t}_{\text {count }}<\mathrm{t}_{\text {table }}(-1.98<2.000)$, it means that hypothesis $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{a}}$ was rejected and $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ was accepted. So, in pre test, the two classes were same. There is no difference in the both classes. But, in post test, researcher found that $\mathrm{t}_{\text {count }} 3.18$ while $\mathrm{t}_{\text {table }} 2.000$ with opportunity $(1-\alpha)=1-5 \%=95 \%$ and $d k=n_{1}+n_{2}-2=40+$ $40-2=78$. Cause $\mathrm{t}_{\text {count }}>\mathrm{t}_{\text {table }}(3.18>2.000)$, it means that hypothesis $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{a}}$ was accepted and $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ was rejected. The calculation can be seen on the appendix 12. In this case, the mean score of experimental class by using Outlining technique was 79 and mean score of control class was 72.48 that was taught by using conventional technique. So, there was the significant effect of using Outlining technique on students' writing descriptive text ability at $X$ grade of MAN 1 Padangsidimpuan.

## C. Discussion

The researcher discussed the result of this research and compared with the related findings. It also discussed with the theory that has been stated by the researcher. Related to the theory from Flora Debora stated that an outline is a visual and conceptual design of your writing. It breaks down the parts of your text in a clear, hierarchical manner. It helps you to organize your ideas, present your material in a logical form and show the relationship among ideas in your writing. ${ }^{1}$ Then, Jhon Langan stated that outlining provides a quick check on whether your paper will be unified. It also suggests right at the start whether your paper will be adequately supported, and it shows you how to plan a paper that is well organized. ${ }^{2}$ Besides it, this technique also had advantages, they are; Outline helps to prevent a writer from getting stuck when performing the actual writing of the essay, It also can be the framework on which the whole essay that will be written, An outline also provides a map of where to go with the essay. So, it has proven that Outlining technique was suitable to teach students' writing ability and has significant effect on students' writing descriptive text ability.

Based on the related findings, Amrullah said that Outlining technique suitable to teach writing ability. Outlining technique technique can increase students' writing descriptive text ability because teaching learning process in the

[^27]classroom easier. ${ }^{3}$ So, it was make the class more active study and the students to undestand material easily.

Next, Lutvie Nirmala Fauzi said that used outline activity in teaching writing can be more effective way to increase students writing ability. It can be seen that the students ability in constructing text with well organization. So, the score of students' writing after using outline activity was higher than before using outline activity. ${ }^{4}$ It meant that the outline activity was suitable to teach students' writing ability.

Then, Gusti Herlambang, said that clustering technique suitable to teach writing ability. The students became easier in writing a text, relating among ideas. ${ }^{5}$ So, the implication clustering technique was suitable to teach students' writing ability and give a positive effect on students' writing ability

The research result and the theory has proven that this technique is good where the students were so enthusiastic to follow the lesson. The students directly easy to write a text with well organization. It was a proud while looking them think hard, but still enthutiastic, to find create a text with well organization.

This proofs show that Outlining technique is suitable to be applied in teaching Outlining technique. So, Outlining technique has given the effect to the

[^28]research that has been done by the researcher or the other researcher who mentioned in related findings.

## D. Limitation of the Research

The research was limited in some situations. It was the problems in the class that appeared during doing the research, but the researcher couldn't hold or improve those things. The limitation of the research was as follow:

1. The researcher was not sure whether all of students in the experimental class and control class did the test honestly. There was a possibility that some of them answered the test by copying or imitating their friends' answer.
2. The students were noisy while in learning process. They were not concentrating in following the learning process. Some of them talked to their friends and some of them did something outside the teacher's rule. Of course it made them cannot get the teacher's explanation well and gave the impact to the post-test answer.
3. It was also a possibility that some of students were not too serious in answering the pre-test and post-test. It may caused by the test, because they knew before that the test would not influence their score in the school. It made them answer the test without thinking hard and the answer of the test was not pure because they did not do it seriously.

## CHAPTER V

## CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

## A. Conclusion

Based on the result of the research, the conclusions of this research are:

1. The scores of students' writing descriptive text before using Outlining technique at X grade of MAN 1 Padangsidimpuan was low. Before using Outlining technique, the mean score of experimental class was 59.34.
2. After using Outlining technique, the mean score of experimental class was higher than before using Outlining technique. The mean score of post-test for the experimental class was 79.00
3. The result of research showed that the students' score in the experimental class was higher than control class. Eventhough it was not a high difference, the result prove that $\mathrm{t}_{\text {count }}$ was higher than $\mathrm{t}_{\text {table }}$. $\mathrm{t}_{\text {count }}$ was 3.18 and $\mathrm{t}_{\text {table }}$ was $2.000(3.18>2.000)$. So, the hypothesis was accepted. It means that there was a significant effect of using Outlining technique on students' writing descriptive text ability at X grade of MAN 1 Padangsidimpuan.

## B. Suggestion

After finishing the research, the reseracher got many informations in English teaching and learning. Therefore, from that experience, the researcher saw some things need to be improved. It makes the researcher give some suggestions, as follow:

1. From the research result it can be seen that the students' score were unsatisfied. So, the researcher hopes to the English teacher of MAN 1 Padangsidimpuan to apply various innovative techniques in teaching English. It also can be supported by choosing right media and good class management. Besides it, it is also important for students to follow learning process seriously, because the success of learning is in students' result.
2. From the second conclusion, it can be seen that the experimental class which was taught by using Outlining technique, got the improvement from 59.34 to 79.00 . So, the researcher suggests to the English teacher of MAN 1 Padangsidimpuan to use this technique in teaching writing.
3. From the last conclusion, it can be seen that there was significant effect of using outlining technique on students' writing descriptive text ability at X grade of MAN 1 Padangsidimpuan. The researcher suggests to English teacher to use Outlining technique in another classes, or in different grade, even in another schools, because of the improvement that has been made by using this technique. So, it is hoped that Outlining technique can increase students' writing descriptive text ability in larger area.
4. Besides, the researcher also wants to suggest for the teacher and the other researcher who wants to apply this technique are hoped to manage the class well during the application of Outlining technique. For the other researchers, to develop the findings of this research largely by adding variables, enlarging sample, or making combination in research approach.
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## CURRICULUM VITAE



## A. Identity

| Name | $:$ Anita Lustiana |
| :--- | :--- |
| Reg. No. | $: 133400004$ |
| Place/Birth | $:$ Sigala - gala, $25^{\text {th }}$ June 1995 |
| Sex | $:$ Female |
| Religion | $:$ Islam |
| Address | $:$ Perkebunan Sigala - gala, Batang Toru |

B. Parents

| Father's Name | : Suyatmin |
| :--- | :--- |
| Mother's Name | $:$ Mini |

## C. Educational Background

1. Elementary School : SD Negeri 100717 Sigala - gala
2. Junior High School : MTs Baharuddin
3. Senior High School : MAs Baharuddin
4. Institute : IAIN Padangsidimpuan

## Appendix 1

# RENCANA PELAKSANAAN PEMBELAJARAN 

(RPP)

## EXPERIMENT CLASS

| Nama Sekolah | : MAN 1 Padangsidimpuan |
| :--- | :--- |
| Mata Pelajaran | : Bahasa Inggris |
| Kelas | $:$ X |
| Semester | $:$ I |
| Standar Kompetensi | $:$ Mengungkapkan makna dalam teks monolog/ esei tulis |
|  | berbentuk deskriptif secara akurat, lancar, dan berterima dalam |
|  | konteks kehidupan sehari-hari. |
| Kompetensi Dasar | $:$ Mengungkapkan makna dan langkah-langkah retorika dalam |
|  | teks monolog berbentuk deskriptif dengan menggunakan ragam |
|  | bahasa tulis secara akurat, lancar dan berterima untuk |
| Jenisteraksi dengan lingkungan terdekat. |  |
| Alokasi waktu | $: 2$ x 45 menit |
| Indicator | $: 1$. Mengungkapkan makna dalam teks deskriptif. |
|  | 2. Menulis teks berbentuk deskriptif |

Tujuan Pembelajaran : Siswa dapat menulis teks monolog berbentuk deskriptif.

Materi Pembelajaran : Descriptive Text
Metode : Outlining Technique
Langkah-langkah kegiatan (Procedure)
a. Kegiatan pendahuluan

1. Mengucapkan salam
2. Memulai pelajaran dengan mengajak siswa membaca do'a.
b. Kegiatan inti
3. Guru memberikan topik kepada siswa.
4. Guru mengajak siswa membuat outline mengenai topik yang telah diberikan.
5. Guru mengajak siswa mengembangkan ide berdasarkan outline.
6. Siswa diminta untuk menulis teks berdasarkan outline yang telah dibuat.
7. Siswa diminta untuk membacakan hasil tulisannya di depan kelas.
8. Guru memberikan komentar dan penelian tentang penampilan siswa.
c. Kegiatan penutup
9. Menyimpulkan sekaligus menutup pembelajaran.
10. Mengucapkan salam.

Sumber Belajar : Buku teks dan buku-buku yang relevan.

| Indikator <br> pencapaian <br> kompetensi | Teknik <br> penilaian | Bentuk <br> instrument | Instrument/ soal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Menulis teks <br> berbentuk <br> deskriptif | Test tertulis | Tugas individu | Write a descriptive <br> text about the topic <br> given.. |

Score

1. Grammar :
2. Organization :
3. Fluency :
4. Vocabularies :
5. Mechanics :

Total Score :
Padangsidimpuan,
2017

Validator

Sojuangon Rambe, S.S., M.Pd
Nip. 197908152006041003

Anita Lustiana
Nim. 133400004

## Learning Material

My Best Friend

A. Introductory Paragraph
B. Body

1. Physically
2. Personality
3. Hobbies:
C. Concluding Paragraph

Task : write a descriptive text based on the outline.

## Appendix 2

## RENCANA PELAKSANAAN PEMBELAJARAN (RPP)

## CONTROL CLASS

| Nama Sekolah | : MAN 1 Padangsidimpuan |
| :--- | :--- |
| Mata Pelajaran | : Bahasa Inggris |
| Kelas | $:$ X |
| Semester | : I |
| Standar Kompetensi | : Mengungkapkan makna dalam teks monolog/ esei tulis |
|  | berbentuk deskriptif secara akurat, lancer, dan berterima dalam |
|  | konteks kehidupan sehari-hari. |
| Kompetensi Dasar | : Mengungkapkan makna dan langkah-langkah retorika dalam |
|  | teks monolog berbentuk deskriptif dengan menggunakan ragam |
|  | berinteraksi dengan lingkungan terdekat. |
| Jenis teks/ Tema | : Descriptive Text |
| Alokasi waktu | $: 2$ x 45 menit |
| Indicator | $: 1$. Mengungkapkan makna dalam teks deskriptif. |
| Tujuan Pembelajaran $:$ Siswa dapat menulis teks monolog berbentuk deskriptif. |  |
| Materi Pembelajaran $:$ Descriptive Text |  |

Metode : Conventional Technique
Langkah-langkah kegiatan (Procedure)
a. Kegiatan pendahuluan

1. Mengucapkan salam
2. Memulai pelajaran dengan mengajak siswa membaca do'a.
b. Kegiatan inti
3. Guru menjelaskan tentang descriptive text.
4. Guru menjelaskan generic structure of descriptive text.
5. Guru memberikan contoh descriptive text.
6. Guru menanyakan kesulitan yang dialami siswa tentang descriptive text.
7. Guru menjelaskan kembali agar siswa lebih memahami descriptive text.
8. Guru meminta siswa untuk menulis descriptive text.
9. Guru memeriksa hasil pekerjaan siswa.
c. Kegiatan penutup
10. Menyimpulkan sekaligus menutup pembelajaran.
11. Mengucapkan salam.

Sumber Belajar : Buku teks dan buku-buku yang relevan.

Evaluasi :

| Indikator | Teknik | Bentuk |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| pencapaian | penilaian | instrumen | Instrument/ soal |
| kompetensi |  |  | Write a descriptive |
| Menulis teks | Test tertulis | Tugas individu | text about the topic |
| berbentuk |  |  | given. |
| deskriptif |  |  |  |

Score

1. Grammar :
2. Organization :
3. Fluency :
4. Vocabularies :
5. Mechanics :

Total Score :
Padangsidimpuan,
2017

Validator
Researcher

Abdul Haris, S.Pd
Nip. 197206091999031004

Anita Lustiana
Nim. 133400004

Learning Material

## My Best Friend

I have a best friend. Her name is isna. She is very honest, friendly and funny person. And she is my classmate in Primary School. Her full name is Isna Hanifah. Her nickname is Isna. Now, she is 16 years old. She was born in Jakarta on Mei $21^{\text {st }}$ 1998. Now she is live at kenanga Street No 6 in Padangsidimpuan. Her father worked as a police officer and her mother worked as a teacher in a primary school. Isna has a brother and sister. Her sister is Mifta Aulifa and her brother is Ilman Amanu.

Isna school at SMA N 2 Padangsidimpuan. She is very good at academic or non academic. In academic she is very good math and english. At school ever a champion olympiad math and sains. She is active in all of school activities. She is also confident at every opportunity.

Isna has an oval face. She has curly hair. She has a pointed nose. The skin color is white. Her favorite food is fried rice. And her hobby is a swimming and drawing.

She likes cat very much. She always takes care of her cat kindly. She also likes to collect dolls, especially Hello kitty doll.

## Appendix 3

## Instrument for Pre Test

Information: This test is just to know your ability in writing descriptive text and there is no affected in your appraisal in final examination of this school.

Name : $\qquad$

Class
: $\qquad$

Instruction: Choose which one of the topics below. Then write a descriptive text based on your topic.
a. My Mother
b. My Self
c. My boy/ girl Friend
d. My Classroom
e. My Bedroom

Validator

Sojuangon Rambe, S.S., M.Pd
Nip. 197908152006041003

Anita Lustiana
Nim. 133400004

## Appendix 4

## Instrument for Post Test

Information: This test is just to know your ability in writing descriptive text and there is no affected in your appraisal in final examination of this school.

Name : $\qquad$

Class
: $\qquad$

Instruction: Choose which one of the topics below. Then write a descriptive text based on your topic.
a. My Favorite Teacher
b. My Favorite Singer
c. My pet
d. My Favorite Food
e. My Favorite Actor/ Actress
Padangsidimpuan, Maret 2017
Validator
Researcher

Sojuangon Rambe, S.S., M.Pd
Nip. 197908152006041003

Anita Lustiana
Nim. 133400004

## Appendix 5

## Score of Experimental Class and Control Class Pre Test

1. Pre Test Score of Experimental Class (X MIA-2)

| No | The Initial Name of Students (n) | Pre Test |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | ANP | 80 |
| 2 | ASP | 65 |
| 3 | AAA | 65 |
| 4 | ARH | 65 |
| 5 | ASD | 55 |
| 6 | AMH | 55 |
| 7 | AD | 45 |
| 8 | AHA | 30 |
| 9 | AR | 30 |
| 10 | DJD | 55 |
| 11 | DR | 60 |
| 12 | DMR | 80 |
| 13 | FA | 50 |
| 14 | FM | 60 |
| 15 | FA | 65 |
| 16 | FAS | 70 |
| 17 | GBR | 65 |
| 18 | GS | 65 |
| 19 | IW | 70 |
| 20 | IPA | 80 |
| 21 | KI | 30 |
| 22 | MANS | 30 |
| 23 | MSH | 40 |
| 24 | MR | 40 |
| 25 | MIH | 50 |
| 26 | MSP | 50 |
| 27 | MRAL | 60 |
| 28 | NAH | 65 |
| 29 | PHH | 30 |
| 30 | RP | 40 |
| 31 | RFR | 50 |
| 32 | RAH | 55 |


| 33 | RF | 75 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 34 | RR | 75 |
| 35 | TAP | 40 |
| 36 | SR | 30 |
| 37 | URP | 50 |
| 38 | WAP | 55 |
| 39 | WA | 60 |
| 40 | WML | 60 |
|  | Total Score | $\mathbf{2 1 9 5}$ |

2. Pre Test Score of Control Class (X MIA-1)

| No. | The Initial Name of Students (n) | Xi |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | AA | 70 |
| 2 | AM | 65 |
| 3 | ADA | 60 |
| 4 | ALA | 50 |
| 5 | AAR | 50 |
| 6 | AU | 40 |
| 7 | AYS | 40 |
| 8 | ASN | 40 |
| 9 | CR | 65 |
| 10 | DS | 60 |
| 11 | DL | 30 |
| 12 | FL | 30 |
| 13 | FP | 85 |
| 14 | HA | 75 |
| 15 | HY | 65 |
| 16 | HR | 60 |
| 17 | IA | 55 |
| 18 | IPC | 65 |
| 19 | IGM | 70 |
| 20 | IM | 70 |
| 21 | LA | 50 |
| 22 | MR | 80 |
| 23 | MHR | 60 |
| 24 | MR | 60 |
| 25 | MR | 50 |
| 26 | MA | 40 |
| 27 | NF | 30 |
| 28 | NT | 80 |
| 29 | PA | 70 |
| 30 | RS | 70 |
| 31 | RS | 70 |
| 32 | RF | 70 |
| 33 | RM | 65 |
| 34 | RFL | 60 |
| 35 | RA | 45 |
| 36 | RAR | 40 |
| 37 | SH | 30 |


| 38 | SN | 70 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 39 | SNH | 85 |
| 40 | WP | 30 |
| Total Score |  | $\mathbf{2 3 0 0}$ |

## Appendix 6

## RESULT OF NORMALITY TEST IN PRE TEST

## A. Result Of The Normality Test Of X-MIA 1 in Pre-Test

1. The score of X MIA 1 class in pre test from low score to high score:

| 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 45 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 55 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 |
| 60 | 60 | 65 | 65 | 65 | 65 | 65 | 70 | 70 | 70 |
| 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 75 | 80 | 80 | 85 | 85 |

2. High $=85$

Low $=30$
Range $\quad=$ High - Low
$=85-30$
$=55$
3. Total of Classes $=1+3,3 \log (n)$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =1+3,3 \log (40) \\
& =1+3,3(1.6) \\
& =1+5.28 \\
& =6.28=6
\end{aligned}
$$

4. Length of Classes $=\frac{\text { range }}{\text { total of class }}=\frac{55}{6}=9.16=9$
5. Mean

| Interval | F | X | X | $\mathrm{FX}^{\prime}$ | $\mathrm{X}^{\prime 2}$ | $\mathrm{FX}^{\prime 2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $30-38$ | 5 | 34 | +3 | 15 | 9 | 45 |
| $39-47$ | 6 | 43 | +2 | 12 | 4 | 24 |
| $48-56$ | 5 | 52 | +1 | 5 | 1 | 5 |
| $57-65$ | 11 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $66-74$ | 8 | 70 | -1 | -8 | 1 | 8 |
| $75-83$ | 3 | 79 | -2 | -6 | 4 | 12 |
| $84-92$ | 2 | 88 | -3 | -6 | 9 | 18 |
| $I=9$ | 40 | - | - | 12 | 28 | 112 |

$$
\begin{aligned}
M x= & M^{1}+i \frac{\Sigma f x^{1}}{N} \\
& =61+9\left(\frac{12}{40}\right) \\
& =61+9(0.3) \\
& =61+2.7 \\
& =63.7
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\mathrm{SD}_{\mathrm{t}}=i \sqrt{\frac{\sum f x^{\prime}}{n}-\left(\frac{\sum f x^{\prime}}{n}\right)^{2}}
$$

$$
=9 \sqrt{\frac{112}{40}-\left(\frac{12}{40}\right)^{2}}
$$

$$
=9 \sqrt{2.8-(0.3)^{2}}
$$

$$
=9 \sqrt{2.8-0.09}
$$

$$
=9 \sqrt{2.71}
$$

$$
=9 \times 1.65
$$

$$
=14.85
$$

Table of Normality Data Test with Chi Kuadrad Formula

| Interval of Score | Real <br> Upper <br> Limit | $\mathrm{Z}_{-}$ <br> Score | Limit of Large of the Area | Large of area | $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{h}}$ | $\mathrm{f}_{0}$ | $\begin{gathered} \left.\underline{f}_{\underline{0}-}^{-}-f_{\underline{h}}\right) \\ f_{\mathrm{f}} \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 84-92 | 92.5 | 1.94 | 0.4738 |  |  |  |  |
| 75-83 | 83.5 | 1.33 | 0.4082 | 0.07 | 2.73 | 2 | -0. 27 |
|  |  |  |  | 0.14 | 5.46 | 3 | -0.45 |
| 66-74 | 74.5 | 0.73 | 0.2673 | 0.22 | 5.46 8.58 | 8 | -0.07 |
| 57-65 | 65.5 | 0.12 | 0.0478 |  |  | 8 |  |
| 48-56 | 56.5 | -0.48 | 0.31561 | -0.27 | -10.53 | 11 | -2.04 |
|  |  |  |  | 0.18 | 7.02 | 5 | -0.29 |
| 39-47 | 47.5 | -1.09 | 0.13786 |  | 3.51 | 6 | 0.71 |
| 30-38 | 38.5 | -1. 70 | 0.04457 |  |  | 6 |  |
|  | 29.5 | -2. 30 | 0.01072 | 0.03 | 1.17 | 5 | 3.27 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{X}^{2}$ | 0.86 |

Based on the table above, the reseracher found that $\mathrm{x}^{2}{ }_{\text {count }}=0.86$ while
$\mathrm{x}^{2}$ table $=11.070$ cause $\mathrm{x}^{2}{ }_{\text {count }}<\mathrm{x}_{\text {table }}^{2}(0.86<11.070)$ with degree of freedom $(\mathrm{dk})=$ 6-1 = 5 and significant level $\alpha=5 \%$. So distribution of X MIA 1 class (pre-test) is normal.
6. Median

| No | Interval | F | FK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $30-38$ | 5 | 5 |
| 2 | $39-47$ | 6 | 11 |
| 3 | $48-56$ | 5 | 16 |
| 4 | $57-65$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | 27 |
| 5 | $66-74$ | 8 | 35 |
| 6 | $75-83$ | 3 | 38 |
| 7 | $84-92$ | 2 | 40 |

Position of Me in the interval of classes is number 4, that:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{Bb}=56.5 \\
& \mathrm{~F}=16 \\
& \mathrm{fm}=11 \\
& \mathrm{i}=9 \\
& \mathrm{n}=40 \\
& 1 / 2 \mathrm{n}=20
\end{aligned}
$$

So :

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Me} & =\mathrm{Bb}+\mathrm{i}\left(\frac{n / 2-F}{f m}\right) \\
& =56.5+9\left(\frac{20-16}{11}\right) \\
& =56.5+9(0.36) \\
& =56.5+3.24 \\
& =59.74
\end{aligned}
$$

7. Modus

| No | Interval | F | FK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $30-38$ | 5 | 5 |
| 2 | $39-47$ | 6 | 11 |
| 3 | $48-56$ | 5 | 16 |
| 4 | $57-65$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | 27 |
| 5 | $66-74$ | 8 | 35 |
| 6 | $75-83$ | 3 | 38 |
| 7 | $84-92$ | 2 | 40 |

$$
\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{o}}=L+\frac{d_{1}}{d_{1}+d_{2}} i
$$

$\mathrm{L}=56.5$
$\mathrm{d}_{1}=6$
$\mathrm{d}_{2}=3$
i $=9$
So,

$$
\begin{aligned}
M_{o} & =56.5+\frac{6}{6+3} 9 \\
& =56.5+0.67(9) \\
& =56.5+6.03 \\
& =62.53
\end{aligned}
$$

## B. Result of The Normality Test of X-MIA 2 in Pre-Test

1. The score of X MIA 2 class in pre test from low score to high score:

| 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 45 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 55 | 55 | 55 | 55 |
| 55 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 65 | 65 | 65 | 65 |
| 65 | 65 | 65 | 70 | 70 | 75 | 75 | 80 | 80 | 80 |

2. High $=80$

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Low } & =30 \\
\text { Range } & =\text { High }- \text { Low } \\
& =80-30 \\
& =50
\end{array}
$$

3. Total of Classes $=1+3,3 \log (\mathrm{n})$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =1+3,3 \log (40) \\
& =1+3,3(1.6) \\
& =1+5.28 \\
& =6.28=6
\end{aligned}
$$

4. Length of Classes $=\frac{\text { range }}{\text { total of class }}=\frac{50}{6}=8.33=8$
5. Mean

| Interval | F | X | X | $\mathrm{FX}^{\prime}$ | $\mathrm{X}^{\prime 2}$ | $\mathrm{FX}^{\prime 2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $30-37$ | 6 | 33.5 | +3 | 18 | 9 | 54 |
| $38-45$ | 5 | 41.5 | +2 | 10 | 4 | 20 |
| $46-53$ | 5 | 49.5 | +1 | 5 | 1 | 5 |
| $54-61$ | 10 | 57.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $62-69$ | 7 | 65.5 | -1 | -7 | 1 | 7 |
| $70-77$ | 4 | 73.5 | -2 | -8 | 4 | 16 |
| $78-85$ | 3 | 81.5 | -3 | -9 | 9 | 27 |
| $i=8$ | 40 | - | - | 9 | 28 | 129 |

$$
\begin{aligned}
M x=M^{1} & +i \frac{\Sigma f x^{1}}{N} \\
& =57.5+8\left(\frac{9}{40}\right) \\
& =57.5+8(0.23) \\
& =57.5+1.84 \\
& =59.34 \\
\mathrm{SD}_{\mathrm{t}} & =i \sqrt{\frac{\sum f x^{\prime}}{n}-\left(\frac{\sum f x \prime}{n}\right)^{2}} \\
& =8 \sqrt{\frac{129}{40}-\left(\frac{9}{40}\right)^{2}} \\
& =8 \sqrt{3.23-(0.23)^{2}} \\
& =8 \sqrt{3.23-0.05} \\
& =8 \sqrt{3.18} \\
& =8 \times 1.78 \\
& =14.24
\end{aligned}
$$

Table of Normality Data Test with Chi Kuadrad Formula

| Interval of Score | Real <br> Upper <br> Limit | Z - <br> Score | Limit of Large of the Area | Large of area | $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{h}}$ | $\mathrm{f}_{0}$ | $\begin{gathered} \left.\underline{f}_{0}-f_{\mathrm{h}}\right) \\ f_{\mathrm{h}} \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 78-85 | 85.5 | 2.02 | 0.4783 |  |  |  |  |
| $70-77$ | 77.5 | 1.46 | 0.4279 | 0.05 | 2.00 | 3 | 0.5 |
| 62-69 | 69.5 | 0.90 | 0.3159 | 0.11 | 4.40 | 4 | -0.09 |
| 54-61 | 61.5 | 0.34 | 0.1331 | 0.18 | 7.20 | 7 | -0.03 |
| 46-53 | 53.5 | -0.22 | 0.41294 | -0.28 | -11.20 | 10 | -1.89 |
| 38-45 | 45.5 | -0.79 | 0.21476 | 0.20 | 8.00 | 5 | -0.38 |
| 30-37 | 37.5 | -1.35 | 0.08851 | 0.12 | 4.80 | 5 | 0.04 |
|  | 29.5 | -1.91 | 0.02807 | 0.06 | 2.40 | 6 | 1.5 |
| $\mathrm{X}^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.35 |

Based on the table above, the reseracher found that $x^{2}{ }_{\text {count }}=-0.35$ while
$\mathrm{x}_{\text {table }}^{2}=11.070$ cause $\mathrm{x}^{2}{ }_{\text {count }}<\mathrm{x}_{\text {table }}^{2}(-0.35<11.070)$ with degree of freedom ( dk ) $=6-1=5$ and significant level $\alpha=5 \%$. So distribution of X MIA 2 class (pretest) is normal.
6. Median

| Interval | F | FK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $30-37$ | 6 | 6 |
| $38-45$ | 5 | 11 |
| $46-53$ | 5 | 16 |
| $54-61$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | 26 |
| $62-69$ | 7 | 33 |
| $70-77$ | 4 | 37 |
| $78-85$ | 3 | 40 |

Position of Me in the interval of classes is number 4, that:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{Bb}=53.5 \\
& \mathrm{~F}=16 \\
& \mathrm{fm}=10 \\
& \mathrm{i}=8 \\
& \mathrm{n}=40 \\
& 1 / 2 \mathrm{n}=20
\end{aligned}
$$

So :

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Me} & =\mathrm{Bb}+\mathrm{i}\left(\frac{n / 2-F}{f m}\right) \\
& =53.5+8\left(\frac{20-16}{10}\right) \\
& =53.5+8(0.4) \\
& =53.5+3.2 \\
& =56.70
\end{aligned}
$$

7. Modus

| Interval | F | FK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $30-37$ | 6 | 6 |
| $38-45$ | 5 | 11 |
| $46-53$ | 5 | 16 |
| $54-61$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | 26 |
| $62-69$ | 7 | 33 |
| $70-77$ | 4 | 37 |
| $78-85$ | 3 | 40 |

$$
\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{o}}=L+\frac{d_{1}}{d_{1}+d_{2}} i
$$

$\mathrm{L}=53.5$
$\mathrm{d}_{1}=5$
$\mathrm{d}_{2}=3$
i $=8$
So,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{o}} & =53.5+\frac{5}{3+5} 8 \\
& =53.5+0.63(8) \\
& =53.5+5.04 \\
& =58.54
\end{aligned}
$$

## C. Result of The Normality Test of X-MIA 3 in Pre-Test

1. The score of X MIA 3 class in pre test from low score to high score:

| 30 | 30 | 35 | 35 | 40 | 40 | 45 | 45 | 45 | 45 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 55 | 55 | 55 | 55 |
| 55 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 65 | 65 | 65 |
| 65 | 65 | 65 | 70 | 70 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 80 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

2. High $=80$

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Low } & =30 \\
\text { Range } & =\text { High }- \text { Low } \\
& =80-30 \\
& =50
\end{array}
$$

3. Total of Classes $=1+3,3 \log (\mathrm{n})$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =1+3,3 \log (39) \\
& =1+3,3(1.59) \\
& =1+5.25 \\
& =6.25=6
\end{aligned}
$$

4. Length of Classes $=\frac{\text { range }}{\text { total of class }}=\frac{50}{6}=8.33=8$
5. Mean

| Interval | F | X | X | $\mathrm{FX}^{\prime}$ | $\mathrm{X}^{\prime 2}$ | $\mathrm{FX}^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $30-37$ | 4 | 33.5 | +3 | 12 | 9 | 36 |
| $38-45$ | 6 | 41.5 | +2 | 12 | 4 | 24 |
| $46-53$ | 6 | 49.5 | +1 | 6 | 1 | 6 |
| $54-61$ | 11 | 57.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $62-69$ | 6 | 65.5 | -1 | -6 | 1 | 6 |


| $70-77$ | 5 | 73.5 | -2 | -10 | 4 | 20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $78-85$ | 1 | 81.5 | -3 | -3 | 9 | 9 |
| $I=8$ | 39 | - | - | 11 | 28 | 101 |

$$
\begin{aligned}
M x=M^{1} & +i \frac{\Sigma f x^{1}}{N} \\
& =57.5+8\left(\frac{11}{39}\right) \\
& =57.5+8(0.28) \\
& =57.5+2.24 \\
& =59.74 \\
\mathrm{SD}_{\mathrm{t}} & =i \sqrt{\frac{\sum f x^{2}}{n}-\left(\frac{\sum f x^{\prime}}{n}\right)^{2}} \\
& =8 \sqrt{\frac{101}{39}-\left(\frac{11}{39}\right)^{2}} \\
& =8 \sqrt{2.59-(0.28)^{2}} \\
& =8 \sqrt{2.59-0.08} \\
& =8 \sqrt{2.51} \\
& =8 \times 1.58 \\
& =12.64
\end{aligned}
$$

Table of Normality Data Test with Chi Kuadrad Formula

| Interval of Score | Real <br> Upper <br> Limit | $\mathrm{Z}-$ <br> Score | Limit of Large of the Area | Large of area | $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{h}}$ | $\mathrm{f}_{0}$ | $\begin{gathered} \left.\underline{f}_{\underline{0}}-\mathrm{f}_{\underline{b}}\right) \\ \mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{h}} \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 78-85 | 85.5 | 2.04 | 0.4793 |  |  |  |  |
| 70-77 | 77.5 | 1.41 | 0.4207 | 0.06 | 2.34 | 1 | -0.57 |
| 62-69 | 69.5 | 0.77 | 0.2794 | 0.14 | 5.46 | 5 | -0.08 |
| 54-61 | 61.5 | 0.14 | 0.0557 | 0.22 | 8.58 | 6 | -0.30 |
| 46-53 | 53.5 | -0.49 | 0.31207 | -0.26 | -10.14 | 11 | -2.08 |
| 38-45 | 45.5 | -1.13 | 0.12924 | 0.18 | 7.02 | 6 | -0.15 |
| 30-37 | 37.5 | -1.76 | 0.03920 | 0.09 | 3.51 | 6 | 0.71 |
|  | 29.5 | -2.39 | 0.00842 | 0.03 | 1.17 | 4 | 2.42 |
| $\mathrm{X}^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.05 |

Based on the table above, the reseracher found that $\mathrm{x}^{2}$ count $=-0.05$ while
$\mathrm{x}_{\text {table }}^{2}=11.070$ cause $\mathrm{x}^{2}{ }_{\text {count }}<\mathrm{x}_{\text {table }}^{2}(-0.05<11.070)$ with degree of freedom ( dk ) $=6-1=5$ and significant level $\alpha=5 \%$. So distribution of X MIA 3 class (pretest) is normal.
6. Median

| Interval | F | FK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $30-37$ | 4 | 4 |
| $38-45$ | 6 | 10 |
| $46-53$ | 6 | 16 |
| $54-61$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | 27 |
| $62-69$ | 6 | 33 |
| $70-77$ | 5 | 38 |
| $78-85$ | 1 | 49 |

Position of Me in the interval of classes is number 4, that:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{Bb}=53.5 \\
& \mathrm{~F}=16 \\
& \mathrm{fm}=10 \\
& \mathrm{i}=8 \\
& \mathrm{n}=39
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
1 / 2 \mathrm{n}=19.5
$$

So :

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Me} & =\mathrm{Bb}+\mathrm{i}\left(\frac{n / 2-F}{f m}\right) \\
& =53.5+8\left(\frac{19.5-16}{11}\right) \\
& =53.5+8(0.32) \\
& =53.5+2.56 \\
& =56.06
\end{aligned}
$$

7. Modus

| Interval | F | FK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $30-37$ | 4 | 4 |
| $38-45$ | 6 | 10 |
| $46-53$ | 6 | 16 |
| $54-61$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | 27 |
| $62-69$ | 6 | 33 |
| $70-77$ | 5 | 38 |
| $78-85$ | 1 | 49 |

$$
\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{o}}=L+\frac{d_{1}}{d_{1}+d_{2}} i
$$

$\mathrm{L}=53.5$
$\mathrm{d}_{1}=5$
$\mathrm{d}_{2}=5$
i $=8$
So,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{o}} & =53.5+\frac{5}{5+5} 8 \\
& =53.5+0.5(8) \\
& =53.5+4 \\
& =57.5
\end{aligned}
$$

## Appendix 7

## HOMOGENEITY TEST (PRE-TEST)

Calculation of parameter to get variant of the first class as experimental class sample by using direct method and variant of the second class as control class sample by using conventional method are used homogeneity test by using formula:
$S^{2}=\frac{n \Sigma x i^{2}-(\Sigma x i)}{n(n-1)}$

Hypotheses:
$\mathrm{H}_{0} \quad: \delta_{1}^{2}=\delta_{2}^{2}$
$\mathrm{H}_{1} \quad: \delta_{1}^{2} \neq \delta_{2}^{2}$
a. Variant of MIA 1 Class is:

| No. | $\mathbf{X i}$ | $\mathbf{X i}^{\mathbf{2}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 70 | 4900 |
| 2 | 65 | 4225 |
| 3 | 60 | 3600 |
| 4 | 50 | 2500 |
| 5 | 50 | 2500 |
| 6 | 40 | 1600 |
| 7 | 40 | 1600 |
| 8 | 40 | 1600 |
| 9 | 65 | 4225 |
| 10 | 60 | 3600 |
| 11 | 30 | 900 |
| 12 | 30 | 900 |
| 13 | 85 | 7225 |
| 14 | 75 | 5625 |
| 15 | 65 | 4225 |
| 16 | 60 | 3600 |
| 17 | 55 | 3025 |
| 18 | 65 | 4225 |
| 19 | 70 | 4900 |
| 20 | 70 | 4900 |
| 21 | 50 | 2500 |
| 22 | 80 | 6400 |


| 23 | 60 | 3600 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 24 | 60 | 3600 |
| 25 | 50 | 2500 |
| 26 | 40 | 1600 |
| 27 | 30 | 900 |
| 28 | 80 | 6400 |
| 29 | 70 | 4900 |
| 30 | 70 | 4900 |
| 31 | 70 | 4900 |
| 32 | 70 | 4900 |
| 33 | 65 | 4225 |
| 34 | 60 | 3600 |
| 35 | 45 | 2025 |
| 36 | 40 | 1600 |
| 37 | 30 | 900 |
| 38 | 70 | 4900 |
| 39 | 85 | 7225 |
| 40 | 30 | 900 |
| $\sum$ | $\mathbf{2 3 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 2 3 5 0}$ |

n $=40$
$\sum x i=2300$
$\sum_{x i} 2=142350$
So:

$$
\begin{aligned}
S^{2} & =\frac{n \sum x i^{2}-\left(\sum x i\right)}{n(n-1)} \\
& =\frac{40(142350)-(2300)^{2}}{40(40-1)} \\
& =\frac{5694000-5290000}{40(39)} \\
& =\frac{404000}{1560} \\
& =258.97
\end{aligned}
$$

b. Variant of MIA 2 class is:

| No | Xi | $\mathbf{X i}{ }^{\mathbf{2}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 80 | 6400 |
| 2 | 65 | 4225 |
| 3 | 65 | 4225 |
| 4 | 65 | 4225 |
| 5 | 55 | 3025 |
| 6 | 55 | 3025 |
| 7 | 45 | 2025 |
| 8 | 30 | 900 |
| 9 | 30 | 900 |
| 10 | 55 | 3025 |
| 11 | 60 | 3600 |
| 12 | 80 | 6400 |
| 13 | 50 | 2500 |
| 14 | 60 | 3600 |
| 15 | 65 | 4225 |
| 16 | 70 | 4900 |
| 17 | 65 | 4225 |
| 18 | 65 | 4225 |
| 19 | 70 | 4900 |
| 20 | 80 | 6400 |
| 21 | 30 | 900 |
| 22 | 30 | 900 |
| 23 | 40 | 1600 |
| 24 | 40 | 1600 |
| 25 | 50 | 2500 |
| 26 | 50 | 2500 |
| 27 | 60 | 3600 |
| 28 | 65 | 4225 |
| 29 | 30 | 900 |
| 30 | 40 | 1600 |
| 31 | 50 | 2500 |
| 32 | 55 | 3025 |
| 33 | 75 | 5625 |
| 34 | 75 | 5625 |
| 35 | 40 | 1600 |
| 36 | 30 | 900 |
| 37 | 50 | 2500 |
| 38 | 55 | 3025 |
| 39 | 60 | 3600 |
| 40 | 60 | 3600 |
| $\Sigma$ | 2195 | 129275 |

$\mathrm{n}=40$
$\sum x i=2195$
$\sum_{x i} 2=129275$
So:

$$
\begin{aligned}
S^{2} & =\frac{n \Sigma x i^{2}-(\Sigma x i)}{n(n-1)} \\
& =\frac{40(129275)-(2195)^{2}}{40(40-1)} \\
& =\frac{5171000-4818025}{40(39)} \\
& =\frac{352975}{1560} \\
& =226.27
\end{aligned}
$$

c. Variant of MIA 3 class is:

| $\mathbf{N o}$ | $\mathbf{X i}$ | $\mathbf{X i}^{\mathbf{2}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 30 | 900 |
| 2 | 35 | 1225 |
| 3 | 30 | 900 |
| 4 | 35 | 1225 |
| 5 | 40 | 1600 |
| 6 | 40 | 1600 |
| 7 | 45 | 2025 |
| 8 | 45 | 2025 |
| 9 | 45 | 2025 |
| 10 | 50 | 2500 |
| 11 | 45 | 2025 |
| 12 | 50 | 2500 |
| 13 | 50 | 2500 |
| 14 | 50 | 2500 |
| 15 | 50 | 2500 |
| 16 | 50 | 2500 |
| 17 | 55 | 3025 |
| 18 | 55 | 3025 |
| 19 | 55 | 3025 |
| 20 | 55 | 3025 |
| 21 | 55 | 3025 |
| 22 | 60 | 3600 |


| 23 | 60 | 3600 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 24 | 60 | 3600 |
| 25 | 60 | 3600 |
| 26 | 60 | 3600 |
| 27 | 60 | 3600 |
| 28 | 65 | 4225 |
| 29 | 65 | 4225 |
| 30 | 65 | 4225 |
| 31 | 65 | 4225 |
| 32 | 65 | 4225 |
| 33 | 65 | 4225 |
| 34 | 70 | 4900 |
| 35 | 70 | 4900 |
| 36 | 75 | 5625 |
| 37 | 75 | 5625 |
| 38 | 75 | 5625 |
| 39 | 80 | 6400 |
| $\sum$ | $\mathbf{2 1 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 5 7 0 0}$ |

n $=39$
$\sum x i=2160$
$\sum_{x i} 2=125700$
So:

$$
\begin{aligned}
S^{2} & =\frac{n \sum x i^{2}-\left(\sum x i\right)}{n(n-1)} \\
& =\frac{39(125700)-(2160)^{2}}{39(39-1)} \\
& =\frac{4902300-4665600}{39(38)} \\
& =\frac{236700}{1482} \\
& =159.72
\end{aligned}
$$

The Formula used to test hypothesis was:

1. X MIA-1 and X MIA-2 :

$$
\mathrm{F}=\frac{\text { The Biggest Variant }}{\text { The Smallest Variant }}
$$

## So:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{F} & =\frac{258.97}{226.27} \\
& =1.14
\end{aligned}
$$

After doing the calculation, researcher found that $\mathrm{F}_{\text {count }}=1.14$ with $\alpha 5 \%$ and $\mathrm{dk}=\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{k}-1=40-1-1=38$ and 38 from the distribution list F , researcher found that $\mathrm{F}_{\text {table }}=4.10$, cause $\mathrm{F}_{\text {count }}<\mathrm{F}_{\text {table }}(1.14<4.10)$. So, there is no difference the variant between the X MIA-1 class and X MIA-2 class. It means that the variant is homogenous.

## 2. X MIA-1 and X MIA-3 :

$$
\mathrm{F}=\frac{\text { The Biggest Variant }}{\text { The Smallest Variant }}
$$

So:

$$
\mathrm{F}=\frac{258.97}{159.72}
$$

$$
=1.62
$$

After doing the calculation, researcher found that $\mathrm{F}_{\text {count }}=1.62$ with $\alpha$ $5 \%$ and $\mathrm{dk}=\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{k}-1=40-1-1=38$ and 38 from the distribution list F , researcher found that $\mathrm{F}_{\text {table }}=4.10$, cause $\mathrm{F}_{\text {count }}<\mathrm{F}_{\text {table }}(1.62<4.10)$. So, there is no difference the variant between the X MIA-1 class and X MIA-2 class. It means that the variant is homogenous.

## 3. X MIA-2 and X MIA-3 :

$$
\mathrm{F}=\frac{\text { The Biggest Variant }}{\text { The Smallest Variant }}
$$

So:

$$
\mathrm{F}=\frac{226.27}{159.72}
$$

$$
=1.42
$$

After doing the calculation, researcher found that $\mathrm{F}_{\text {count }}=1.42$ with $\alpha$ $5 \%$ and $\mathrm{dk}=\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{k}-1=40-1-1=38$ and 38 from the distribution list F , researcher found that $\mathrm{F}_{\text {table }}=4.10$, cause $\mathrm{F}_{\text {count }}<\mathrm{F}_{\text {table }}(1.42<4.10)$. So, there is no difference the variant between the X MIA-1 class and X MIA-2 class. It means that the variant is homogenous

## Appendix 8

## Score of Experimental Class and Control Class

> Post Test

1. Post Test Score of Experimental Class After Using Outlining Technique (X MIA-2)

| No | The Initial Name of Students (n) | Post Test |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | ANP | 90 |
| 2 | ASP | 75 |
| 3 | AAA | 75 |
| 4 | ARH | 70 |
| 5 | ASD | 70 |
| 6 | AMH | 80 |
| 7 | AD | 80 |
| 8 | AHA | 70 |
| 9 | AR | 65 |
| 10 | DJD | 65 |
| 11 | DR | 75 |
| 12 | DMR | 75 |
| 13 | FA | 80 |
| 14 | FM | 75 |
| 15 | FA | 70 |
| 16 | FAS | 75 |
| 17 | GBR | 75 |
| 18 | GS | 85 |
| 19 | IW | 80 |
| 20 | IPA | 85 |
| 21 | KI | 60 |
| 22 | MANS | 60 |
| 23 | MSH | 85 |
| 24 | MR | 60 |
| 25 | MIH | 70 |
| 26 | MSP | 60 |
| 27 | MRAL | 60 |
| 28 | NAH | 75 |
| 29 | PHH | 75 |
| 30 | RP | 70 |
| 31 | RFR | 65 |


| 32 | RAH | 70 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 33 | RF | 85 |
| 34 | RR | 80 |
| 35 | TAP | 65 |
| 36 | SR | 90 |
| 37 | URP | 65 |
| 38 | WAP | 65 |
| 39 | WA | 70 |
| 40 | WML | 75 |
| Total Score |  |  |

2. Post Test Score of Control Class (X-MIA 1)

| No. | The Initial Name of Students (n) | Post Test |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | AA | 70 |
| 2 | AM | 75 |
| 3 | ADA | 75 |
| 4 | ALA | 70 |
| 5 | AAR | 70 |
| 6 | AU | 55 |
| 7 | AYS | 65 |
| 8 | ASN | 50 |
| 9 | CR | 65 |
| 10 | DS | 65 |
| 11 | DL | 75 |
| 12 | FL | 75 |
| 13 | FP | 80 |
| 14 | HA | 75 |
| 15 | HY | 70 |
| 16 | HR | 75 |
| 17 | IA | 75 |
| 18 | IPC | 55 |
| 19 | IGM | 80 |
| 20 | IM | 85 |
| 21 | LA | 60 |
| 22 | MR | 60 |
| 23 | MHR | 55 |
| 24 | MR | 60 |
| 25 | MR | 70 |
| 26 | MA | 60 |
| 27 | NF | 60 |
| 28 | NT | 70 |
| 29 | PA | 70 |
| 30 | RS | 70 |
| 31 | RS | 65 |
| 32 | RF | 70 |


| 33 | RM | 85 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 34 | RFL | 80 |
| 35 | RA | 65 |
| 36 | RAR | 60 |
| 37 | SH | 65 |
| 38 | SN | 65 |
| 39 | SNH | 70 |
| 40 | WP | 75 |
| Total Score |  | $\mathbf{2 7 4 0}$ |

## Appendix 9

## RESULT OF NORMALITY TEST IN POST TEST

## a. Result Of The Normality Test Of X-MIA 1 in Post-Test

1. The score of X MIA 1 class in post test from low score to high score:

| 50 | 55 | 55 | 55 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 65 | 65 | 65 | 65 | 65 | 65 | 65 | 70 | 70 | 70 |
| 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 75 | 75 | 75 |
| 75 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 85 | 85 |

2. High $=85$

Low $=50$
Range $\quad=$ High - Low
$=85-50$
$=35$
3. Total of Classes $=1+3,3 \log (n)$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =1+3,3 \log (40) \\
& =1+3,3(1.60) \\
& =1+5.28 \\
& =6.28 / 6
\end{aligned}
$$

4. Length of Classes $=\frac{\text { range }}{\text { total of class }}=\frac{35}{6}=5.83=6$
5. Mean

| Interval | F | X | X | $\mathrm{FX}^{\prime}$ | $\mathrm{X}^{\prime 2}$ | $\mathrm{FX}^{\prime 2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $50-55$ | 4 | 52.5 | +3 | 12 | 9 | 36 |
| $56-61$ | 6 | 58.5 | +2 | 12 | 4 | 24 |
| $62-67$ | 7 | 64.5 | +1 | 7 | 1 | 7 |
| $68-73$ | 10 | 70.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $74-79$ | 8 | 76.5 | -1 | -8 | 1 | 8 |
| $80-85$ | 5 | 82.5 | -2 | -10 | 4 | 20 |
| $I=6$ | 40 | - | - | 13 | 19 | 95 |

$$
\begin{aligned}
M x= & M^{1}+i \frac{\Sigma f x^{1}}{N} \\
& =70.5+6\left(\frac{13}{40}\right) \\
& =70.5+6(0.33) \\
& =70.5+1.96 \\
& =72.48
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\mathrm{SD}_{\mathrm{t}}=i \sqrt{\frac{\sum f x^{2}}{n}-\left(\frac{\sum f x^{\prime}}{n}\right)^{2}}
$$

$$
=6 \sqrt{\frac{95}{40}-\left(\frac{13}{40}\right)^{2}}
$$

$$
=6 \sqrt{2.38-(0.33)^{2}}
$$

$$
=6 \sqrt{2.38-0.11}
$$

$$
=6 \sqrt{2.27}
$$

$$
=6 \times 1.51
$$

$$
=9.06
$$

Table of Normality Data Test with Chi Kuadrad Formula

| Interval of Score | Real <br> Upper <br> Limit | $\mathrm{Z}-$ <br> Score | Limit of Large of the Area | Large of area | $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{h}}$ | $\mathrm{f}_{0}$ | $\begin{gathered} \left(\mathrm{f}_{0}-\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{h}}\right) \\ f_{\mathrm{f}} \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 80-85 | 85.5 | 1.44 | 0.4251 |  |  |  |  |
| 74-79 | 79.5 | 0.77 | $0.2794$ | 0.15 | 6 | 5 | -0.17 |
|  |  | $0.11$ | 0.0438 | 0.24 | 9.6 | 8 | -0.17 |
| 68-73 | 73.5 |  | 0.0438 | -0.25 | -10 | 10 | 2 |
| 62-67 | 67.5 | -0.55 | 0.29116 | -0.25 | -10 | 10 | ${ }^{2}$ |
| 56-61 | 61.5 | -1.21 | 0.11314 | 0.18 | 7.2 | 7 | -0.03 |
| 50-55 | 55.5 | -1.87 | $0.03074$ | 0.08 | 3.2 | 6 | 0.88 |
|  | 49.5 | -2.54 | $0.00554$ | 0.03 | 1.2 | 4 | 2.33 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{X}^{2}$ | 4.84 |

Based on the table above, the reseracher found that $x^{2}{ }_{\text {count }}=4.84$ while
$\mathrm{x}_{\text {table }}^{2}=11.070$ cause $\mathrm{x}^{2}{ }_{\text {count }}<\mathrm{x}_{\text {table }}^{2}(4.84<11.070)$ with degree of freedom $(\mathrm{dk})=$ 6-1 = 5 and significant level $\alpha=5 \%$. So distribution of X MIA 1 class (pre-test) is normal.

## 6. Median

| Interval | F | FK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $50-55$ | 4 | 4 |
| $56-61$ | 6 | 10 |
| $62-67$ | 7 | 17 |
| $68-73$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | 27 |
| $74-79$ | 8 | 35 |
| $80-85$ | 5 | 40 |

Position of Me in the interval of classes is number 4, that:
$\mathrm{Bb}=67.5$

$$
\mathrm{F}=17
$$

$\mathrm{fm}=10$
i $=6$
$\mathrm{n}=40$
$1 / 2 \mathrm{n}=20$
So :

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Me} & =\mathrm{Bb}+\mathrm{i}\left(\frac{n / 2-F}{f m}\right) \\
& =67.5+6\left(\frac{20-17}{10}\right) \\
& =67.5+6(0.30) \\
& =67.5+1.80 \\
& =69.30
\end{aligned}
$$

7. Modus

| Interval | F | FK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $50-55$ | 4 | 4 |
| $56-61$ | 6 | 10 |
| $62-67$ | 7 | 17 |
| $68-73$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | 27 |
| $74-79$ | 8 | 35 |
| $80-85$ | 5 | 40 |

$\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{o}}=L+\frac{d_{1}}{d_{1}+d_{2}} i$
$\mathrm{L}=67.5$
$\mathrm{d}_{1}=3$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{d}_{2}=2 \\
& \mathrm{i}=6
\end{aligned}
$$

So,

$$
\begin{aligned}
M_{o} & =67.5+\frac{3}{3+2} 6 \\
& =67.5+0.60(6) \\
& =67.5+3.60 \\
& =71.10
\end{aligned}
$$

## D. Result of The Normality Test of X-MIA 2 in Post-Test

1. The score of X MIA 2 class in post test from low score to high score:

| 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 65 | 65 | 65 | 65 | 65 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 65 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 75 |
| 75 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 80 |
| 80 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 90 | 90 |

2. High $=90$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text { Low } & =60 \\
\text { Range } & =\text { High }- \text { Low } \\
& =90-60 \\
& =30
\end{aligned}
$$

3. Total of Classes $=1+3,3 \log (\mathrm{n})$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =1+3,3 \log (40) \\
& =1+3,3(1.60) \\
& =1+5.28 \\
& =6.28 / 6
\end{aligned}
$$

4. Length of Classes $=\frac{\text { range }}{\text { total of class }}=\frac{30}{6}=5$
5. Mean

| Interval | F | X | X | $\mathrm{FX}^{\prime}$ | $\mathrm{X}^{\prime 2}$ | $\mathrm{FX}^{\prime 2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $60-64$ | 5 | 62 | +3 | 15 | 9 | 45 |
| $65-69$ | 6 | 67 | +2 | 12 | 4 | 24 |
| $70-74$ | 8 | 72 | +1 | 8 | 1 | 8 |
| $75-79$ | 10 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $80-84$ | 5 | 82 | -1 | -5 | 1 | 5 |
| $85-89$ | 4 | 87 | -2 | -8 | 4 | 16 |

$$
\begin{aligned}
& M x=M^{1}+i \frac{\Sigma f x^{1}}{N} \\
& =77+5\left(\frac{16}{40}\right) \\
& =77+5(0.4) \\
& =77+2.00 \\
& =79.00 \\
& \mathrm{SD}_{\mathrm{t}}=i \sqrt{\frac{\sum f x^{\prime}{ }^{2}}{n}-\left(\frac{\sum f x \prime}{n}\right)^{2}} \\
& =5 \sqrt{\frac{116}{40}-\left(\frac{16}{40}\right)^{2}} \\
& =5 \sqrt{2.9-(0.4)^{2}} \\
& =5 \sqrt{2.9-0.16} \\
& =5 \sqrt{2.74} \\
& =5 \times 1.66 \\
& =8.30
\end{aligned}
$$

Table of Normality Data Test with Chi Kuadrad Formula

| Interval of Score | Real <br> Upper <br> Limit | Z - <br> Score | Limit of Large of the Area | Large of area | $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{h}}$ | $\mathrm{f}_{0}$ | $\begin{gathered} \left.\underline{f}_{0}-f_{\underline{b}}\right) \\ f_{\mathrm{f}} \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 90-94 | 94.5 | 1.87 | 0.4693 |  |  |  |  |
| 85-89 | 89.5 | 1.27 | 0.3980 | 0.07 | 2.8 | 2 | -0.29 |
|  |  |  |  | 0.15 | 6 | 4 | -0.33 |
| 80-84 | 84.5 | 0.66 | 0.2454 | 0.22 | 8.8 | 5 | -0.43 |
| 75-79 | 79.5 | 0.06 | 0.0239 |  |  |  |  |
| 70-74 | 74.5 | -0.54 | 0.29460 | -0.27 | -10.8 | 10 | 1.93 |
|  |  |  |  | 0.17 | 6.8 | 8 | 0.18 |
| 65-69 | 69.5 | -1.14 | 0.2714 | 0.09 | 3.6 | 6 | 0.67 |
| 60-64 | 64.5 | -1.75 | 0.04006 | 0.03 | $1.2$ | 5 | 3.17 |
|  | 59.5 | -2.35 | 0.00939 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{X}^{2}$ | 4.23 |

Based on the table above, the reseracher found that $\mathrm{x}^{2}{ }_{\text {count }}=4.23$ while $\mathrm{x}^{2}$ table $=11.070$ cause $\mathrm{x}^{2}{ }_{\text {count }}<\mathrm{x}^{2}$ table $(4.23<11.070)$ with degree of freedom $(\mathrm{dk})=$ 6-1 = 5 and significant level $\alpha=5 \%$. So distribution of X MIA 2 class (pre-test) is normal.
6. Median

| Interval | F | FK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $60-64$ | 5 | 5 |
| $65-69$ | 6 | 11 |
| $70-74$ | 8 | 19 |
| $75-79$ | 10 | 29 |
| $80-84$ | 5 | 34 |
| $85-89$ | 4 | 38 |
| $90-94$ | 2 | 40 |

Position of Me in the interval of classes is number 4, that:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{Bb}=74.5 \\
& \mathrm{~F}=19 \\
& \mathrm{fm}=10 \\
& \mathrm{i}=5 \\
& \mathrm{n}=40 \\
& 1 / 2 \mathrm{n}=20
\end{aligned}
$$

So :

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Me} & =\mathrm{Bb}+\mathrm{i}\left(\frac{n / 2-F}{f m}\right) \\
& =74.5+5\left(\frac{20-19}{10}\right) \\
& =74.5+5(0.10) \\
& =74.5+0.50 \\
& =75.00
\end{aligned}
$$

7. Modus

| Interval | F | FK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $60-64$ | 5 | 5 |
| $65-69$ | 6 | 11 |
| $70-74$ | 8 | 19 |
| $75-79$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | 29 |
| $80-84$ | 5 | 34 |
| $85-89$ | 4 | 38 |
| $90-94$ | 2 | 40 |

$$
\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{o}}=L+\frac{d_{1}}{d_{1}+d_{2}} i
$$

$\mathrm{L}=74.5$
$\mathrm{d}_{1}=2$
$\mathrm{d}_{2}=5$
i $=5$
So,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{o}} & =74.5+\frac{2}{2+5} 5 \\
& =74.5+0.29(5) \\
& =74.5+1.45 \\
& =75.95
\end{aligned}
$$

## Appendix 10

## HOMOGENEITY TEST (POST-TEST)

Calculation of parameter to get variant of the first class as experimental class sample by using direct method and variant of the second class as control class sample by using conventional method are used homogeneity test by using formula:
$S^{2}=\frac{n \Sigma x i^{2}-(\Sigma x i)}{n(n-1)}$

Hypotheses:
$\mathrm{H}_{0} \quad: \delta_{1}^{2}=\delta_{2}^{2}$
$\mathrm{H}_{1} \quad: \delta_{1}^{2} \neq \delta_{2}^{2}$
a. Variant of MIA 1 class is:

| No. | $\mathbf{X i}$ | $\mathbf{X i}^{\mathbf{2}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 70 | 4900 |
| 2 | 75 | 5625 |
| 3 | 75 | 5625 |
| 4 | 70 | 4900 |
| 5 | 70 | 4900 |
| 6 | 55 | 3025 |
| 7 | 65 | 4225 |
| 8 | 50 | 2500 |
| 9 | 65 | 4225 |
| 10 | 65 | 4225 |
| 11 | 75 | 5625 |
| 12 | 75 | 5625 |
| 13 | 80 | 6400 |
| 14 | 75 | 5625 |
| 15 | 70 | 4900 |
| 16 | 75 | 5625 |
| 17 | 75 | 5625 |
| 18 | 55 | 3025 |
| 19 | 80 | 6400 |
| 20 | 85 | 7225 |
| 21 | 60 | 3600 |


| 22 | 60 | 3600 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23 | 55 | 3025 |
| 24 | 60 | 3600 |
| 25 | 70 | 4900 |
| 26 | 60 | 3600 |
| 27 | 60 | 3600 |
| 28 | 70 | 4900 |
| 29 | 70 | 4900 |
| 30 | 70 | 4900 |
| 31 | 65 | 4225 |
| 32 | 70 | 4900 |
| 33 | 85 | 7225 |
| 34 | 80 | 6400 |
| 35 | 65 | 4225 |
| 36 | 60 | 3600 |
| 37 | 65 | 4225 |
| 38 | 65 | 4225 |
| 39 | 70 | 4900 |
| 40 | 75 | 5625 |
| $\sum$ | $\mathbf{2 7 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 0 4 0 0}$ |

n $=40$
$\sum x i=2740$
$\sum_{x i} 2=190400$
So:

$$
\begin{aligned}
S^{2} & =\frac{n \sum x i^{2}-(\Sigma x i)}{n(n-1)} \\
& =\frac{40(190400)-(2740)^{2}}{40(40-1)} \\
& =\frac{7616000-7507600}{40(39)} \\
& =\frac{108400}{1560} \\
& =69.49
\end{aligned}
$$

b. Variant of MIA 2 class is:

| NO | Xi | $\mathbf{X i}{ }^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 90 | 8100 |
| 2 | 75 | 5625 |
| 3 | 75 | 5625 |
| 4 | 70 | 4900 |
| 5 | 70 | 4900 |
| 6 | 80 | 6400 |
| 7 | 80 | 6400 |
| 8 | 70 | 4900 |
| 9 | 65 | 4225 |
| 10 | 65 | 4225 |
| 11 | 75 | 5625 |
| 12 | 75 | 5625 |
| 13 | 80 | 6400 |
| 14 | 75 | 5625 |
| 15 | 70 | 4900 |
| 16 | 75 | 5625 |
| 17 | 75 | 5625 |
| 18 | 85 | 7225 |
| 19 | 80 | 6400 |
| 20 | 85 | 7225 |
| 21 | 60 | 3600 |
| 22 | 60 | 3600 |
| 23 | 85 | 7225 |
| 24 | 60 | 3600 |
| 25 | 70 | 4900 |
| 26 | 60 | 3600 |
| 27 | 60 | 3600 |
| 28 | 75 | 5625 |
| 29 | 75 | 5625 |
| 30 | 70 | 4900 |
| 31 | 65 | 4225 |
| 32 | 70 | 4900 |
| 33 | 85 | 7225 |
| 34 | 80 | 6400 |
| 35 | 65 | 4225 |
| 36 | 90 | 8100 |
| 37 | 65 | 4225 |
| 38 | 65 | 4225 |
| 39 | 70 | 4900 |
| 40 | 75 | 5625 |
| $\Sigma$ | 2920 | 215900 |

$\mathrm{n}=40$
$\sum x i=2920$
$\sum_{x i} 2=215900$
So:

$$
\begin{aligned}
S^{2} & =\frac{n \sum x i^{2}-\left(\sum x i\right)}{n(n-1)} \\
& =\frac{40(215900)-(2920)^{2}}{40(40-1)} \\
& =\frac{8636000-8526400}{40(39)} \\
& =\frac{109600}{1560} \\
& =70.26
\end{aligned}
$$

## 1. X MIA-1 and X MIA-2 :

$$
\mathrm{F}=\frac{\text { The Biggest Variant }}{\text { The Smallest Variant }}
$$

So:

$$
F=\frac{70.26}{69.49}
$$

$$
=1.01
$$

After doing the calculation, researcher found that $\mathrm{F}_{\text {count }}=1.01$ with $\alpha$ $5 \%$ and $\mathrm{dk}=\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{k}-1=40-1-1=38$ and 38 from the distribution list F , researcher found that $\mathrm{F}_{\text {table }}=4.10$, cause $\mathrm{F}_{\text {count }}<\mathrm{F}_{\text {table }}(1.01<4.10)$. So, there is no difference the variant between the X MIA-1 class and X MIA-2 class. It means that the variant is homogenous.

## Appendix 11

## T-test of the Both Averages in Pre-Test

The formula was used to analyse homogeneity test of the both averages was $t$ test, that:

$$
T t=\frac{M_{1}-M_{2}}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\left(n_{1}-1\right) s_{1}^{2}+\left(n_{2}-1\right) s_{2}^{2}}{n_{1}+n_{2}-2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{n_{1}}+\frac{1}{n_{2}}\right)}}
$$

$$
T t=\frac{59.34-63.7}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{(40-1) 226.27+(40-1) 258.97}{40+40-2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{40}+\frac{1}{40}\right)}}
$$

$$
T t=\frac{-4.36}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{39(226.27)+39(258.97)}{78}\right)(0.01+0.01)}}
$$

$$
T t=\frac{-4.36}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{8824.53+10099.83}{78}\right)(0.01+0.01)}}
$$

$$
T t=\frac{-4.36}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{18924.36}{78}\right)(0.02)}}
$$

$$
T t=\frac{-4.36}{\sqrt{242.62(0.02)}}
$$

$$
T t=\frac{-4.36}{\sqrt{4.85}}
$$

$$
T t=\frac{4.36}{2.20}
$$

$$
T t=-1.98
$$

Based on researcher calculation result of homogeneity test of the both averages, researcher found that $\mathrm{t}_{\text {count }}=2.00$ with opportunity $(1-\alpha)=1-5 \%=95 \%$
and $\mathrm{dk}=\mathrm{n}_{1}+\mathrm{n}_{2}-2=40+40-2=78, \mathrm{t}_{\text {table }}=2.00$. So, $\mathrm{t}_{\text {count }}<\mathrm{t}_{\text {table }}(-1.98<2.00)$ and $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ is accepted, it means no difference the average between the first class as experimental class and the second class as control class in this research.

## Appendix 12

## T-test of the Both Averages in Post-Test

The formula was used to analyse homogeneity test of the both averages was ttest, that:
$T t=\frac{M_{1}-M_{2}}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\left(n_{1}-1\right) s_{1}^{2}+\left(n_{2}-1\right) s_{2}^{2}}{n_{1}+n_{2}-2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{n_{1}}+\frac{1}{n_{2}}\right)}}$
$T t=\frac{79.00-72.48}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{(40-1) 70.26+(40-1) 69.49}{40+40-2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{40}+\frac{1}{40}\right)}}$
$T t=\frac{6.52}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{39(70.26)+39(69.49)}{78}\right)(0.03+0.03)}}$
$T t=\frac{6.52}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{2740.14+2710.11}{78}\right)(0.03+0.03)}}$
$T t=\frac{6.52}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{5450.25}{78}\right)(0.06)}}$
$T t=\frac{6.52}{\sqrt{69.88(0.06)}}$
$T t=\frac{6.52}{\sqrt{4.19}}$
$T t=\frac{6.52}{2.05}$
$T t=3.18$
Based on calculation above, the result of homogeneity test of the both averages, researcher found that $\mathrm{t}_{\text {count }}=3.18$ with opportunity $(1-\alpha)=1-5 \%=95 \%$
and $\mathrm{dk}=\mathrm{n}_{1}+\mathrm{n}_{2}-2=37+36-2=71$, researcher found that $\mathrm{t}_{\text {table }}=2.000$, cause, $\mathrm{t}_{\text {count }}>\mathrm{t}_{\text {table }}(3.18>2.000)$ it means that $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{a}}$ was accepted, it means there was the difference average between experimental class and conrol class in post test. It can be concluded that there was the significant effect of using outlining technique on students' writing descriptive text ability at X grade of MAN 1 Padangsidimpuan.

## Appendix 13

## INDICATOR OF WRITING IN PRE-TEST AND POST TEST

## A. Assessment Indicator of Writing in Pre-test of Experimental Class

| NoThdicator of Writing <br> Naitial <br> Name of <br> Students <br> (n) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Grammar | Vocabulary | Mechanics | Fluency | Form | Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | ANP | 15 | 15 | 20 | 15 | 15 | 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | ASP | 10 | 10 | 20 | 15 | 10 | 65 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | AAA | 10 | 10 | 20 | 15 | 10 | 65 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | ARH | 10 | 15 | 20 | 10 | 10 | 65 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | ASD | 5 | 10 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | AMH | 5 | 10 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | AD | 5 | 15 | 10 | 5 | 10 | 45 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | AHA | 5 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | AR | 5 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | DJD | 10 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | DR | 10 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | DMR | 15 | 15 | 20 | 15 | 15 | 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | FA | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 | FM | 10 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 | FA | 10 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 65 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 | FAS | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 70 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 | GBR | 15 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 15 | 65 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 | GS | 15 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 15 | 65 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 | IW | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 70 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20 | IPA | 15 | 15 | 15 | 20 | 15 | 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21 | KI | 5 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22 | MANS | 5 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23 | MSH | 5 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 40 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24 | MR | 5 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 40 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 | MIH | 10 | 10 | 5 | 15 | 10 | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 26 | MSP | 10 | 10 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 50 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 27 | MRAL | 15 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 15 | 60 |
| 28 | NAH | 10 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 65 |
| 29 | PHH | 5 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 30 |
| 30 | RP | 5 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 40 |
| 31 | RFR | 10 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 15 | 50 |
| 32 | RAH | 10 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 55 |
| 33 | RF | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 75 |
| 34 | RR | 15 | 20 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 75 |
| 35 | TAP | 5 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 40 |
| 36 | SR | 5 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 30 |
| 37 | URP | 5 | 10 | 15 | 15 | 5 | 50 |
| 38 | WAP | 10 | 10 | 15 | 15 | 5 | 55 |
| 39 | WA | 10 | 10 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 60 |
| 40 | WML | 15 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 60 |

## B. Assessment Indicator of Writing in Post-test of Experimental Class

| Indicator of Writing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No | The <br> Initial <br> Name of <br> Students <br> (n) | Grammar | Vocabulary | Mechanics | Fluency | Form | Total |  |
| 1 | ANP | 15 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 15 | 90 |  |
| 2 | ASP | 15 | 15 | 20 | 10 | 15 | 75 |  |
| 3 | AAA | 15 | 15 | 20 | 10 | 15 | 75 |  |
| 4 | ARH | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 15 | 70 |  |
| 5 | ASD | 15 | 15 | 10 | 15 | 15 | 70 |  |
| 6 | AMH | 15 | 15 | 20 | 20 | 10 | 80 |  |
| 7 | AD | 15 | 15 | 20 | 15 | 15 | 80 |  |
| 8 | AHA | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 70 |  |
| 9 | AR | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 65 |  |
| 10 | DJD | 10 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 15 | 65 |  |
| 11 | DR | 15 | 20 | 15 | 10 | 15 | 75 |  |
| 12 | DMR | 15 | 20 | 10 | 15 | 15 | 75 |  |


| 13 | FA | 10 | 20 | 20 | 15 | 15 | 80 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14 | FM | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 75 |
| 15 | FA | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 15 | 70 |
| 16 | FAS | 10 | 15 | 20 | 15 | 15 | 75 |
| 17 | GBR | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 75 |
| 18 | GS | 15 | 15 | 20 | 20 | 15 | 85 |
| 19 | IW | 15 | 15 | 20 | 15 | 15 | 80 |
| 20 | IPA | 15 | 15 | 20 | 20 | 15 | 85 |
| 21 | KI | 10 | 10 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 60 |
| 22 | MANS | 10 | 10 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 60 |
| 23 | MSH | 20 | 15 | 20 | 15 | 15 | 85 |
| 24 | MR | 10 | 10 | 20 | 10 | 10 | 60 |
| 25 | MIH | 10 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 70 |
| 26 | MSP | 15 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 60 |
| 27 | MRAL | 10 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 60 |
| 28 | NAH | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 75 |
| 29 | PHH | 15 | 20 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 75 |
| 30 | RP | 10 | 20 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 70 |
| 31 | RFR | 10 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 15 | 65 |
| 32 | RAH | 10 | 20 | 20 | 10 | 10 | 70 |
| 33 | RF | 15 | 15 | 20 | 20 | 15 | 85 |
| 34 | RR | 15 | 20 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 80 |
| 35 | TAP | 10 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 65 |
| 36 | SR | 20 | 15 | 20 | 15 | 20 | 90 |
| 37 | URP | 10 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 65 |
| 38 | WAP | 15 | 10 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 65 |
| 39 | WA | 10 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 70 |
| 40 | WML | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 75 |

## C. Assessment Indicator of Writing in Pre-test of Control Class

| No. Indicator of Writing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Thitial <br> Name of <br> Students <br> (n) | Grammar | Vocabulary | Mechanics | Fluency | Form | Total |  |
| 1 | AA | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 70 |  |
| 2 | AM | 10 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 65 |  |
| 3 | ADA | 10 | 15 | 10 | 15 | 10 | 60 |  |
| 4 | ALA | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 50 |  |
| 5 | AAR | 10 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 50 |  |
| 6 | AU | 5 | 10 | 15 | 5 | 5 | 40 |  |
| 7 | AYS | 10 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 40 |  |
| 8 | ASN | 5 | 10 | 15 | 5 | 5 | 40 |  |
| 9 | CR | 10 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 65 |  |
| 10 | DS | 10 | 10 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 60 |  |
| 11 | DL | 5 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 30 |  |
| 12 | FL | 5 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 30 |  |
| 13 | FP | 15 | 15 | 20 | 20 | 15 | 85 |  |
| 14 | HA | 15 | 15 | 20 | 15 | 10 | 75 |  |
| 15 | HY | 10 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 65 |  |
| 16 | HR | 15 | 10 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 60 |  |
| 17 | IA | 10 | 15 | 10 | 15 | 5 | 55 |  |
| 18 | IPC | 10 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 65 |  |
| 19 | IGM | 10 | 15 | 15 | 20 | 10 | 70 |  |
| 20 | IM | 10 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 10 | 70 |  |
| 21 | LA | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 50 |  |
| 22 | MR | 15 | 15 | 20 | 20 | 10 | 80 |  |
| 23 | MHR | 15 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 60 |  |
| 24 | MR | 15 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 60 |  |
| 25 | MR | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 50 |  |
| 26 | MA | 10 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 40 |  |
| 27 | NF | 5 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 30 |  |
| 28 | NT | 15 | 20 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 80 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 29 | PA | 10 | 20 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 70 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 30 | RS | 10 | 20 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 70 |
| 31 | RS | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 70 |
| 32 | RF | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 70 |
| 33 | RM | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 5 | 65 |
| 34 | RFL | 10 | 15 | 20 | 10 | 5 | 60 |
| 35 | RA | 5 | 10 | 15 | 10 | 5 | 45 |
| 36 | RAR | 5 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 40 |
| 37 | SH | 5 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 30 |
| 38 | SN | 10 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 70 |
| 39 | SNH | 15 | 15 | 20 | 20 | 15 | 85 |
| 40 | WP | 5 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 30 |

## D. Essessement Indicator of Writing in Post-test of Control Class

| No. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | The <br> Initial <br> Name of <br> Students <br> (n) | Grammar Writing | Vocabulary | Mechanics | Fluency | Form | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | AA | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 70 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | AM | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | ADA | 15 | 15 | 20 | 15 | 10 | 75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | ALA | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 70 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | AAR | 10 | 15 | 15 | 20 | 10 | 70 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | AU | 10 | 15 | 10 | 15 | 5 | 55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | AYS | 10 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 65 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | ASN | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | CR | 10 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 65 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | DS | 10 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 65 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | DL | 10 | 15 | 20 | 20 | 10 | 75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | FL | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | FP | 15 | 15 | 20 | 20 | 10 | 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 | HA | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 | HY | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 70 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 | HR | 15 | 15 | 20 | 20 | 15 | 75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 17 | IA | 15 | 15 | 20 | 20 | 15 | 75 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18 | IPC | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 5 | 55 |
| 19 | IGM | 15 | 15 | 15 | 20 | 15 | 80 |
| 20 | IM | 20 | 15 | 15 | 20 | 15 | 85 |
| 21 | LA | 15 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 60 |
| 22 | MR | 10 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 60 |
| 23 | MHR | 10 | 10 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 55 |
| 24 | MR | 10 | 10 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 60 |
| 25 | MR | 10 | 20 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 70 |
| 26 | MA | 10 | 10 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 60 |
| 27 | NF | 10 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 60 |
| 28 | NT | 15 | 10 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 70 |
| 29 | PA | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 15 | 70 |
| 30 | RS | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 70 |
| 31 | RS | 10 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 65 |
| 32 | RF | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 70 |
| 33 | RM | 15 | 15 | 20 | 20 | 15 | 85 |
| 34 | RFL | 15 | 20 | 20 | 15 | 10 | 80 |
| 35 | RA | 10 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 65 |
| 36 | RAR | 10 | 10 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 60 |
| 37 | SH | 10 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 65 |
| 38 | SN | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 65 |
| 39 | SNH | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 70 |
| 40 | WP | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 75 |

## Appendix 14

## COMPARISON SCORE OF STUDENT'S WRITING ABILITY IN PRE-TEST

AND POST-TEST

## A. Comparison Score of Students' Writing Ability in Pre-test (Experimental and Control Class)

| No | Name | Result Pre-test of Experimental Class | Name | Result of Pretest of Control Class |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | ANP | 80 | AA | 70 |
| 2 | ASP | 65 | AM | 65 |
| 3 | AAA | 65 | ADA | 60 |
| 4 | ARH | 65 | ALA | 50 |
| 5 | ASD | 55 | AAR | 50 |
| 6 | AMH | 55 | AU | 40 |
| 7 | AD | 45 | AYS | 40 |
| 8 | AHA | 30 | ASN | 40 |
| 9 | AR | 30 | CR | 65 |
| 10 | DJD | 55 | DS | 60 |
| 11 | DR | 60 | DL | 30 |
| 12 | DMR | 80 | FL | 30 |
| 13 | FA | 50 | FP | 85 |
| 14 | FM | 60 | HA | 75 |
| 15 | FA | 65 | HY | 65 |
| 16 | FAS | 70 | HR | 60 |
| 17 | GBR | 65 | IA | 55 |
| 18 | GS | 65 | IPC | 65 |
| 19 | IW | 70 | IGM | 70 |
| 20 | IPA | 80 | IM | 70 |
| 21 | KI | 30 | LA | 50 |
| 22 | MANS | 30 | MR | 80 |
| 23 | MSH | 40 | MHR | 60 |
| 24 | MR | 40 | MR | 60 |
| 25 | MIH | 50 | MR | 50 |
| 26 | MSP | 50 | MA | 40 |
| 27 | MRAL | 60 | NF | 30 |
| 28 | NAH | 65 | NT | 80 |


| 29 | PHH | 30 | PA | 70 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 30 | RP | 40 | RS | 70 |
| 31 | RFR | 50 | RS | 70 |
| 32 | RAH | 55 | RF | 70 |
| 33 | RF | 75 | RM | 65 |
| 34 | RR | 75 | RFL | 60 |
| 35 | TAP | 40 | RA | 45 |
| 36 | SR | 30 | RAR | 40 |
| 37 | URP | 50 | SH | 30 |
| 38 | WAP | 55 | SN | 70 |
| 39 | WA | 60 | SNH | 85 |
| 40 | WML | 60 | WP | 30 |

## B. Comparison Score Students' Writing Ability in Post-test (Experimental and Control Class

| No | Name | Result Post-test <br> of Experimental <br> Class | Name | Result of Post- <br> test of Control <br> Class |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | ANP | 90 | AA | 70 |
| 2 | ASP | 75 | AM | 75 |
| 3 | AAA | 75 | ADA | 75 |
| 4 | ARH | 70 | ALA | 70 |
| 5 | ASD | 70 | AAR | 70 |
| 6 | AMH | 80 | AU | 55 |
| 7 | AD | 80 | AYS | 65 |
| 8 | AHA | 70 | ASN | 50 |
| 9 | AR | 65 | CR | 65 |
| 10 | DJD | 65 | DS | 65 |
| 11 | DR | 75 | DL | 75 |
| 12 | DMR | 75 | FL | 75 |
| 13 | FA | 80 | FP | 80 |
| 14 | FM | 75 | HA | 75 |
| 15 | FA | 70 | HY | 70 |
| 16 | FAS | 75 | HR | 75 |
| 17 | GBR | 75 | IA | 75 |


| 18 | GS | 85 | IPC | 55 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19 | IW | 80 | IGM | 80 |
| 20 | IPA | 85 | IM | 85 |
| 21 | KI | 60 | LA | 60 |
| 22 | MANS | 60 | MR | 60 |
| 23 | MSH | 85 | MHR | 55 |
| 24 | MR | 60 | MR | 60 |
| 25 | MIH | 70 | MR | 70 |
| 26 | MSP | 60 | MA | 60 |
| 27 | MRAL | 60 | NF | 60 |
| 28 | NAH | 75 | NT | 70 |
| 29 | PHH | 75 | PA | 70 |
| 30 | RP | 70 | RS | 70 |
| 31 | RFR | 65 | RS | 65 |
| 32 | RAH | 70 | RF | 70 |
| 33 | RF | 85 | RM | 85 |
| 34 | RR | 80 | RFL | 80 |
| 35 | TAP | 65 | RA | 65 |
| 36 | SR | 90 | RAR | 60 |
| 37 | URP | 65 | SH | 65 |
| 38 | WAP | 65 | SN | 65 |
| 39 | WA | 70 | SNH | 70 |
| 40 | WML | 75 | WP | 75 |

Appendix 15
Chi-Square Table

| $\mathbf{D k}$ | Significant level |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{5 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 \%}$ |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | 0,455 | 1,074 | 1,642 | 2,706 | 3,841 | 6,635 |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | 1,386 | 2,408 | 3,219 | 4,605 | 5,991 | 9,210 |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | 2,366 | 3,665 | 4,642 | 6,251 | 7,815 | 11,341 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | 3,357 | 4,878 | 5,989 | 7,779 | 9,488 | 13,277 |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | 4,351 | 6,064 | 7,289 | 9,236 | 11,070 | 15,086 |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | 5,348 | 7,231 | 8,558 | 10,645 | 12,592 | 16,812 |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | 6,346 | 8,383 | 9,803 | 12,017 | 14,067 | 18,475 |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | 7,344 | 9,524 | 11,030 | 13,362 | 15,507 | 20,090 |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | 8,343 | 10,656 | 12,242 | 14,684 | 16,919 | 21,666 |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | 9,342 | 11,781 | 13,442 | 15,987 | 18,307 | 23,209 |
| $\mathbf{1 1}$ | 10,341 | 12,899 | 14,631 | 17,275 | 19,675 | 24,725 |
| $\mathbf{1 2}$ | 11,340 | 14,011 | 15,812 | 18,549 | 21,026 | 26,217 |
| $\mathbf{1 3}$ | 12,340 | 15,119 | 16,985 | 19,812 | 22,362 | 27,688 |
| $\mathbf{1 4}$ | 13,339 | 16,222 | 18,151 | 21,064 | 23,685 | 29,141 |
| $\mathbf{1 5}$ | 14,339 | 17,222 | 19,311 | 22,307 | 24,996 | 30,578 |
| $\mathbf{1 6}$ | 15,338 | 18,418 | 20,465 | 23,542 | 26,296 | 32,000 |
| $\mathbf{1 7}$ | 16,338 | 19,511 | 21,615 | 24,769 | 27,587 | 33,409 |
| $\mathbf{1 8}$ | 17,338 | 20,601 | 22,760 | 25,989 | 28,869 | 34,805 |
| $\mathbf{1 9}$ | 18,338 | 21,689 | 23,900 | 27,204 | 30,144 | 36,191 |
| $\mathbf{2 0}$ | 19,337 | 22,775 | 25,038 | 28,412 | 31,410 | 37,566 |
| $\mathbf{2 1}$ | 20,337 | 23,858 | 26,171 | 29,615 | 32,671 | 38,932 |
| $\mathbf{2 2}$ | 21,337 | 24,939 | 27,301 | 30,813 | 33,924 | 40,289 |
| $\mathbf{2 3}$ | 22,337 | 26.018 | 28,429 | 32,007 | 35,172 | 41,638 |
| $\mathbf{2 4}$ | 23,337 | 27,096 | 29,553 | 33,196 | 35,415 | 42,980 |
| $\mathbf{2 5}$ | 24,337 | 28,172 | 30,675 | 34,382 | 37,652 | 44,314 |
| $\mathbf{2 6}$ | 25,336 | 29,246 | 31,795 | 35,563 | 38,885 | 45,642 |
| $\mathbf{2 7}$ | 26,336 | 30,319 | 32,912 | 36,741 | 40,113 | 46,963 |
| $\mathbf{2 8}$ | 27,336 | 31,391 | 34,027 | 37,916 | 41,337 | 48,278 |
| $\mathbf{2 9}$ | 28,336 | 32,461 | 35,139 | 39,087 | 42,557 | 49,588 |
| $\mathbf{3 0}$ | 29,336 | 33,530 | 36,250 | 40,256 | 43,773 | 50,892 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Appendix 16

Z-Table

| Z | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.06 | 0.07 | 0.08 | 0.09 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -3.9 | 0.0000 | 0.00005 | 0.0000 | 0.00004 | 0.00004 | 0.00004 | 0.00004 | 0.00004 | . 0000 | 0.00003 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.00006 | 0.00005 | 0.00005 | 0.00005 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.00013 | 00012 | 0.00012 | 0.00011 |
|  |  | 0.00022 |  |  |  | 0.00019 | 0.00019 | 0.00018 | 0.00017 | 0.00017 |
|  | 0.00034 | 0.00032 | 0.00031 | 0.00030 | 0.00029 | 0.00028 | 0.00027 | 0.00026 | 0.00025 | 0.00024 |
|  | 0. | 0.00047 | 0.0004 | 0.00043 | 004 | 0.00040 | . 0003 | 003 | . 000 | 0.00035 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.00050 |
|  | 0.0009 | 0.00094 | 0.0009 | 0.00087 | 0.0008 | 0.00082 | . 0079 | 76 | 0.00074 | . 00071 |
|  | 0. | 0.0013 | 0.00126 | 0.00122 | 0.00118 | 0.00114 | , 011 | 0.00107 | 0.00104 | 0.00100 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 0.00164 | 0.00159 | 0.00154 |  |  | 0.00139 |
| -2.8 |  |  |  |  | 0.0022 |  | 0.00212 |  |  | 0.00193 |
| -2.7 | 0.0 | 0.0033 | 0.00326 | , 0031 | 00307 | . 029 | .00289 | 0280 | 0.00272 | 0026 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.00402 | 0.00391 |  | 0.03680 | 0.00357 |
| -2.5 |  | 0.006 | 0.0058 | 0.00570 | 0.0055 | 0.00539 | 0.00523 | 0.00508 |  | . 00480 |
| -2.4 |  | 0.0079 |  |  | 0.00734 | 0.00714 | 006 | 0.0676 |  | 0.00639 |
| -2.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.00914 |  |  |  |
| -2.2 | 0. | 0.01355 | 0.0132 | 0.01287 | 0.01255 | 0.01222 | 0.01191 | 0.01160 | 0.01130 | 0.01101 |
| -2.1 |  |  |  |  | , 16 | 0, 1578 | 0.01539 |  | 0.01463 | 0.01426 |
| -2.0 | 0. | 0.02222 |  |  | 0.02068 | 0.02018 | 0.01970 |  | 0.01876 | 0.01831 |
| -1.9 |  |  |  |  | 0.02619 |  | 0.02500 |  |  | 0.02330 |
| -1.8 |  | 0.035 |  | 0.03 | , 328 | 0.03216 | 0.03144 | 0.03074 | 0.03005 | 0.02938 |
| -1.7 |  | 0.04363 | 0.04272 |  | 0.04093 | 0.04006 | 03920 | 0.03836 | 0.03754 | 0.03673 |
| -1.6 |  | 0.05370 |  |  | 05050 | 0.04947 | 0.04846 | 746 | 0.04648 |  |
| -1.5 |  | , |  |  | 0.06178 | . 605 | 0.0593 | 0.05821 | 0.05705 | 0.05592 |
| -1.4 |  |  |  | 0.07636 | 0.07493 | 0.07353 | 0.07215 |  | 0.06944 | 0.06811 |
| -1.3 |  | 0.09510 | 0.09342 | 0.09176 | 0912 | 0.08851 | 869 | 85 | , 83 | 0822 |
| -1.2 |  |  |  |  | 0.10749 |  | 0.10383 | 0.10204 | 0.10027 | 0.09853 |
| -1. | 0. | 0.13350 |  | 0.12924 | 0.12714 | 0.12507 | 0.12302 | 0.12100 | 0.11900 | 0.11702 |
| -1.0 | 0.1 | 0.15625 | 0.1 | 0.151 | 0.14917 | 0.14 | 0.1445 | 0.14231 | 0.140 | 0.137 |
| -0.9 | 0.18 | 0.18141 | 0.1787 | 0.1761 | 0.17361 | 0.17106 | 0.1685 | 6602 | 0.16 | 0.16109 |
| -0.8 | 0.2 |  |  | 0.20327 | 0.20045 | 197 | 0.19489 | 921 | 0.18943 | 0.18673 |
| -0.7 | 0.2419 | 0.23885 | 0.2357 | . 2327 | 0.22965 | 0.22663 | 0.22363 | 0.22065 | 0.21770 | 0.21476 |
| -0.6 | 0.27425 | 0.27093 | 0.26763 | 0.26435 | 0.26109 | 0.25785 | 0.25463 | 0.25143 | 0.24825 | 0.245 |


| $\mathbf{- 0 . 5}$ | 0.30854 | 0.30503 | 0.30153 | 0.29806 | 0.29460 | 0.29116 | 0.28774 | 0.28434 | 0.28096 | 0.27760 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{- 0 . 4}$ | 0.34458 | 0.34090 | 0.33724 | 0.33360 | 0.32997 | 0.32636 | 0.32276 | 0.31918 | 0.31561 | 0.31207 |
| $\mathbf{- 0 . 3}$ | 0.38209 | 0.37828 | 0.37448 | 0.37070 | 0.36693 | 0.36317 | 0.35942 | 0.35569 | 0.35197 | 0.34827 |
| $\mathbf{- 0 . 2}$ | 0.42074 | 0.41683 | 0.41294 | 0.40905 | 0.40517 | 0.40129 | 0.39743 | 0.39358 | 0.38974 | 0.38591 |
| $\mathbf{- 0 . 1}$ | 0.46017 | 0.45620 | 0.45224 | 0.44828 | 0.44433 | 0.44038 | 0.43644 | 0.43251 | 0.42858 | 0.42465 |
| $\mathbf{- 0 . 0}$ | 0.50000 | 0.49601 | 0.49202 | 0.48803 | 0.48405 | 0.48006 | 0.47608 | 0.47210 | 0.46812 | 0.46414 |

## Z-Table

| z | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.06 | 0.07 | 0.08 | 0.09 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.0 | 0.0000 | 0.0040 | 0.0080 | 0.0120 | 0.0160 | 0.0199 | 0.0239 | 0.0279 | 0.0319 | 0.0359 |
| 0.1 | 0.0398 | 0.0438 | 0.0478 | 0.0517 | 0.0557 | 0.0596 | 0.0636 | 0.0675 | 0.0714 | 0.0753 |
| 0.2 | 0.0793 | 0.0832 | 0.0871 | 0.0910 | 0.0948 | 0.0987 | 0.1026 | 0.1064 | 0.1103 | 0.1141 |
| 0.3 | 0.1179 | 0.1217 | 0.1255 | 0.1293 | 0.1331 | 0.1368 | 0.1406 | 0.1443 | 0.1480 | 0.1517 |
| 0.4 | 0.1554 | 0.1591 | 0.1628 | 0.1664 | 0.1700 | 0.1736 | 0.1772 | 0.1808 | 0.1844 | 0.1879 |
| 0.5 | 0.1915 | 0.1950 | 0.1985 | 0.2019 | 0.2054 | 0.2088 | 0.2123 | 0.2157 | 0.2190 | 0.2224 |
| 0.6 | 0.2257 | 0.2291 | 0.2324 | 0.2357 | 0.2389 | 0.2422 | 0.2454 | 0.2486 | 0.2517 | 0.2549 |
| 0.7 | 0.2580 | 0.2611 | 0.2642 | 0.2673 | 0.2704 | 0.2734 | 0.2764 | 0.2794 | 0.2823 | 0.2852 |
| 0.8 | 0.2881 | 0.2910 | 0.2939 | 0.2967 | 0.2995 | 0.3023 | 0.3051 | 0.3078 | 0.3106 | 0.3133 |
| 0.9 | 0.3159 | 0.3186 | 0.3212 | 0.3238 | 0.3264 | 0.3289 | 0.3315 | 0.3340 | 0.3365 | 0.3389 |
| 1.0 | 0.3413 | 0.3438 | 0.3461 | 0.3485 | 0.3508 | 0.3531 | 0.3554 | 0.3577 | 0.3599 | 0.3621 |
| 1. | 0.3643 | 0.3665 | 0.3686 | 0.3708 | 0.3729 | 0.3749 | 0.3770 | 0.3790 | 0.3810 | 0.3830 |
| 1.2 | 0.3849 | 0.3869 | 0.3888 | 0.3907 | 0.3925 | 0.3944 | 0.3962 | 0.3980 | 0.3997 | 0.4015 |
| 1.3 | 0.4032 | 0.4049 | 0.4066 | 0.4082 | 0.4099 | 0.4115 | 0.413 | 0.4147 | 0.4162 | 0.4177 |
| 1.4 | 0.4192 | 0.4207 | 0.4222 | 0.4236 | 0.4251 | 0.4265 | 0.4279 | 0.4292 | 0.4306 | 0.4319 |
| 1.5 | 0.4332 | 0.4345 | 0.4357 | 0.4370 | 0.4382 | 0.4394 | 0.4406 | 0.4418 | 0.4429 | 0.4441 |
| 1.6 | 0.4452 | 0.4463 | 0.4474 | 0.4484 | 0.4495 | 0.4505 | 0.4515 | 0.4525 | 0.4535 | 0.4545 |
| 1.7 | 0.4554 | 0.4564 | 0.4573 | 0.4582 | 0.4591 | 0.4599 | 0.4608 | 0.4616 | 0.4625 | 0.4633 |
| 1.8 | 0.4641 | 0.4649 | 0.4656 | 0.4664 | 0.4671 | 0.4678 | 0.4686 | 0.4693 | 0.4699 | 0.4706 |
| 1.9 | 0.4713 | 0.4719 | 0.4726 | 0.4732 | 0.4738 | 0.4744 | 0.4750 | 0.4756 | 0.4761 | 0.4767 |
| 2.0 | 0.4772 | 0.4778 | 0.4783 | 0.4788 | 0.4793 | 0.4798 | 0.4803 | 0.4808 | 0.4812 | 0.4817 |
| 2.1 | 0.4821 | 0.4826 | 0.4830 | 0.4834 | 0.4838 | 0.4842 | 0.4846 | 0.4850 | 0.4854 | 0.4857 |
| 2.2 | 0.4861 | 0.4864 | 0.4868 | 0.4871 | 0.4875 | 0.4878 | 0.4881 | 0.4884 | 0.4887 | 0.4890 |
| 2.3 | 0.4893 | 0.4896 | 0.4898 | 0.4901 | 0.4904 | 0.4906 | 0.4909 | 0.4911 | 0.4913 | 0.4916 |
| 2.4 | 0.4918 | 0.4920 | 0.4922 | 0.4925 | 0.4927 | 0.4929 | 0.4931 | 0.4932 | 0.4934 | 0.4936 |
| 2.5 | 0.4938 | 0.4940 | 0.4941 | 0.4943 | 0.4945 | 0.4946 | 0.4948 | 0.4949 | 0.4951 | 0.4952 |


| $\mathbf{2 . 6}$ | 0.4953 | 0.4955 | 0.4956 | 0.4957 | 0.4959 | 0.4960 | 0.4961 | 0.4962 | 0.4963 | 0.4964 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2 . 7}$ | 0.4965 | 0.4966 | 0.4967 | 0.4968 | 0.4969 | 0.4970 | 0.4971 | 0.4972 | 0.4973 | 0.4974 |
| $\mathbf{2 . 8}$ | 0.4974 | 0.4975 | 0.4976 | 0.4977 | 0.4977 | 0.4978 | 0.4979 | 0.4979 | 0.4980 | 0.4981 |
| $\mathbf{2 . 9}$ | 0.4981 | 0.4982 | 0.4982 | 0.4983 | 0.4984 | 0.4984 | 0.4985 | 0.4985 | 0.4986 | 0.4986 |
| $\mathbf{3 . 0}$ | 0.4987 | 0.4987 | 0.4987 | 0.4988 | 0.4988 | 0.4989 | 0.4989 | 0.4989 | 0.4990 | 0.4990 |
| $\mathbf{3 , 1}$ | 0,4990 | 0,4991 | 0,4991 | 0.4991 | 0,4992 | 0,4992 | 0,4992 | 0,4992 | 0,4993 | 0,4993 |
| $\mathbf{3 , 2}$ | 0,4993 | 0,4993 | 0,4994 | 0,4994 | 0,4994 | 0,4994 | 0,4994 | 0,4995 | 0,4995 | 0,4995 |
| $\mathbf{3 , 3}$ | 0,4995 | 0,4995 | 0,4995 | 0,4996 | 0,4996 | 0,4996 | 0,4996 | 0,4996 | 0,4997 | 0,4997 |
| $\mathbf{3 , 4}$ | 0,4997 | 0,4997 | 0,4997 | 0,4997 | 0,4997 | 0,4997 | 0,4997 | 0,4997 | 0,4997 | 0,4998 |
| $\mathbf{3 , 5}$ | 0,4998 | 0,4998 | 0,4998 | 0,4998 | 0,4998 | 0,4998 | 0,4998 | 0,4998 | 0,4998 | 0,4998 |
| $\mathbf{3 , 6}$ | 0,4998 | 0,4998 | 0,4999 | 0,4999 | 0,4999 | 0,4999 | 0,4999 | 0,4999 | 0,4999 | 0,4999 |
| $\mathbf{3 , 7}$ | 0,4999 | 0,4999 | 0,4999 | 0,4999 | 0,4999 | 0,4999 | 0,4999 | 0,4999 | 0,4999 | 0,4999 |
| $\mathbf{3 , 8}$ | 0,4999 | 0,4999 | 0,4999 | 0,4999 | 0,4999 | 0,4999 | 0,4999 | 0,4999 | 0,4999 | 0,4999 |
| $\mathbf{3 , 9}$ | 0,5000 | 0,5000 | 0,5000 | 0,5000 | 0,5000 | 0,5000 | 0,5000 | 0,5000 | 0,5000 | 0,5000 |

## Appendix 17

## Percentage Points of the $t$ Distribution

| Two Tail Test |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0,50 | 0,20 | 0,10 | 0,05 | 0,02 | 0,01 |
| One Tail Test |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dk | 0,25 | 0,10 | 0,005 | 0,025 | 0,01 | 0,05 |
| 1 | 1,000 | 3,078 | 6,314 | 12,706 | 31,821 | 63,657 |
| 2 | 0,816 | 1,886 | 2,920 | 4,303 | 6,965 | 9,925 |
| 3 | 0,765 | 1,638 | 2,353 | 3,182 | 4,541 | 5,841 |
| 4 | 0,741 | 1,533 | 2,132 | 2,776 | 3,747 | 4,604 |
| 5 | 0,721 | 1,486 | 2,015 | 2,571 | 3,365 | 4,032 |
| 6 | 0,718 | 1,440 | 1,943 | 2,447 | 3,143 | 3,707 |
| 7 | 0,711 | 1,415 | 1,895 | 2,365 | 2,998 | 3,499 |
| 8 | 0,706 | 1,397 | 1,860 | 2,306 | 2,896 | 3,355 |
| 9 | 0,703 | 1,383 | 1,833 | 2,262 | 2,821 | 3,250 |
| 10 | 0,700 | 1,372 | 1,812 | 2,228 | 2,764 | 3,165 |
| 11 | 0,697 | 1,363 | 1,796 | 2,201 | 2,718 | 3,106 |
| 12 | 0,695 | 1,356 | 1,782 | 2,178 | 2,681 | 3.055 |
| 13 | 0,692 | 1,350 | 1,771 | 2,160 | 2,650 | 3.012 |
| 14 | 0,691 | 1,345 | 1,761 | 2,145 | 2,624 | 2,977 |
| 15 | 0,690 | 1,341 | 1,753 | 2,132 | 2,623 | 2,947 |
| 16 | 0,689 | 1,337 | 1,746 | 2,120 | 2,583 | 2,921 |
| 17 | 0,688 | 1,333 | 1,743 | 2,110 | 2,567 | 2,898 |
| 18 | 0,688 | 1,330 | 1,740 | 2,101 | 2,552 | 2,878 |
| 19 | 0,687 | 1,328 | 1,729 | 2,093 | 2,539 | 2,861 |
| 20 | 0,687 | 1,325 | 1,725 | 2,086 | 2,528 | 2,845 |
| 21 | 0,686 | 1,323 | 1,721 | 2,080 | 2,518 | 2,831 |
| 22 | 0,686 | 1,321 | 1,717 | 2,074 | 2,508 | 2,819 |
| 23 | 0,685 | 1,319 | 1,714 | 2,069 | 2,500 | 2,807 |
| 24 | 0,685 | 1,318 | 1,711 | 2,064 | 2,492 | 2,797 |
| 25 | 0,684 | 1,316 | 1,708 | 2,060 | 2,485 | 2,787 |
| 26 | 0,684 | 1,315 | 1,706 | 2,056 | 2,479 | 2,779 |
| 27 | 0,684 | 1,314 | 1,703 | 2,052 | 2,473 | 2,771 |
| 28 | 0,683 | 1,313 | 1,701 | 2,048 | 2,467 | 2,763 |
| 29 | 0,683 | 1,311 | 1,699 | 2,045 | 2,462 | 2,756 |
| 30 | 0,683 | 1,310 | 1,697 | 2,042 | 2,457 | 2,750 |
| 40 | 0,681 | 1,303 | 1,684 | 2,021 | 2,423 | 2,704 |
| 60 | 0,679 | 1,296 | 1,671 | 2,000 | 2,390 | 2,660 |
| 120 | 0,677 | 1,289 | 1,658 | 1,980 | 2,358 | 2,617 |
| $\infty$ | 0,674 | 1,282 | 1,645 | 1,960 | 2,326 | 2,576 |
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