

**THE EFFECT OF USING RAFT (ROLE, AUDIENCE, FORMAT,
TOPIC) STRATEGY TOWARD STUDENTS' ABILITY
IN WRITING NARRATIVE TEXT AT THE SECOND
YEAR STUDENTS OF SMA N 12
PEKANBARU**



By:

DWI SEV ENDRIANI

NIM. 10714000857

**FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND TEACHER TRAINING
STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY SULTAN SYARIF KASIM RIAU
PEKANBARU
1433 H/2012 M**

**THE EFFECT OF USING RAFT (ROLE, AUDIENCE, FORMAT,
TOPIC) STRATEGY TOWARD STUDENTS' ABILITY
IN WRITING NARRATIVE TEXT AT THE SECOND
YEAR STUDENTS OF SMA N 12
PEKANBARU**

A Thesis

Submitted to Fulfill One of the Requirements
for Undergraduate Degree in English Education Department
(S.Pd.)



By:

DWI SEV ENDRIANI

NIM. 10714000857

**FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND TEACHER TRAINING
STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY SULTAN SYARIF KASIM RIAU
PEKANBARU
1433 H/2012 M**

SUPERVISOR APPROVAL

The thesis entitled “*The Effect of Using RAFT (Role, Audience, Format, Topic) Strategy Toward Students’ Ability in Writing Narrative Text at The Second Year Students of SMA N 12 Pekanbaru*” is written by Dwi Sev Endriani, NIM. 10714000857. It is accepted and approved to be examined in the meeting of the final examination committee of undergraduate degree at the Faculty of Education and Teacher Training State Islamic University of Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau.

Pekanbaru, Rajab 18th 1433 H
June 8nd 2012 M

Approved by

The Chairperson of English
Education Department

Dr. Hj. Zulhidah, M.Pd.

Supervisor

Drs. H. Muliardi, M.Pd.

ABSTRAK

Dwi Sev Endriani: “ Pengaruh dari Penggunaan Strategy RAFT (Role, Audience, Format, Topic) terhadap Pemahaman Menulis Teks Narrative Siswa kelas dua di SMAN 12 Pekanbaru”

Fokus utama dalam penelitian ini adalah untuk mengetahui apakah ada atau tidak perbedaan yang signifikan antara kemampuan siswa dalam pemahaman menulis teks narrative menggunakan strategi RAFT dan dengan tidak menggunakan strategy RAFT di sekolah SMAN 12 Pekanbaru. Pada penelitian ini, jenis penelitian yang digunakan adalah quasi-ekperimental. Penulis menggunakan *nonrandomized control pre-test and post-test design*. Penulis menggunakan 2 kelas sebagai sampel yang terdiri dari 80 siswa. Kelas pertama sebagai kelas eksperimen dan kelas kedua adalah kelas control. Kelas eksperimen diajarkan dengan menggunakan strategy RAFT dan kelas control diajarkan dengan tidak menggunakan strategy RAFT. Teknik pengumpulan data adalah tes. Tes digunakan untuk mengumpul data dari kemampuan anak di dalam pemahaman menulis. Teknik analisa data menggunakan rumus *Independent Sample T-test* dalam tujuan untuk mengetahui perbedaan nilai rata-rata antara kelas eksperimen dan kelas control dengan mempertimbangkan degree of freedom (df).

Berdasarkan analisis data, penulis menyimpulkan bahwa ada perbedaan yang signifikan antara kemampuan siswa dalam menulis teks narrative diajarkan dengan menggunakan strategy RAFT dan kemampuan siswa dalam menulis teks narrative dengan tidak menggunakan strategy RAFT dengan konsiderasi $t_0 = 3.30$ lebih tinggi dari t_{table} pada taraf signifikan 5% = 2.65 atau pada taraf signifikan 1% = 2.00. dapat dibaca $2.65 < 3.30 > 2.00$. Itu berarti bahwa H_a diterima H_0 ditolak. Jadi, dapat disimpulkan bahwa ada perbedaan signifikan antara kemampuan siswa dalam menulis teks narrative diajar dengan menggunakan strategi RAFT dan kemampuan siswa dalam menulis diajar dengan tidak menggunakan strategi RAFT. Dengan kata lain, ada efek signifikan menggunakan strategi RAFT untuk meningkatkan menulis teks narrative siswa kelas dua SMAN 12 pekanbaru.

LIST OF CONTENT

SUPERVISOR APPROVAL.....	i
EXAMINER APPROVAL.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDMENT.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	v
LIST OF CONTENT.....	viii
LIST OF TABLES.....	ix
LIST OF APPENDICES.....	x
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION.....	1
A. The Background of the Problem	1
B. The Definition of the Term	4
C. The Problem	5
D. The Objective and the Significance of the Research	7
CHAPTER II LITERATURE REVIEW	9
A. The Theoretical Framework.....	9
B. The Relevant Research.....	14
C. The Operational Concept	15
D. The Assumption and Hypothesis	18
CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHOD	20
A. The Research Design.....	20
B. The Location and Time of the Research	21
C. The Subject and the Object of the Research	21
D. The Population and Sample of the Research.....	22
E. The Treatment Procedures.....	23
F. The Technique of Collecting Data	24
G. The Technique of Data Analysis.....	25
H. Evaluators Team.....	28
CHAPTER IV PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS	29
A. The Description of the Research Procedures	29
B. The Data Presentation	30
C. The Analysis Data.....	41
CHAPTER V CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION	52
A. Conclusion	52
B. Suggestion.....	52
BIBLIOGRAPHY	
APPENDIX	

LIST OF TABLES

Table III.1	The Research Design	21
Table III.2	The Population of the Second Year Students of SMAN 12 Pekanbaru	12 22
Table III.3	Assessment Aspects of Writing Recount	26
Table IV.1	The Classification of the Students' Score.....	30
Table IV.2	The Score of the Students' Writing Ability for Narrative Text Taught by Using RAFT Strategy	32
Table IV.3	The Frequency of the Students' Pretest and Posttest Score in Experimental Class.....	33
Table IV.4	The Mean and Standard Deviation of Pre-test and Post-test of Experimental Class.....	34
Table IV.5	The Students' Writing Ability for Narrative Text Taught Without Using RAFT Strategy.....	36
Table IV.6	The Frequency Score of Pre-test and Post-test of Control Class	37
Table IV.7	The Mean and Standard Deviation of Pre-Test and Post-Test Control Class.....	38
Table IV.8	The Students' Pre-Test and Post-Test of Experimental and Control Class.....	40
Table IV.9	The Students' Pre-Test and Post-Test Score Of Experimental Class	42

Table IV.10	The Students' pre-Test and Post-Test Score Control Class	44
Table IV.11	Percentage of Pre-Test and Post-Test Students' Writing Ability in Recount Text	47
Table IV.12	Mean and Standard Deviation of Score for Experimental Class and Control Class	49

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. The Background

Writing is very important especially in education. All subjects at school are presented in written form. The same thing has been stated by Halliday that writing has important role in human life. Written language is capable of extending and delivering whatever that cannot be expressed by spoken language.¹

To common sense, conventional understanding of writing is as follow. Writing has two steps of process. First, you figure out your meaning, then you put into language and figure out what you want to say: do not start writing until you do make a plan used as outline to begin writing. Central to this model is the idea for keeping control, keeping things in hand. Do not let thing wander into a mess.² No matter of kind of writing has ideas that tell to the reader, include writing narrative text. Simon and Schuster state that narrative essay tell about fiction and non-fiction, it gives an account of one or more experiences. It tells ideas or experiences of the author.³

Part of speech is one of the important components that should be mastered by the writer to make a good written text. By knowing the part of speech of the word, the writer will know how to make a good sentence based on the function of

¹ David, Nunan. *Language Teaching Methodology a Textbook for Teachers*. (New York: Prentice Hall International UK Ltd,1991), p.84

² H. Douglas, Brown. *Teaching by Principles*. (New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents, 1994),p. 321

³ Simon and Schuster, *Essay Writing Step-by-step: a Newsweek Education Program Guide Fourteens*. (New York: Newsweek, Inc, 2003), p.138

the word itself. According dictionary, there are eight kinds of word in part of speech.⁴

In order to accomplish students' needs toward writing. School based Curriculum (KTSP) provides writing as one of the skills taught and learned in senior high school. SMA Negeri 12 Pekanbaru is one of the schools that also uses School Based Curriculum (KTSP) as its guide in teaching-learning process, especially include for English subject. Based on the syllabus, the second year students of SMAN 12 have semester they studied writing about narrative text. Writing is still problematic subject for the students of second year, some of the students are difficult in writing narrative text. After test, score of the students did not active standard of Total Minimal Value KKM, the score of KKM is 65. We can conclude that SMAN 12 Pekanbaru has already carried out teaching-learning process based on KTSP that as a competence to make students able to convey the meaning and rhetorical pattern in essay correctly in daily life context.

Based on the writer's preliminary research to the second year students of SMAN 12 Pekanbaru, the writer found that students had many problems in learning English especially for writing skill. Even though the second year SMAN 12 Pekanbaru have been taught English and they are supposed to be able to master English well. But in fact, most of the students are still problematic in writing. By looking this problem, the writer explains the phenomena of students' writing as follows:

⁴ Jack, C Richard et al. *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistic*. (London: Winthrop Publisher 1988) p.266

1. Most of the students are not able to identify the orientation of narrative text
2. Most of the students are not able to identify the complication of narrative text
3. Most of the students are not able to identify the resolution of narrative text
4. Most of the students are not able to use the correct tense (past tense) include vocabularies in writing

To improve the students' ability in writing essay needs an appropriate strategy and technique that helps them as salutation for their problems. There is actually a technique that can help students writing narrative text, called raft strategies. The RAFT is to help students understand their role as a writer, the audience they will address, the varied formats for writing, and the expected content.⁵ RAFT is a writing strategy that can be used in all content areas and offers students a choice in their writing assignment. R stands for Role, the person or thing that students will become. A is for Audience, the person or people who are reading the finished product. F is for Format, the way in which the writing will be done with the examples that might include letter, brochure, memo, speech or advertisement. T stands for Topic, what the writing will discuss. Students can demonstrate their mastery of content knowledge in this manner. The RAFT strategy can be used as a prewriting strategy and or as a strategy for helping students prepare for a small or large group discussion.⁶

⁵ <http://www.instructionalstrategiesforengaginglearners.com>: February,06,2011, 13:42 PM. P.1

⁶ Doug, Buehl, *Classroom Strategies for Interactive Learning*. (2001).p. 131

Based on explanation and the problems experienced by the students above, the writer is interested in conducting a research which entitled: **“The Effect of Using Raft (Role, Audience, Format, Topic) Strategy toward Students’ Ability in Writing Narrative Text at the Second Year Students’ of SMAN12 Pekanbaru”**.

B. The Definition of the Term

1. Effect

According to Jack C. Richards, effect is measure of the strength of one variable’s effect on another or the relationship between two or more variables.⁷

In this research, effect is defined as the result of teaching writing narrative text treated by using of RAFT

2. RAFT

RAFT is an organizing concept which directs the learner to identify the Role of the writer (reporter, letter, writer, researcher, narrator, etc.), the Audience, the writer is writing (newspaper reader, corporate sponsor, home owners, etc.) the Format of the writing (news article, persuasive letter, how-to-manual, etc.) and the Topic (current event, changing the method for manufacturing a toy, lab report and directions, etc.)⁸

In this research, the RAFT means a technique used by writer to know its effect toward students’ ability in writing narrative text.

⁷Jack C. Richards and Richards Schmidt. *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics. Third Edition*. (New York: Pearson Education, 2002).p. 175

⁸ Cook, Debra L, *Academic Language/Literacy Strategies Adolescents*. (New York: Routledge,2010), p.114

3. Writing Ability

Writing is the process of expressing the idea or what we want to others known in written form. Dealing with Penny, the purpose of the writing is to express the ideas; it means the writer will convey the ideas in written form; so the ideas must be understandable by the reader.⁹ Writing Ability in this research means the students' ability in expressing their ideas in written form especially narrative text.

4. Narrative

Narrative typically contains action, dialogue, elaborate, details, and humor. In this research, narrative means that the students write a short story. For example Malingkundang

5. Text

Text is a piece of spoken or written language. A text may be considered from the point of view of its structure and/or its function¹⁰. In this research, the text is narrative text, which is written by the students.

⁹Penny ur. *A Course in Language Teaching*. (United State of America: Cambridge University. 2003) p. 163

¹⁰Richards et al. *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. (England: Longman Group, 1992), p. 378

C. The Problem

1. The identification of the problem

Based on the explanation above, the writer identifies the problem as follows:

- a. Why do some of the students not enable to identify the orientation of narrative text?
- b. Why do some of the students not enable to identify the complication of narrative text?
- c. Why do some of the students not enable to identify the resolution of narrative text?
- d. Why do some of the students not enable to use the correct tense (past tense) include vocabularies in writing?
- e. How is writing ability of the students who are taught by using RAFT strategy?
- f. How is writing ability of the students who are taught without using RAFT strategy?
- g. Is there any significant effect of using RAFT strategy toward students' ability in writing narrative text at the second year students of SMAN 12 Pekanbaru.

2. The Limitation of the Problem

Based on the above identification of the problems, the writer found many problems which are faced by the students. To avoid misunderstanding toward the problem in this research, it is quite necessary for the writer to limit the problem. Since the technique that has been used by the teacher is not effective. The writer focuses on the technique used by the teacher. As possible solution, RAFT strategies will be applied to Increase Students' Writing Narrative Text at the Second year of SMAN 12 Pekanbaru.

3. The Formulation of the research

The problems of the research will be formulated in the following questions:

- a. How is writing ability of the students who are taught by using RAFT strategy?
- b. How is writing ability of the students who are taught without using RAFT strategy?
- c. Is there any significant effect of using RAFT strategy toward students' ability in writing narrative text at the second year students of SMAN 12 Pekanbaru.

4. The objectives and the significance of the Research

a. The Objectives of the Research

1. To find out writing ability of the students who are taught by using RAFT strategy?
2. To find out writing ability of the students who are taught without using RAFT strategy?
3. To find out whether or not there is significant effect of using RAFT strategy toward students' ability in writing narrative text at the second year students of SMAN 12 Pekanbaru.

b. The significance of The Research

Related to the objectives of the research above, the significance of the research are as follows:

1. To give information to the teachers, and the institutions about the effect of using raft strategies toward students ability in writing narrative text
2. To give some contributions to the students in order to improve students ability in writing narrative text
3. To enhance the writer's knowledge about teaching writing by using raft strategies

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

A. The Theoretical Framework

1. Ability in Writing

Writing is one of the language skills that is important to master is English. It is also an essential subject that should be taught in senior high school level. Besides, writing is one of the skills that can improve the students' language and stimulate the students' cognitive which is useful for the students who learn a language. In addition, Reid says that writing is a complex skill because there are some components that should be focused in writing, such as the purpose of writing and writer's knowledge of writing (paragraph's component and pattern organization).¹¹

The term of ability is defined as skill or power. Concisely, writing ability is the skill to express ideas, thoughts, and feelings to other people in written symbols to make other people or readers understand the ideas conveyed.¹² Besides, writing ability means specific ability which helps writers to put their ideas into words in meaningful form and interact with the message.¹³ According to Nunan, the learners' purposes for writing, which transcend, are producing text from teacher. However, the students' concerns and interests are acknowledged

¹¹Joy M Reid, *Teaching ESL Writing*. (New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regent, 1993), p. 28

¹²Admin. *Definition of Writing Ability*. Retrieved on February 16, 2011. <http://teachingenglishonline.net/definition-of-writing-ability/>

¹³SIL International. *What are Writing Skills?*. Retrieved on February 16, 2011. www.sil.org/lingualinks/literacy/.../whatarewritingskills.htm.

that can be developed rapidly through writing skill. In which it can be practiced by forming words to be a coherent sentence in a paragraph.¹⁴

Writing activity produces words to become a sentence and create sentences into a paragraph. According to Reid, a paragraph is a series of sentences that develop one idea. Idea is usually stated in general form in one sentence, called the topic sentence. The sentence tells your audience what to express in the paragraph. The rest of the sentences in the paragraph provide the reader with specific explanation or proof of the general topic sentence. The supporting sentences helps the reader understand more clearly what the writer means.¹⁵

According to Brown, writing is sometimes used as a production mode for learning, reinforcing, or testing grammatical concepts.¹⁶ In addition, Paulston and Bruder say that writing is one way of providing variety in classroom procedures, and also makes possible individualized work in large classes. Writing tends to increase retention and makes available a source for later reference.¹⁷

According to syllabus 2011-2012 at the second grade of senior high school, the basic competence of writing English refers to capability of students in Understanding and responding the meaning in the monologue text/ essay which

¹⁴David Nunan, *Language Teaching Methodology a Textbook for Teachers*. (New York: Prentice Hall International UK Ltd, 1991), p. 88

¹⁵Joy M Reid. *The Process of Composition*. (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents, 1988), p. 8

¹⁶H. Douglas Brown. *Teaching by principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. (Englewood cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents, 1994), p. 328.

¹⁷Christina Bratt Paulston and Mary Newton Bruder. *Teaching English as a Second Language: Techniques and Procedures*. (Cambridge: Winthrop Publishers inc, 1976), pp. 203.

uses various written language accurately, fluently, and contextually in the form of narrative text.¹⁸

The ideas generated will determine the quality of writing itself. Normally, the readers will be interested in reading writing because of the ideas generated. Therefore, generating ideas can be called as a prominent key to be successful in writing. In other words, the better the idea is, the better the writing will be. No matter of kind of writing produced; generating ideas is required very much, including writing narrative text.

2. The Nature of RAFT Strategy

The R.A.F.T. strategy provides a focused writing assignment and encourages students to analyze the content while assuming different roles and addressing different audiences. The strategy motivates students by allowing for choice and involving them in the topic in a personal way. According to Susan, RAFT is another strategy that adolescent enjoys and that encourages reflection on multiple perspectives. In this strategy, students write from perspectives different from their own and use alternative discourse modes to create authentic writing projects.¹⁹

The RAFT strategy employs writing to learn activities to enhance understanding of informational text.²⁰ Instead of writing a traditional essay explaining a concept learned, students demonstrate their understanding in

¹⁸ *Syllabus of SMA 2011/2012.2011*. Unpublished: *Op. Cit.*, p.20

¹⁹ Susan Lenski and Jill Lewis, *Reading Success for Struggling Adolescent Learners*. (New York: the Guilford Press. 2008). P. 28

²⁰ Santa, in *RAFT strategy samples*. Differentiated Instruction Workshop Schuylkill intermediate unit 29. P.1

nontraditional format. This technique encourages creative thinking and motivates students to reflect in unusual ways about concepts they have read. RAFT is an acronym that stands for:²¹

1. Role of the writer: what is the writer's role: reporter, observer, eyewitness, object, number, etc?
2. Audience: who will be reading the writing: the teacher, other students, a parent, editor, people in the community, etc?
3. Format: what is the best way to present this writing: in a letter, an article, a report, a contract, a poem, an advertisement, e-mail, etc?
4. Topic: who or what is the subject of this writing: a famous scientist, a prehistoric cave dweller, a character from literature, a chemical element or physical object, etc?

Based on the theories above, it can be stated that Role Audience Format Topic (R.A.F.T.) is a writing strategy that helps students understand a topic from different perspectives. The R.A.F.T. strategy provides a focused writing assignment and encourages students to analyze the content while assuming different roles and addressing different audiences. The strategy motivates students by allowing for choice and involving them in the topic in a personal way.

3. Narrative Text

Narrative is a text which retells events or experiences in the past. Its purpose is either to inform or to entertain the audience. Baygell says that narrative tells fiction and non-fiction, it can be called as a story that is based on a

²¹ *Ibid.* p.1

chronological order in events, where the events that were experienced by the subject (someone) that experienced a conflict.²² It means that narrative tells about past, where it always tells about story to be told orally or written text.

According to Siahaan et.al, narratives have a purpose, which may be to entertain, to amuse, and to deal with actual or vicarious experience in different ways. It means narrations deal with problematic events which lead to a crisis or turning point of some kind, which in turn finds a resolution. They also point out that narrative text has a particular organizational structure that consists of five components, they are:

- a. Orientation: sets the scene and introduces the participants.
- b. Evaluation: a stepping back evaluates the plight.
- c. Complication: a crisis arises.
- d. Resolution: the crises is resolved, for better or for worse.
- e. Re-orientation; optional.²³

4. Using RAFT strategy toward ability in Writing Narrative Text

There are some possible steps that might be applied in using RAFT strategy in teaching narrative text, that are:

1. Think about the concepts or process that you want to students to learn as they read a selected passage. Consider how writing in a fun way may enhance students' understanding of the topic
2. Brainstorm possible roles students could assume in their writing

²²Ruth Baygell. Education Program Newsweek: *Essay Writing Step-By-Step*. (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2003), p.139.

²³ Sanggan Siahaan and Kisno Shinoda. *Generic Text Structure*. (Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu, 2008), pp. 73-74.

3. Decide who the audience would be as well as the format for writing
4. After students have finished reading, identify the role, audience, format and topic (RAFT) for the writing. Assign the same role for all students, or let them choose from several different roles.²⁴

B. The Relevant Research

1. A research from Dahloan Hembree

In 2008, Dahloan Hembree conducted a research which entitled: “RAFT specific reading strategy”. He tried to find out whether there was significant influence of raft strategy toward reading strategy or not. He said that RAFT is both a strategy and a form that is used to record information. It is used to combine a student’s reading with a writing assignment, developing deeper understanding of the text. It is used after the text is read. The students are taught the RAFT strategy then fill in each portion of the RAFT chart. The RAFT is a wonderful way to expand knowledge about what a student has read. It also takes into account varying styles of learning. With practice, you will discover that your students really enjoy using the RAFT and will even beg you to use it with future text assignments.

2. A Research from Solicha

In 2008, Solicha conducted a research entitled: “A Descriptive study on students’ ability in writing narrative text at the second year of SMAN 1 Surakarta”. She tried to find out whether there is a significant effect of a

²⁴ *RAFT Strategy Samples*. Differentiated Instruction Workshop Schuylkill intermediate unit 29. P.1

descriptive study toward students' ability in writing narrative text or not at the second year of SMAN 1 Surakarta. From the research, she found that there is a significant of a descriptive study toward students' ability in writing narrative text or not at the second year of SMAN 1 Surakarta

C. The Operational Concept

In order to clarify the theories used in this research, the researcher would like to explain briefly about variable of this research. This research is experimental research in which focuses on the effect of using RAFT strategy toward students' ability in writing narrative text. Therefore, in analyzing the problem in this research, there are two variables used. The first is RAFT strategy which refers to the teacher's strategy in teaching writing. The second is students' ability in writing narrative text. RAFT strategy is an independent variable and students' ability in writing narrative text is a dependent variable. To operate the investigation on the variable, the researcher worked based on the following indicators:

1. The indicators of RAFT strategy are as follows:
 - a. The teacher thinks about the concepts or processes that teacher wants students to learn as they read a selected passage and consider how writing in a fun way that may enhance students' understanding of the topic.
 - b. The teacher brainstorm possible role for students that could assume their writing

- c. The teachers ask the students to decide who the audience would be as well as the format for writing.
 - d. After students have finished reading, identify the role, audience, format and topic (RAFT) for the writing. Assign the same role for all students, or let them choose several different roles.
2. Based on the limitation of the problem that the text used by researcher is narrative text. Because of that the indicators of students' ability in writing narrative text are as follows:
- a. The students are able to write orientation clearly.
 - b. The students are able to write complication coherently.
 - c. The students are able to write resolution clearly.
 - d. The students are able to use past tense correctly.

D. The Assumption and Hypothesis

1. The Assumption

In this research, the researcher assumes that the better using RAFT strategy is the better ability in writing narrative text will be

2. The Hypothesis

Based on the assumptions above the writer formulates two hypotheses as follows:

Ha: There is significant effect of using RAFT strategy toward students' ability in writing narrative text at the second year of SMAN 12 Pekanbaru

Ho: There is no significant effect of using RAFT strategy toward students' ability in writing narrative text at the second year of SMAN 12 Pekanbaru.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHOD

A. The Research design

The design of this research is quasi experiment design. A quasi-experiment design is where the treatment variable is manipulated but the groups are not equated prior to manipulate of the independent variable. Then, Jhon W. Cresswell states that experiment is you test an idea (or practice or procedure) to determine whether it influences an outcome or dependent variable²⁵. The design of the research is *pre* and *post test* design, which used two groups as a sample. The type used is pretest-posttest nonequivalent group design.²⁶ Meanwhile, control group was only given a pre-test and posttest without particular treatment as given to the experimental group. There are two variable in this research: namely the effect of RAFT strategy as independent variable (X), and writing narrative text as dependent variable (Y). This research used two groups as sample. The first was experiemental group and another was control group. The experimental group was treated by using RAFT strategy while, the control group was treated without using RAFT strategy.

²⁵ Jhon. W. Cresswell. *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. (New Jersey: pearson education, 2008), p. 299

²⁶ Louis Cohen, et.al., *Research Methods in Education*, sixth edition, (New York: Routledge, 2007), p. 275

Table III. 1
The Research Design

Group	Pre – test	Treatment	Post – test
E	Test 1	X	Test 2
C	Test 1		Test 2

E = Experimental Group

C = Control Group

T1 = Pre – Test to experimental Group and Control Group

X = Receive the treatment using outlining technique

T2 = Post – Test to Experimental and Control Group

B. The location and the time of the Research

The research was conducted at the second year students of SMAN 12 Pekanbaru. The research was done for two months, starting from January to February 2012.

C. The Subject and the Object of the Research

Subject of the research was the second year students of Islamic senior high school of SMAN 12 Pekanbaru. The Object of this research was the effect of using raft strategy toward students' ability in writing narrative text.

D. The Population and the Sample of the Research

The population of this research was the second year students of SMAN 12 Pekanbaru in 2011-2012 academic years. It had 9 classes which consisted of 3 classes for science department and 6 classes for social department. The number of the second year students of SMAN 12 Pekanbaru was 335 students

Table III. 2
The Population of the Second Year
Students of SMAN 2 Pekanbaru 2011-2012

No	Class	Total
1	XI IPS 1	40
2	XI IPS 2	40
3	XI IPS 3	40
4	XI IPS 4	40

According Arikunto, if the population is more than 100 respondents, we can take 25% or more than it. Therefore, the writer took 50% from the population as the sample.²⁷ The samples of this research were 80 students, which consist of two classes as experimental class and controll class.

E. The Treatment Procedures

a. Planning

This research was conducted in SMAN 12 Pekanbaru. The participants of this research were samples of this research were 80 students, which consist of two classes as experimental class and controll class. The research had been done from January to February 2012. The purposes of this research were to know the students' ability taught by using raft strategy and taught by using conventional technique and to know the difference of writing ability between students who are taught by using raft strategy and those who are taught by using without RAFT

²⁷ Suharsimi Arikunto. *Procedure Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktis*. (Jakarta: Rhineka Cipta, 2006), p. 134.

strategy. During this research, the writer acted as the teacher for both classes. The material given during this research was narrative text. In experimental class, the writer collaborated with the observer in order to observe the process of teaching and learning and to check and to ensure whether all stages of teaching raft strategy procedure had been accomplished or not. In control class, the writer taught the students alone in the class without collaborated with the observer by using conventional technique as follows; (1) The teacher gave the students explanation about narrative text. (2) The teacher gave the students an example of narrative text. (3) The students were asked to make a narrative text based on the topic given.

b. Implementation

It consisted of 8 meetings which focused on the topic of narrative text. The first meeting was used to conduct pretest in the form of extensive writing test (composition test) for both classes. They wrote a full length of narrative essay individually. The second to seven meetings were used to conduct the treatment for experimental group only. The treatment was using raft strategy in teaching writing narrative text. During treatment, they had practiced to write a full length of narrative essay collaboratively. While the control class used conventional technique. The eight meeting was used to conduct posttest for both classes.

c. Evaluation

In this stage, the teacher gave posttest for both classes in the form of extensive writing test (composition test). In accomplishing posttest, the students

were given 90 minutes to write a full length of narrative text independently. The topic of recount text was chosen by the students freely.

F. The Technique of Collecting Data

In this research, the writer used observation and test as instrument to collect data. Observation was used to get the data about the implementation of using RAFT Strategy in teaching writing. In this case, the writer used observation checklist and asked one of the English teacher at SMAN 12 Pekanbaru as an observer. The test was used to collect the data on students' writing ability of narrative text. The tests were divided into two series as follows:

1. Pre-test was used to determine students' writing ability before getting the treatment.
2. Post-test was used to determine students' writing ability after getting the treatment.

G. The Technique of Data Analysis

In the research, the researcher used test to collect data. The test was used to find out the students' ability in writing narrative text. The data of this research were the score of the students' writing ability obtained by using composition test. The test was done twice, before and after treatment intended to obtain the students' ability in writing narrative text at the second year of Islamic Senior High School of SMAN 12 Pekanbaru. The students' ability in writing narrative text was measured by using writing assessment used by the English teacher of Islamic Senior High School of SMAN 12 Pekanbaru.

Table III.3**Assessment Aspect of Writing Narrative Text**

No	Aspects Assessed	Score			
		1	2	3	4
1	Content				
2	Organization a. Orientation b. complication c. resolution				
3	Vocabulary				
4	Grammatical Features a. Action Verb b. Temporal Connectives c. Past Tense				
5	Spelling & Punctuation				
Total					
Maximum Score		20			

Explanation of score:

1 = incompetent

2 = competent enough

3 = competent

4 = very competent

$$\text{Final Score} = \frac{\text{TotalScore}}{\text{MaximumScore}} \times 8$$

H. The Technique of Data Analysis

In order to analyze the students' ability in writing narrative text, the researcher used graduated standard of English lesson in Islamic Senior High School of SMAN 12 Pekanbaru (SKL) that was 75 for the students' ability in writing narrative text, it means for those who got score <75, they did not pass graduated standard (SKL), while for those who got score ≥ 75 , they passed graduated standard (SKL).

In analyzing the data, the writer used scores of post-test of the experimental, and control class. The different means were analyzed by using T-test formula. The writer used the formula in Hartono as follows:²⁸

$$t_{0} = \frac{M_x - M_y}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{SD_x}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{SD_y}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right)^2}}$$

Where: t_0 : The value of t-obtained

M_x : Mean score of experiment class

M_y : Mean score of control class

SD_x : Standard deviation of experiment class

SD_y : Standard deviation of control class

N : Number of Student

In determining the percentage of the increase and the decrease of the students' ability. The following formula was used:

$$\frac{\text{Gain Score}}{\text{Pretest Score}} \times 100\%$$

I. Evaluators Team

In evaluating the students' writing performance, the writer cooperated with two raters. In order to produce consistent judgment on the students' writing ability in narrative text. In discussing about raters, Jacobs et.al in Sulasmi say that raters are persons who participate in cooperative evaluation of written composition tests,

²⁸ Hartono, *Statistik untuk Penelitian*. (Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar, 2009), p. 208.

and their cooperation is as a part of school testing program.²⁹ The raters that have evaluated the students' score were as follows:

1. Yasir Amri, S. Pd.I, M.Pd an He graduated from English Education department of UIN SUSKA RIAU in 2005 and past graduate (S2) in UNP (University of Padang) in 2009. he is one of English lectures at UIN SUSKA Riau for some courses.
2. Kurnia Budiyanti, M. Pd. She graduated from English Education of University Riau (S1) in 2006 and postgraduate (S2) in University of padang in 2010. She is one of the English teachers in UIN SUSKA Riau for some courses.

²⁹Sulasmi karim, *An Experiment on the Effectiveness of Using Brainstorming Technique in Increasing Student's Writing Ability at the Second Year of English Education Department State Islamic University of SUSKA RIAU*. (Unpublished, 2007). p. 30.

CHAPTER IV

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

A. The Description of Research Procedure

The purposes of the research are to obtain the students' writing ability in narrative text taught by using RAFT strategy and students' writing ability in narrative text taught by using without RAFT strategy, and to know the significant difference of ability in writing narrative text between students who are taught by using RAFT strategy and students who are taught by using without RAFT strategy. The data were obtained from the students' post-test scores of experimental and control class. Before treatment (only experimental class), the writer gave pre test to XI IPA 1 and XI IPA 3. The writing test was about writing narrative text evaluated by concerning five components: content, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanic of writing. Each component had its score. Then, the writer gave treatments to experimental class for eight meetings.

After giving treatments to experimental class, the writer used the same format of writing test for the post-test to experimental class. While for control class was taught without using any treatments, the writer used the same format of writing test for their post-test too.

The score of pre-test and post-test in both classes was significantly different. The total score of the experimental class was 1396, while the highest score was 78 and the lowest was 54. The total score of control group was 1160 while the highest was 66 and the lowest was 40.

The data of the research were the score of the students' pre-test and post-test both experiment and control classes. There were two data of students' writing

ability served by the writer. They were: the data of students' writing ability taught by using RAFT strategy and the data of the students' writing ability taught by using without RAFT strategy, and they are as follows:

1. The Data Presentation of RAFT strategy (variable X)

The data of the research were the score of the students' pre-test and post-test both experimental and control classes. There were two data of students' writing ability served by the writer. They were: the data of the students' writing ability taught by using RAFT strategy and the data of the students' writing ability taught by using without RAFT strategy , and they are as follows:

Table IV.1
The Classification of Students' Score

THE SCORE LEVEL	CATEGORY
80-100	Very Good
66-79	Good
56-65	Enough
46-55	Less
0-45	Fail

2. The Data Presentation of the Students' Writing Ability in Narrative Text(Variable X)

a. The Students' Writing Ability for Narrative Text Taught by Using RAFT Strategy

The data of the students' writing ability in writing text taught by using RAFT strategy were gotten from pre-test and post-test of experimental class taken from the sample of this class (40 students). The writer taught directly, and the English teacher observed the writer for eight meetings in the experimental class. The data can be seen from the table below:

Table IV.2
The Score of the Students' Writing Ability for Narrative Text Taught
by Using RAFT Strategy

Students	Experiment Class		Gain S core
	Pretest Score	Posttest Score	
1	42	76	34
2	56	76	20
3	60	76	16
4	50	72	22
5	50	76	26
6	60	60	-
7	60	76	16
8	52	76	24
9	40	76	36
10	68	76	8
11	50	76	26
12	42	76	34
13	76	78	2
14	76	76	-
15	62	64	2
16	48	76	28
17	48	76	28
18	52	62	10
19	70	76	6
20	42	76	34
21	76	78	2
22	49	62	13
23	46	66	20
24	50	68	18
25	50	76	26
26	48	76	28
27	42	56	14
28	72	76	4
29	76	78	2
30	52	76	24
31	48	76	28
32	50	76	26
33	48	78	30
34	46	76	30
35	64	76	12
36	46	76	30
37	44	78	34
38	76	76	-
39	48	76	28
40	52	76	24
Total	2.187	2.954	765

From the table IV.3 , the writer found that the total score of pre test in experimental group is 2.187 while the highest is 76 and the lowest is 40, and the total score of post- test in experimental group is 2954 while the highest is 78 and the lowest is 56. It means that the students have significant increasing of their writing ability for Narrative text, it is proved by the total score and the score of frequency from pretest and post test which is significantly different, and it can be seen as follows:

Table IV.3
The Frequency Score of Pre test and Post Test of Experimental Class

Pre-Test			Post- Test		
Score	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Score	Frequency	Percentage (%)
40	1	2.5%	40	-	-
42	4	10%	42	-	-
44	1	2.5%	44	-	-
46	3	7.5%	46	-	-
48	6	15%	48	-	-
50	6	15%	50	-	-
52	4	10%	52	-	-
54	-	-	54	-	-
56	1	2,5	56	1	2.5%
58	-	-	58	-	-
60	3	7.5%	60	1	2.5%
62	-	-	62	2	5%
64	1	2,5%	64	1	2.5%
66	-	-	66	1	2.5%
68	1	2.5%	68	1	2.5%
70	2	5%	70	-	-
72	2	5%	72	1	2.5%
74	-	-	74	-	-
76	5	12.5%	76	27	67,5%
78	-	-	78	5	12.5%
	N=40	100%		N=40	100%

Based on the table above, it can be seen that in pretest 1 student got score 40 (2.5%), 4 students got score 42 (10%), 1 student got score 44 (2.5%), 3 students got score 46 (7.5%), 6 students got score 48 (15%), 6 students got score 50 (15%), 4 students got score 52 (10%), none of the students got score 54, 1

student score got 56 (2.5%), none students got score 58 , 3 students got score 60 (7.5%), 1 student got score 64 (2.5%), 1 student got score 68 (2.5%), 2 students got score 70 (5%), 2 students got score 72 (5%), and 5 students got score 76 (12,5%). The highest frequency was 5 at the score of 76. The total frequency was 40. While in posttest 1 student got score 56 (2.5%), none students got score 58, 1 student got score 60 (2.5%), 2 students got score 62 (5%), 1 students got score 64 (2.5%), 1 student got score 68 (2.5%), none students got score 70, 1 student got score 72 (2.5%), 27 students got score 76 (67,5%),5 students got score 76 (12,5%) and none of the student got score 80 (0%). The highest frequency was 27 at the score of 76. The total frequency was 40.

Table IV.4
The Mean and Standard Deviation of Pre-test and Post-test of Experimental Class

	Mean	Std. Dev
Pre-Test	54.56	4.08
Post-Test	73.85	5.54

From the table above, the distance between Mean (M_x) and Standard Deviation (δ) is too far. In other words, the scores obtained are n

a. The Students' Writing Ability for Narrative Text Taught Without Using RAFT Strategy

The data of the students' writing ability in narrative text taught without using RAFT strategy were also taken from pre-test and post-test of IPA 3 as control class taken from the sample of this class (40 students). The data can be seen from the table below:

Table IV.5
The Score of the Students' Writing Ability for Narrative Text Taught
Without Using RAFT Strategy

Students	Control Class		Gain Score
	Pretest Score	Posttest Score	
1	48	56	8
2	68	76	8
3	54	58	4
4	42	56	14
5	44	48	4
6	42	60	18
7	72	76	4
8	60	76	16
9	44	52	8
10	64	76	12
11	42	50	8
12	60	72	12
13	70	76	6
14	36	46	10
15	60	76	16
16	48	50	2
17	70	76	6
18	52	76	24
19	42	52	10
20	42	50	8
21	48	60	12
22	56	76	20
23	40	50	10
24	76	76	-
25	44	60	16
26	48	50	2
27	60	76	16
28	42	54	12
29	64	76	12
30	44	52	8
31	50	76	36
32	42	50	8
33	46	76	30
34	44	52	8
35	50	76	26
36	72	76	4
37	48	70	22
38	46	50	4
39	46	68	22

40	50	76	26
Total	2.074	2.528	492

From the table IV.5, the writer found that the total score of pre test in control class was 2074 while the highest was 76 and the lowest was 36, and the total score of post- test in control class was 2.528, while the highest was 76 and the lowest was 46. It means that the students have little increasing of their writing ability in narrative text, and it is not as experimental class. Besides, the mean of pre test and post test of control class and experimental class also have a big different. The frequency score and the mean of pre test and post test of control class can be seen as below:

Table IV.6

The Frequency Score of Pre test and Post Test of Control Class

Pre-Test			Post- Test		
Score	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Score	Frequency	Percentage (%)
36	1	2.5%	36	-	-
40	1	2.5%	40	-	-
42	7	17.5%	42	-	-
44	5	12.5%	44	-	-
46	3	7,5%	46	1	2.5%
48	5	12,5%	48	1	2.5%
50	3	7.5%	50	7	17.5%
52	1	2.5%	52	4	10%
54	1	2,5%	54	1	2.5%
56	1	2,5%	56	2	5%
58	-	-	58	1	2.5%
60	4	10%	60	3	7.5%
62	-	-	62	-	-
64	2	5%	64	-	-
66	-	-	66	-	-
68	1	2.5%	68	1	2.5%
70	2	5%	70	1	2,5%
72	2	5%	72	1	2.5%
76	1	2.5%	76	17	42,5%
80	-	-	80	-	-
	N=40	100%		N=40	100%

Based on the table above, it can be seen that in pretest 1 student got score 36 (2.5%), 1 student got score 40 (2.5%), 7 students got score 42 (17.5%), 5 students got score 44 (12.5%), 3 students got score 46 (7.5%), 5 students got score 48 (12.5%), 3 students got score 50 (7.5%), 1 student got score 52 (2.5%), 1 student got score 54 (2.5%), 1 student got score 56 (2.5%), none student got score 58 (0%), 4 students got score 60 (10%), none student got score 62(0%), 2 students got score 64 (5%), none students got score 66 (0%), 1 student got score 68 (2.5%), 2 student got score 70 (5%), 2 students got score 72 (5%), 1 student get score 76 (2.5%), none student got score 80 (0%). The highest frequency was 7 at the score of 42. The total frequency was 40. While in posttest 1 student got score 46 (2.5%), 1 students got score 48 (2.5%), 7 students got score 50 (17.5%), 4 students got score 52 (10%), 1 student got score 54 (2.5%), 2 students got score 56 (5%), 1 student got score 58 (2.5%), 3 students got score 60 (7.5%), none student got score 62 (0%), none student got score 64 (0%), none students got score 66 (0%) ,1 student got score 68 (2.5%), 1 students got score 70 (2.5%), 1 student got score 72 (2.5%), 17 students got score 76 (42,5%) The highest frequency was 7 at the score of 50. The total frequency was 40.

Table IV.7
The Mean and Standard Deviation of Pre-test and Post-test of Control Class

	Mean	Std. Dev
Pre-Test	51.85	8.648
Post-Test	63.2	9.338

From the table above, the distance between Mean (Mx) and Standard Deviation (δ) is too far. In other words, the scores obtained are normal.

3. The Data Presentation of the Effect of Using RAFT Strategy toward Students' Writing Ability in Narrative Text

The following table is the description of pre-test and post-test of experimental class and control class.

Table IV. 8

The Students' Pre-Test and Post-Test of Experimental and Control Class

Students	Experiment Class		Gain Score	Control Class		Gain Score
	Pretest Score	Posttest Score		Pretest Score	Posttest Score	
1	42	76	34	48	56	8
2	56	76	20	68	76	8
3	60	76	16	54	58	4
4	50	72	22	42	56	14
5	50	76	26	44	48	4
6	60	60	-	42	60	18
7	60	76	16	72	76	4
8	52	76	24	60	76	16
9	40	76	36	44	52	8
10	68	76	8	64	76	12
11	50	76	26	42	50	8
12	42	76	34	60	72	12
13	76	78	2	70	76	6
14	76	76	-	36	46	10
15	62	64	2	60	76	16
16	48	76	28	48	50	2
17	48	76	28	70	76	6
18	52	62	10	52	76	24
19	70	76	6	42	52	10
20	42	76	34	42	50	8
21	76	78	2	48	60	12
22	49	62	13	58	76	20
23	46	66	20	40	50	10
24	50	68	18	72	76	4
25	50	76	26	44	60	16
26	48	76	28	48	50	2
27	42	56	14	60	70	16
28	72	76	4	42	54	12
29	76	78	2	64	76	12
30	52	76	24	44	52	8
31	48	76	28	50	76	6
32	50	76	26	40	50	8
33	48	78	30	46	76	30
34	46	76	30	44	52	8

35	64	76	12	50	76	26
36	46	76	30	72	76	4
37	44	78	34	48	70	22
38	76	76	-	46	50	4
39	48	76	28	46	68	22
40	52	76	24	50	76	26
Total	2187	2952		2116	2552	

From the table above, it can be seen that there is actually significant different between pre-test and post-test in experimental class and pre-test and post-test in control class. It can also be seen from the difference of the gain in the experimental class and control class. To make it clear, it will be analyzed in the data analysis below.

B. The Data Analysis

1. The Data Analysis of Using RAFT Strategy (Variable X)

The data analysis of using RAFT Strategy was based on the percentage of the observation list. The writer had fully implemented the raft strategy to the second year students of Senior high school 12 Pekkanbaru. It can be seen from the total percentage of using RAFT Strategy (78.13%).

2. The Data Analysis of the Students' Writing Ability in Narrative Text (Variable Y)

a. The Students' Writing Ability in Narrative text with RAFT Strategy

The data of students' pre test and post test score were obtained from the result of their writing narrative text. The data can be described as follows:

Table IV. 9
Students' pre test and post test scores of experimental class

Score of pre-test	Frequency	Fx	Standard graduated	Score of post-test	Frequency	fx	Standard graduated
40	1	40	No Pass	40	-	-	
42	4	168	No Pass	42	-	-	
44	1	44	No Pass	44	-	-	
46	3	138	No Pass	46	-	-	
48	6	288	No Pass	48	-	-	
50	6	300	No Pass	50	-	-	
52	4	208	No Pass	52	-	-	
54	-	-		54	-	-	
56	1	56	No Pass	56	1	56	No Pass
58	-	-		58	-	-	
60	3	180	No Pass	60	1	60	No Pass
62	-			62	2	124	No Pass
64	1	64	No Pass	64	1	64	No Pass
66	-	-		66	1	66	No Pass
68	1	68	No Pass	68	1	68	No Pass
70	2	140	No Pass	70	-	-	
72	2	144	No Pass	72	1	72	No Pass
74	-	-		74	-	-	
76	5	380	Pass	76	27	2052	Pass
78	-	-		78	5	390	Pass
	N=40				N=40		

Based on the data obtained in the pre-test of experimental class there were 35 students who did not pass the graduated standard (SKL) or the score obtained was < 75 , while there were 5 students who passed the graduated standard (SKL) or the score obtained was ≥ 75 . The percentage of students who did not pass the graduated standard is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \frac{35}{40} \times 100\% \\
 &= 87.5\%
 \end{aligned}$$

The percentage of students who passed the graduated standard is as follows:

$$= \frac{5}{40} \times 100\%$$

$$= 12.5\%$$

In the post-test of experimental class 8 student did not pass the graduated standard (SKL) or the score obtained was < 75 , while 32 students passed the graduated standard (SKL) or the score obtained was ≥ 75 . The percentage of students who did not pass the graduated standard is as follows:

$$= \frac{8}{40} \times 100\%$$

$$= 20\%$$

The percentage of students who passed the graduated standard as follows:

$$= \frac{32}{40} \times 100\%$$

$$= 80\%$$

b. The Students' Writing Ability in Narrative Text without using RAFT Strategy

Table IV. 10

Students' pre test and post test scores of control class

Score of pre-test	Frequency	Fx	Standard graduated	Score of post-test	Frequency	Fx	Standard graduated
36	1	36	No Pass	36	-	-	-
40	1	40	No Pass	40	-	-	-
42	7	294	No Pass	42	-	-	-
44	5	220	No Pass	44	-	-	-
46	3	138	No Pass	46	1	46	No Pass
48	5	240	No Pass	48	1	48	No Pass
50	3	150	No Pass	50	7	350	No Pass
52	1	52	No Pass	52	4	208	No Pass
54	1	54	No Pass	54	1	54	No pass
56	1	56	No Pass	56	2	112	No Pass
58	-	-	-	58	1	58	No Pass
60	4	240	No Pass	60	3	180	No Pass
62	-	-	-	62	-	-	-
64	2	128	No Pass	64	-	-	No Pass
66	-	-	-	66	-	-	-
68	1	68	No Pass	68	1	68	No Pass
70	2	140	No Pass	70	1	70	No Pass

72	2	72	No Pass	72	1	72	No Pass
76	1	76	Pass	76	17	1292	Pass
80	-	-		80	-	-	-
	N=40				N=40		

Based on the data obtained in the pre-test of control class there were 39 students who did not pass the graduated standard (SKL) or the score obtained was < 75 , while there were 1 students who passed the graduated standard (SKL) or the score obtained was ≥ 75 . The percentage of students who did not pass the graduated standard is as follows:

$$= \frac{39}{40} \times 100\%$$

$$= 2.5 \%$$

The percentage of students who passed the graduated standard is as follows:

$$= \frac{1}{40} \times 100\%$$

$$= 97\%$$

In the post-test of control class there were 37 students who did not pass the graduated standard (SKL) or the score obtained was < 75 , while there were 3 students who passed the graduated standard (SKL) or the score obtained was ≥ 75 . The percentage of students who did not pass the graduated standard is as follows:

$$= \frac{23}{40} \times 100\%$$

$$= 57.5\%$$

The percentage of students who passed the graduated standard is as follows:

$$= \frac{17}{40} \times 100 \%$$

$$= 42.5\%$$

3. Significant Difference on Students' writing Ability in Narrative Text those students who use RAFT Strategy and who do not

To know whether there is or not a significant difference on two strategies, the writer used T-test formula to analyze the difference of means. The T-test formula is as follows:

$$t_o = \frac{M_x - M_y}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{SD_x}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{SD_y}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right)^2}}$$

Where: t_o : The value of t-obtained

M_x : Mean score of experimental class

M_y : Mean score of control class

SD_x : Standard deviation of experimental class

SD_y : Standard deviation of control class

N : Number of Student

The following table is the table of the students' writing ability in Narrative text in experimental and control class

Table IV. 11
Percentage of Pretest to Post test of the Students' Writing Ability in
Narrative text

No	Experiment Class				Control Class			
	PRE	POST	RANG E	P(%)	PRE	POST	RANG E	P(%)
1	42	76	34	80.9	48	56	8	16.6
2	56	76	20	35.7	68	76	8	11.7
3	60	76	16	26.6	54	58	4	7.4
4	50	72	22	44	42	56	14	33.3
5	50	76	26	52	44	48	4	9.09
6	60	60	0	0	42	60	18	42.8
7	60	76	16	26.6	72	76	4	5.5
8	52	76	24	46.15	60	76	16	26.6
9	40	76	36	90	44	52	8	18.2
10	68	76	8	11.7	64	76	12	18.7
11	50	76	26	52	42	50	8	19.04
12	42	76	34	80.9	60	72	12	20
13	76	78	2	2.6	70	76	6	7.8
14	76	76	0	0	36	46	10	27.7
15	62	64	2	3.2	60	76	16	26.6
16	48	76	28	58.3	48	50	2	4.16
17	48	76	28	58.3	70	76	6	8.5
18	52	62	10	19.2	52	76	24	46.15
19	70	76	6	7.8	42	52	10	23.8
20	42	76	34	80.9	42	50	8	19.04
21	76	78	2	2.6	48	60	12	25
22	49	62	13	26.5	58	76	20	34.4
23	46	66	20	43.4	40	50	10	25
24	50	68	18	36	72	76	4	5.5
25	50	76	26	52	44	60	16	36.3
26	48	76	28	58.3	48	50	2	4.16
27	42	56	14	33.3	60	70	16	26.6
28	72	76	4	9.5	42	54	12	28.5
29	76	78	2	2.6	64	76	12	18.7
30	52	76	24	46.15	44	52	8	18.18

31	48	76	28	58.3	50	76	6	12
32	50	76	26	52	40	50	8	20
33	48	78	30	62.5	46	76	30	65.2
34	46	76	30	62.5	44	52	8	18.18
35	64	76	12	18.75	50	76	26	52
36	46	76	30	65.2	72	76	4	5.5
37	44	78	34	77.2	48	70	22	45.8
38	76	76	0	0	46	50	4	8.6
39	48	76	28	58.3	46	68	22	45.8
40	52	76	24	46.15	50	76	26	52
TOTAL	2187	2954	765		2074	2528	492	
MEAN	54.56	73.85	19.13		51.85	63.2	12.3	

From the calculation above, it is clear that the students' ability in writing narrative text of experimental class is higher than the ability in writing Narrative text of control class. It is shown by the calculation mean of range $11.93 >$ (bigger than) 6.5 and by mean percentage of $38.11 >$ (bigger than) 13.47 .

The following table is the table of mean and standard deviation of range score of experimental class and control class.

Table VI.12
MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION OF SCORE FOR
EXPERIMENTAL CLASS AND CONTROL CLASS

Students	Score		X (X-MX)	YY (Y-MY)		
	X	Y				
1	34	8	14.8	-4.3	219.04	219.04
2	20	8	0.8	-4.3	0.64	0.64
3	16	4	-3.1	-8.3	9.61	9.61
4	22	14	2.8	1.7	7.84	2.89
5	26	4	6.8	-8.3	46.24	68.89
6	-	18	-	5.7	-	32.49
7	16	4	-3.1	-8.3	9.61	68.89
8	24	16	4.8	3.7	23.04	13.69
9	36	8	16.8	-4.3	282.24	18.49
10	8	12	-11.1	-0.3	123.21	0.09
11	26	8	6.8	-4.3	46.24	18.49
12	34	12	14.8	0.3	219.04	0.09
13	2	6	-17.1	-6.3	292.41	39.69
14	-	10	-	-2.3	-	5.29
15	2	16	-17.1	3.7	292.41	13.69
16	28	2	8.8	-10.3	77.44	106.09
17	28	6	8.8	-6.3	77.44	39.69
18	10	24	-9.1	11.7	82.81	136.89
19	6	10	-13.1	-2.3	171.61	5.39
20	34	8	14.8	-4.3	219.04	18.49
21	2	12	-17.1	-0.3	292.41	0.09
22	13	20	-6.1	7.7	37.21	59.29
23	20	10	0.8	-2.3	0.64	5.29
24	18	4	-1.13	-8.3	1.28	68.89
25	26	16	6.8	3.7	46.24	46.24
26	28	2	8.8	-10.3	77.44	106.09
27	14	16	-5.1	3.7	26.01	13.69
28	4	12	-15.1	-0.3	228.01	0.09
29	2	12	-17.1	-0.3	292.41	0.09
30	24	8	4.8	-4.3	23.04	18.49
31	28	6	8.8	-6.3	77.44	39.69

32	26	8	6.8	-4.3	46.24	18.49
33	30	30	10.8	17.7	116.64	313.29
34	30	8	10.8	-4.3	116.64	14.49
35	12	26	-7.1	13.7	50.41	187.69
36	30	4	10.8	-1.1	116.64	1.21
37	34	22	14.8	9.7	219.04	19.40
38	-	4	-	-8.3	-	68.89
39	28	22	8.8	9.7	77.44	19.40
40	24	26	4.8	13.7	23.04	187.69
TOTAL	765	492	-	-	4068.13	2007.01
MEAN	19.13	12.3	-	-	101.7	50.18

While the result of the standard deviation of post writing narrative text for each class is as follows:

- a. Standard deviation for range score of experimental class

$$SD_x = \sqrt{\frac{\sum x^2}{N}} = \sqrt{\frac{4068.13}{40}} = \sqrt{101.7} = 10.08$$

- b. Standard deviation for control class

$$SD_y = \sqrt{\frac{\sum y^2}{N}} = \sqrt{\frac{2007.01}{40}} = \sqrt{50.18} = 7.08$$

From the calculation above, it can be stated that:

$$SD_x = 10.8$$

$$SD_y = 7.08$$

$$M_x = 19.13$$

$$M_y = 12.3$$

$$t_0 = \frac{M_x - M_y}{\sqrt{\left[\frac{SD_x}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right]^2 + \left[\frac{SD_y}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right]^2}} = \frac{19.13 - 12.3}{\sqrt{\left[\frac{10.8}{\sqrt{40-1}}\right]^2 + \left[\frac{7.08}{\sqrt{40-1}}\right]^2}}$$

$$t_0 = \frac{6.83}{\sqrt{\left[\frac{10.8}{\sqrt{39}}\right]^2 + \left[\frac{7.08}{\sqrt{39}}\right]^2}} = \frac{6.83}{\sqrt{\left[\frac{10.8}{6.24}\right]^2 + \left[\frac{7.08}{6.24}\right]^2}}$$

$$t_0 = \frac{6.83}{\sqrt{(1.73)^2 + (1.13)^2}} = \frac{6.83}{\sqrt{2.99 + 1.28}}$$

$$t_0 = \frac{6.83}{\sqrt{4.27}} = \frac{6.83}{2.07}$$

$$t_0 = 3.30$$

Based on the calculation above, it is clear that the obtained t_0 is 3.30. To know whether there is significant difference of ability in writing narrative text between students who are taught by using RAFT Strategy and those who are taught by using conventional technique, we need to obtain the degree of freedom by following way:

$$\begin{aligned} df &= (N1 + N2) - 2 \\ &= (40 + 40) - 2 \\ &= 80 - 2 \\ &= 78 \end{aligned}$$

After getting the degree of freedom above, it can be said that the degree of freedom is 78. Because the degree of 78 is not available, the writer took 70 as the nearest score to 78. The T-table at 5% of level of significance = 2.00 and at 1% of level of significance = 2.65. So, the writer can conclude that t_0 is higher than t-table both in 5% and 1% of level of significance. And it can be concluded $2.65 < 3.30 > 2.00$. Therefore, the first hypothesis (H_a) that postulates significant difference of ability in writing recount text between students who are taught by using RAFT Strategy and those who are taught by using without RAFT is accepted automatically and the second hypothesis (H_0) is rejected.

In conclusion, we can also say that there is a significant effect of using RAFT Strategy toward students' ability in writing narrative text at the second year of SMAN 12 Pekanbaru.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

A. Conclusion

After analyzing the previous data, the writer makes the conclusion of this research as follows:

1. Mean of students' ability in writing narrative text taught by using RAFT Strategy is 73,85 categorized into good level. The students who pass the graduated standard (SKL) is 32 (80%).
2. Mean of students' ability in writing narrative text taught without using RAFT Strategy is 63.2 categorized into enough level. The students who pass the graduated standard (SKL) is 17 (42.5%).
3. Based on the analysis of T-test formula. It can be seen t_o is 78, It is higher than t-table either at level 5% = 2.00 or 1% = 2.65. It can be concluded that H_o is rejected and H_a is accepted. It means that there is a significant difference between students' ability in writing narrative text taught by using RAFT Strategy and students' ability in writing narrative text taught without using RAFT Strategy. From the significant different mean between using using RAFT Strategy (73,85) with using conventional (63.2) and it is also supported by the result of t-test that t_o is higher than t table either at level 5% or 1% ($2,65 < 3,30 > 2,00$), it shows that using RAFT Strategy has positive effect toward students' writing ability in narrative text.

B. Suggestion

After conducting a research at SMAN I2 Pekanbaru, the writer would like to propose some suggestions to make teaching and learning process at this school better than before. This suggestion is as follows:

1. Writer recommended to the English teachers to use RAFT Strategy in teaching and learning process.
2. The teacher should build a favorable atmosphere at times of teaching-learning process conducted because the conducive condition in teaching would become one asset to carry the success of material to be taught.
3. Writer also hopes the students of SMAN I2 Pekanbaru to use various Strategy in doing their writing exercise or task, especially; RAFT Strategy because using it can help students to break their blockminded in writing.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Cook, Debra L, (2010). *Academic Language/Literacy Strategies Adolescents*. [Electronic version] New York: Routledge. Retrieved on January 31st, 2011 at 19.45. p.114
- David, Nunan. *Language Teaching Methodology a Textbook for Teachers*. (New York: Prentice Hall International UK Ltd,1991), pp.84
- Doug, Buehl's, *Classroom Strategies for Interactive Learning*. 2001
- Doughlash, Brown. *Teaching by Principle*. (New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents, 1994),pp. 321
- Hartono, *Statistik untuk Penelitian*. (Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar,2009),p.208.
- Hornby. Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary. (new York: Oxford University Press,1995), p. 369
- Hornby, *Op.Cit*. p.2
- Jack, C Richard et al. *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistic*. (London: Winthrop Publisher 1988) pp.266
- Jonri Kasdi, *A Correlation Study between Students' Passive Voice Mastery and Their Writing Achievement at the Fifth Semester Students of English Education Department of Education and Teacher Training Faculty of UIN Suska Riau* (Unpublished, 2006)
- Joy M Reid, *Teaching ESL Writing*. (New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regent,1993), p.28
- Jhon. W. cresswell. *Educational research: planning. Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. (New Jersey: Pearson Education, 2008), p.229).
- RAFT strategy samples*. Differentiated Instruction Workshop Schuylkill intermediate unit 29. P.1
- Ruth Baygell. Education Program Newsweek: *Essay Writing Step by Step*. (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2003), p.139
- Simon and Schuster, *Essay Writing Step-by-step: a Newsweek Education Program Guide Fourteens*. (New York: Newsweek, Inc, 2003), pp.138
- Simon and Schuster *Op.Cit*p.8

Sudijono Anas, *Pengantar Statistik Pendidikan* (Jakarta: PT. Rajagrafindo Persada, 2007), p. 43

Suharsimi Arikunto. *Procedure Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktis*. (Jakarta: Rhineka Cipta, 2006), p. 134.

Sulasm karim, *An Experiment on the Effectiveness of Using Brainstorming Technique in Increasing Student's Writing Ability at the Second Year of English Education Department State Islamic University of SUSKA RIAU*. (Unpublished, 2007). p. 30.

Susan Lenski and Jill Lewis, (2008). *Reading Success for Struggling Adolescent Learners*. [Electronic version] New York: the Guilford Press. Retrieved on January 31st, 2011 at 20.00. P. 28

Toby, Fulwiler. *College Writing*. (London: Scott Foresman Company, 1988), p. 63

Westwood, Peter. *What Teacher Need to know about Reading and Writing difficulties*. (Australian Council: Acer Pres, 2008), p. 69

<http://www.instructionalstrategiesforengaginglearners.com>: February,06,2011, 13:42 PM. P.1