## CHAPTER IV

## FINDING AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter the researcher describes the result of the study at Senior High School 3 Pariaman in six meeting.At the end of the research the students were given a writing test. The analysis of the collected data was to find the data on "The Effect of Quick Writing Strategytowards Students' Writing Ability in Recount Text at Senior High School 3 Pariaman Grade X.

## A. Data Description

Based on the research that had been done in class sample, it is got result of learningwriting. The data in this research were limited on cognitive aspect only. The data of this research are based on students' scores inpost test. The researcher conducted a post-test to see whether the treatment processes had any effect to students' writing skill especially to the experimental class. While the control class did not have any treatment by the researcher, they were taught as they had usually been taught by their English teacher. Post test was given for both of this group experimental group and control group. The posttest data of experimental and control classes were shown as follows;
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Table 4.1
Students' Score of Post-testof Experimental Class
(X IPA 4)

| No | Name | WRITING COMPONENT |  |  |  |  | STUDENTS WRITING SCORE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Content <br> (30) | Organization (20) | Vocabulary <br> (20) | Language Use <br> (25) | Mechanic (5) |  |
| 1 | R1 | 29 | 19 | 18 | 23 | 3 | 92 |
| 2 | R2 | 28 | 17 | 18 | 21 | 4 | 88 |
| 3 | R3 | 27 | 14 | 18 | 24 | 3 | 86 |
| 4 | R4 | 29 | 19 | 19 | 23 | 3 | 95 |
| 5 | R5 | 21 | 15 | 17 | 20 | 3 | 76 |
| 6 | R6 | 23 | 15 | 18 | 18 | 3 | 77 |
| 7 | R7 | 25 | 17 | 17 | 21 | 3 | 83 |
| 8 | R8 | 21 | 13 | 14 | 11 | 1 | 60 |
| 9 | R9 | 17 | 11 | 15 | 22 | 4 | 69 |
| 10 | R10 | 23 | 19 | 15 | 19 | 3 | 79 |
| 11 | R11 | 21 | 10 | 15 | 21 | 2 | 69 |
| 12 | R12 | 22 | 12 | 18 | 21 | 2 | 75 |
| 13 | R13 | 22 | 14 | 17 | 21 | 3 | 77 |
| 14 | R14 | 30 | 19 | 18 | 24 | 4 | 95 |
| 15 | R15 | 28 | 14 | 15 | 23 | 3 | 83 |
| 16 | R16 | 22 | 14 | 13 | 18 | 4 | 71 |
| 17 | R17 | 26 | 17 | 15 | 21 | 3 | 82 |
| 18 | R18 | 22 | 14 | 17 | 21 | 4 | 78 |
| 19 | R19 | 29 | 18 | 19 | 21 | 4 | 91 |
| 20 | R20 | 27 | 17 | 18 | 18 | 4 | 84 |
| 21 | R21 | 25 | 15 | 14 | 21 | 3 | 78 |
| 22 | R22 | 25 | 17 | 17 | 23 | 3 | 85 |
| 23 | R23 | 23 | 14 | 17 | 21 | 4 | 79 |
| 24 | R24 | 21 | 13 | 14 | 21 | 3 | 72 |
| 25 | R25 | 20 | 11 | 17 | 20 | 3 | 70 |
| 26 | R26 | 21 | 13 | 14 | 21 | 3 | - 72 |
| 27 | R27 | 25 | 17 | 17 | 21 | 3 | 83 |
|  | MEAN | 24.14 | 15.11 | 16.44 | 20.70 | 3.14 | 79.59 |
|  | MAX | 30 | 19 | 19 | 24 | 4 | 95 |
|  | MIN | 17 | 12 | 14 | 11 | 1 | 60 |

The table above is students' score of post-test at experimental class. It can be described as follows; there are 27 students at experimental class with the total of total students' mean score is 79.59 . The higher score ofexperimental class is 95 . Then, the scoring of writing' component are stated below. Content;
mean scoreis 24.14 with the higher score is 30 and the lower score is 17 . Next is organization; mean scoreis 15.11 with the higher score 19 and the lower score is 12 . Vocabulary, mean scoreis 16.44 with the higher score is 19 and the lower scoreis 14 . Language use; mean score is 20.70 with the higher score is 24 whilethe lower score is 11 . Mechanics; mean score is 3.14 with the higher score is 4 and the lower score is 1 .

Table 4.2
Students' Score of Post-test of Control Class (X IPA 5)

| No | Name | WRITING COMPONENT |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Content <br> (30) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Organization } \\ & (20) \end{aligned}$ | Vocabulary (20) | Language Use <br> (25) | Mechanic (5) |  |
| 1 | R1 | 19 | 12 | 16 | 20 | 2 | 69 |
| 2 | R2 | 18 | 12 | 17 | 20 | 3 | 70 |
| 3 | R3 | 18 | 14 | 19 | 19 | 3 | 73 |
| 4 | R4 | 18 | 9 | 13 | 19 | 2 | 61 |
| 5 | R5 | 20 | 11 | 16 | 17 | 2 | 66 |
| 6 | R6 | 18 | 12 | 16 | 13 | 2 | 62 |
| 7 | R7 | 18 | 11 | 13 | 20 | 2 | 64 |
| 8 | R8 | 20 | 8 | 14 | 18 | 2 | 62 |
| 9 | R9 | 20 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 3 | 80 |
| 10 | R10 | 16 | 8 | 13 | 10 | 2 | 49 |
| 11 | R11 | 19 | 8 | 16 | 17 | 2 | 62 |
| 12 | R12 | 20 | 15 | 16 | 20 | 2 | 73 |
| 13 | R13 | 19 | 15 | 18 | 21 | 2 | 75 |
| 14 | R14 | 27 | 16 | 18 | 20 | 3 | 84 |
| 15 | R15 | 20 | 15 | 18 | 19 | 2 | 74 |
| 16 | R16 | 20 | 17 | 15 | 20 | 3 | 75 |
| 17 | R17 | 21 | 15 | 17 | 21 | 1 | 75 |
| 18 | R18 | 21 | 13 | 18 | 20 | 1 | 73 |
| 19 | R19 | 25 | 15 | 18 | 18 | 4 | 80 |
| 20 | R20 | 17 | 14 | 14 | 20 | 1 | 66 |
| 21 | R21 | 16 | 13 | 18 | 21 | 2 | 70 |
| 22 | R22 | 21 | 13 | 18 | 18 | 2 | 72 |
| 23 | R23 | 17 | 10 | 17 | 21 | 1 | 66 |
| 24 | R24 | 20 | 14 | 17 | 21 | 1 | 73 |
| 25 | R25 | 23 | 11 | 16 | 17 | 2 | 69 |
| 26 | R26 | 18 | 9 | 15 | 20 | 1 | 63 |
| 27 | R27 | 19 | 13 | 13 | 18 | 2 | 65 |


|  | MEAN | 19.55 | 12.62 | 16.22 | 18.81 | 2.03 | 70.29 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | MAX | 27 | 18 | 19 | 21 | 4 | 84 |
|  | MIN | 16 | 8 | 13 | 13 | 1 | 49 |

As a part of research, the students' post-test of control class also have variteties of score as follows; there are 26 students with mean score is 70.26 . The higher score is 85 and the lower score is 53 . Then, the scoring of writing' component are; content mean score is 22.03 with the higher score is 30 and the lower score is 15 . Organization; mean score is 14.38 with the higher score is 20 and the lower score is 10 . Vocabulary; mean score is 15.38 with the higher score is 18 and the lower score is 12 . Language use; mean score 15.11 with the higher score is 18 and the lower score is 10 . Mechanics;mean score 2.88 with the higher score is 3 and the lower score is 2 . As the comparison, the researcher put the table score of experimental class and control class as follows;

Table 4.3
The Calculation of Comparison of Mean Score Post-Test between Control Class and Experimental Class

| No | Writing component | Experimental | Control | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Content | 24.14 | 19.55 | 4.59 |
| 2 | Organization | 15.11 | 12.62 | 2.49 |
| 3 | Vocabulary | 16.44 | 16.22 | 0.22 |
| 4 | Language Use | 20.70 | 18.81 | 1.89 |
| 5 | Mechanic | 3.14 | 2.03 | 1.11 |

From the table above can be explained that, the average of students' score at experimental class in content is 24.14 while at control class is 19.55 with difference is 4.59 . The organizationscore of experimental class is 15.11 while at the control class is 12.62 with difference is 2.49 . The next term is vocabulary at experimental class is 16.44 at control class is 16.22 with little difference 0.22 . Language use is the higher score, experimental class get 20.70while control class is 18.81 with difference 1.89 . Meanwhile in term of mechanics, these class just have little difference. 3,14at experimental class and 2.03 at control class with 1.11 .

## B. Descriptive Data Analysis

The data will be analyzed by using t -test formula. The calculation of t -test between mean score of post test of experimental class and control class will be explained after find the interval score in experiment class can be seen from the table below:

## 1. Tabulating

Table 4.4
The Interval Data of Post-test Scoreof Experimental ClassX IPA 4

| NO | Interval of Students, <br> Writing Score | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $60-65$ | 1 | $3.70 \%$ |
| 2 | $66-71$ | 4 | $14.81 \%$ |
| 3 | $72-77$ | 6 | $22.22 \%$ |
| 4 | $78-83$ | 8 | $29.62 \%$ |
| 5 | $84-89$ | 4 | $18.75 \%$ |
| 6 | $90-95$ | 4 | $14.81 \%$ |
|  | Total Score | $\mathbf{2 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

The table above asesses by using interval formula;

| $i=\frac{r}{k}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{i}=\text { Interval } \\ & \mathrm{r}=\text { Range (higher score- lower score) } \\ & \mathrm{k}=1+3,3 \cdot \log \text { (total students) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{r}=95-60$ | $\mathrm{k}=1+3,3 . \log$ jumlah siswa $\quad i=r / k$ |
| $=35$ | $=1+3,3 \cdot \log 27 \quad=35 / 5.719$ |
|  | $=1+3,3.1 .43=6.11$ |
|  | $=1+4.719$ |
|  | $=5.719$ |

So, the interval of students writing score is 6
Table 4.5
The Interval Data of Post-test Score of ControlClass (X IPA 5)

| NO | Interval of Students' <br> Writing Score | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $49-54$ | 1 | $3.70 \%$ |
| 2 | $55-60$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| 3 | $61-66$ | 10 | $37.03 \%$ |
| 4 | $67-72$ | 5 | $18.51 \%$ |
| 5 | $73-78$ | 8 | $29.62 \%$ |
| 6 | $79-84$ | 3 | $11.11 \%$ |
|  | Total Score | $\mathbf{2 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

$$
\begin{array}{rlr}
\mathrm{i}=88-53 \mathrm{k} & =1+3,3 \cdot \log \text { jumlah siswa } & \mathrm{I}=\mathrm{r} / \mathrm{k} \\
& =35 \\
& =1+3,3 \cdot \log 27 \\
& =1+3,3 \cdot 1.43 \\
& =1+4.719 & =6.11 \\
& =5.719
\end{array}
$$

The interval of students writing score at control class is 6
2. Means score and Standar Deviation of Experimental Class and Control Class
The formula of means score; $\overline{\mathrm{X}_{1}}=\frac{\sum \mathrm{F}_{1} \mathrm{X}_{1}}{\sum \mathrm{~F}_{1}}$

Table 4.6
Calculation Process of Mean and Standard Deviation of Experimental Class (X IPA 4)


$$
\begin{aligned}
& \overline{\mathrm{x}}=\frac{\sum \mathrm{F} 1 \mathrm{X} 1}{\sum \mathrm{~F} 1}=\frac{2149}{27}=79.59 \\
& \left(\mathrm{~F}_{1} \mathrm{X}_{1}\right)^{2}=(2149)^{2}=4618201
\end{aligned}
$$

The formula of standard deviation: $S^{2}=\frac{n_{1} \sum F_{1} X_{1}^{2}-\left(\sum F_{1} X_{1}\right)^{2}}{n_{1}\left(n_{1}-1\right)}$

$$
\begin{gathered}
S^{2}=\frac{27(172887)-(4618201)}{27(27-1)} \\
S^{2}=\frac{4667679-4618201}{27(26)} \\
S^{2}=\frac{49478}{720}=70.48 \\
S=\sqrt{70.48}=8.39
\end{gathered}
$$

From the calcualtion above, it got that the score of SD of experimental class is 8.39 and mean score is 79.59 .

Tabel 4.7
Calculation Process of Mean and Standard Deviation Control class
X IPA 5

| $\mathbf{N o}$ | $\mathbf{X i}$ | $\mathbf{F i}$ | $\mathbf{X i}^{\mathbf{2}}$ | $\mathbf{F i X i}$ | $\mathbf{F i X i}^{\mathbf{2}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 49 | 1 | 2401 | 49 | 2401 |
| 2 | 61 | 1 | 3721 | 61 | 3721 |
| 3 | 62 | 3 | 3844 | 186 | 11532 |
| 4 | 63 | 1 | 3969 | 63 | 3969 |
| 5 | 64 | 1 | 4096 | 64 | 4096 |
| 6 | 65 | 1 | 4225 | 65 | 4225 |
| 7 | 66 | 3 | 4356 | 198 | 13068 |
| 8 | 69 | 2 | 4761 | 138 | 9522 |
| 9 | 70 | 2 | 4900 | 140 | 9800 |
| 10 | 72 | 1 | 5184 | 72 | 5184 |
| 11 | 73 | 4 | 5329 | 292 | 21316 |
| 12 | 74 | 1 | 5476 | 74 | 5476 |
| 13 | 75 | 3 | 5625 | 225 | 16875 |
| 14 | 80 | 2 | 6400 | 160 | 12800 |
| 15 | 84 | 1 | 7056 | 84 | 7056 |
|  | $\sum$ | $\sum \mathbf{F i}=27$ | $\sum \mathbf{X i}^{\mathbf{2}}$ | $\sum \mathbf{F i X i =}$ | $\sum \mathbf{F i X i}^{\mathbf{2}=}$ |
|  |  |  | 71343 | 1871 | 131041 |

$$
\frac{\sum \mathrm{F} 1 \mathrm{X} 1}{\sum \mathrm{~F} 1}=\frac{1871}{27}=69.29
$$

$$
\left(F_{1} X_{1}\right)^{2}=(1871)^{2}=3500641
$$

The formula of standard deviation: $S^{2}=\frac{n_{1} \sum F_{1} X_{1}^{2}-\left(\sum F_{1} X_{1}\right)^{2}}{n_{1}\left(n_{1}-1\right)}$

$$
\begin{gathered}
S^{2}=\frac{27(131041)-(3500641)}{27(27-1)} \\
S^{2}=\frac{35381007-3500641}{27(26)} \\
S^{2}=\frac{37466}{702}=53.37 \\
S=\sqrt{53.37}=7.301
\end{gathered}
$$

From the calcualtion above, it got that the score of SD of control class is 7.301 and mean score is 69.29 .

Table 4.8
The Data of Post-test Score of Experimental ClassandControl Class

| Class | $\mathbf{N}$ | The <br> highest <br> Score | The <br> lowest <br> Score | Mean <br> (X) | Standard <br> Deviation <br> (SD) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Experimental | 27 | 95 | 60 | 79.59 | 8.39 |
| Control | 27 | 84 | 49 | 69.29 | 7.031 |

Based on the table above, it could be seen that the differences of posttest scores between control class and experimental class. The highest scores of student's writing skill after given treatment by using Quick Writing Strategy experimental class was 95 while the lowest score was 84 , the mean score was 79.59 and SD was 8.39 . On the contrast, the control class by using conventional strategy, the highest score was 60 , while the lowest score was 84, the mean score was 69 and SD was 7.031.

## C. Inferential Data Analysis

A set of measurments prerequisite is necessary to determine whether the analysis of data for hypothesis testing can be continued or not. Some data analysis strategy demanding test prerequisite analysis. Analysis of variance requisite that data come from a populatioan with normal distribution and group compared to homogenity of data. A variety of prerequisite testing analysis, such as a normality test and homogenity test. the prerequisite analysis of data will be mentioned on the next point

## 1. Test of Normality

Normality test had an objective to know the population normal or not. In this research, to do the normality test the researcher used Kolmogrov Smirnov and Shapiro Wilk. This test was SPSS test. Testing criterion data distributed normal if the data was more than 0.05 . The class was normal. Base on that test,the researcher got test of normality class X IPA 4 as experimental class.

Tabel 4.9
Result of Normality Distribution Test on Post-Test
Tests of Normality

|  | VAROO <br> 002 | Kolmogorov-Smirnov ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | Shapiro-Wilk |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Statistic | Df | Sig. | Statistic | df | Sig. |
| VAR00 | 1 | . 083 | 27 | . 200 | . 979 | 27 | . 836 |
| 001 | 2 | . 106 | 27 | . 200 | . 962 | 27 | . 400 |

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction
*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.
a. The Homogenity of Variance Test

To check the homogeneity of variance of the data, Levene's test was conducted. The result of calculating using Levene test are as follows:

## Tabel 4.10

Result of Normality Distribution Test on Post-Test

Test of Homogeneity of Variance

|  |  | Levene Statistic | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| VAR00001 | Based on Mean | . 748 | 1 | 52 | . 391 |
|  | Based on Median | . 664 | 1 | 52 | . 419 |
|  | Based on Median and with adjusted df | . 664 | 1 | 51.212 | . 419 |
|  | Based on trimmed mean | . 774 | 1 | 52 | . 383 |

The tableshows that the significance value (based on mean) is 0.39 . It means that the probability is higher than 0.05 ( $p>0.05$ ). Therefore, the result of the test indicated that the students' test scores in both classes were equal. The table of the homogeneity of variance test result can be seen clearly at the appendix.
b. Hypothesis Testing

Based on Sudjana (2005: 221) Hypothesis testing will get to the conclusion to accept or rejected the hypothesis. In order to see whether the hypothesis accepted or rejected, the researcher analyzed with using T-test. The calculation can be seen follow:
$\overline{X_{1}}=79.59$
$n_{1}=27$
$S_{1}^{2}=70.48$
$\overline{X_{2}}=69.29$
$n_{2}=27$
$S_{2}^{2}=53.37$

Where:
$\overline{\mathrm{X}_{1}}$ : Mean of gain score of experimental class
$\overline{\mathrm{X}_{2}}$ : Mean of gain score of control class
$S_{1}^{2}$ : Standard deviation of gain score of experimental class
$S_{2}^{2}$ : Standard deviation of gain score of control class
$n_{1}$ : The number of subject of experimental group
$\mathrm{n}_{2}$ : The number of subject of control group
$\mathrm{s}^{2}=\frac{\left(\mathrm{n}_{1-} 1\right) S_{1}^{2}+\left(\mathrm{n}_{2-} 1\right) \mathrm{s}_{2}^{2}}{\mathrm{n}_{1}+\mathrm{n}_{2}-2}$
$\frac{(27-1) 70.48+(27-1) 53.37}{27+27-2}$
$\mathrm{s}^{2} \frac{(26) 70.48+(26) 53.37}{52}$

$$
\begin{gathered}
\mathrm{s}^{2}=\frac{1832.48+1387.62}{52} \\
\mathrm{~s}^{2}=\frac{3220.1}{52}
\end{gathered}
$$




Aftergetting standar deviation. So it was subtituted to statistic equation for test T :

$$
t=\frac{\overline{X_{1}}-\overline{X_{2}}}{\sqrt[s]{\frac{1}{n_{1}}+\frac{1}{n_{2}}}}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{80.17-69.30}{7.86 \sqrt{\frac{1}{27}}+\frac{1}{27}} \\
&= \frac{10 .}{7.86(\sqrt{0.074})} \\
&= \frac{10 .}{7.86(0.27)} \\
&= \frac{10 .}{2.13} \\
& t= 4.694 \\
& \alpha= 0.05 \\
& \alpha= 0.05 \\
& d f=\left(n_{1}+n_{2}-2\right) \\
&=(27+27-2) \\
&= 52 \\
& \mathrm{~T} \text {-table }=\mathrm{t}(1-\alpha) \mathrm{df} \\
& \quad=\mathrm{t}(1-0.05) 52 \\
& \mathrm{t}-\mathrm{Calculate} \quad>\mathrm{t}-\mathrm{table} \\
& 4.694>2000
\end{aligned} \quad \begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{t}-\mathrm{Calculate}=4.694 \\
&=49.4
\end{aligned}
$$

From the result of analyzing the data, it is found that t -calculated is 3.694 while critical value of the $t$ - table is 2.000 at the degree of freedom are 54 and the level of significant is 0.05 . In conclusion, the value of t -calculated is bigger than the value of t -table. It means that the use of quick writing strategytowards students' writing significantly.

## 2. Discussion on the Finding

As suggested by Jacob (1981) to success in writing skill activity, the students or the writer have to consider about component of writing. In the other words the students have to master the writing skill that related to content, vocabulary, organization, language use and mechanics. Based on the observation at Senior High School 3 Pariamanthe students still had difficulties in writing. So that in this research the researcher implemented a Strategy that couldhelp the students increase their writing ability. It was Quick Writing Strategy.

Based on the data above, teaching writing by using quick writing gave significant effect on student's writing skill. In this research, the five writing components should be measured to conduct writing activity. Namely; content, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanics. In this case, the researcher tried to assess three aspects; they were content, organization, and language use. Based on the data above, it showed that the students' content, organization and language use were improved.

Students' ability in content was improved because quick writing helps the student's fluency in writing. It activates students" relevant experiences
or background knowledge on a topic, thus facilitating connections between new and existing knowledge.

According toGuillaume et.al (2007:69), quickwrite strategy can increase students" fluency in writing. It activates students" relevant experiences or background knowledge on a topic, thus facilitating connections between new and existing knowledge. It helps the students to organize the sentences in such a way that their readers can easily understand what they are trying to get across to them. Based on this opinion, quick writing can helps students to organize their ideas to develop their writing to be a good paragraph. The students can write their each idea into a sentence to be a paragraph .It can make students easy to write their ideas in writing.

Students' ability in organization was improved because quick writing can fire the imagination and guide the direction of writing. Students just enjoy writing a list based on their thought, experiences, dreams or feel. When the students making plan for writing based on quick writing, they divided their ideas based on the generic structure of the recount text such as orientationl, complication, resolution; so that their ability in organization was improved. Oshima (1998:35) says that the actual writing become easier because you don't have to worry about what are you going to say; you already have a well-organized plan to follow.

The last, students' ability in language use was improved through the use of quick writing. According to Oshima (1998:35) your grammar will improve because you are be able to concentrate on it. When the students made the list, they focused on the language use that they should use in the text. For
example, when they made recount text based on their list, they would use simple present, imperative sentences, mainly material process and temporal conjunction.

According to Jacob (2008),that quick writing has three features: concentrating on content, not worrying about form, and writing without stopping and rushing. In this case only one component of writing namely content Then, Quick Writing strategyalso helped the students in organizing their ideas into the correct form such as the correct use of the generic structures and considering the language features of a Recount text.Based on the explanation from $\operatorname{Jacob}(2008)$, which says that there is only one component writing that is content. This is in accordance with the results of research I have done, where the value of content for experimental class for content is (24.14)and while the value of content for control class that is(19.55).

Whereas,Meier(2010) explain Quick write is a strategy that allows students begin the writing process.It allows students to collect data in a fast away.Next,the students will write as much as they know about the given topic.The teacher supposed to stress to the student garammar and spelling do not matter in this portion of writing.this is in accordance with the result research I have done, where the value of content for experimental class for grammar is 20.70 , and whiilee the value of grammar for control class is 18.81 .

Related to the purpose of the research to determine whether there is anysignificant effect on students' writing ability by using Quick Writing strategy the researcher can say that there is any significant effect on students' writing skill between those who taught by using Quick Writing Strategy and those who taught without using Quick Writing that could be seen on findings. It is shown by the post-test result for both classes after giving the treatment by applying Quick Writing strategy

Aftertaught by usingQuick Writing strategy in several meetings, the students got some improvements of writing skill that was shown by their writing score. The experimental group improved dramatically after receiving treatment. While the control class group showed no significant improvement after receiving no treatment. The research proves that Quick Writing strategy have a dramatic influence on students' writing skill. Statistically calculated, the result of this research, the mean scores of experiment class is 79.59 that taught by Quick Writing strategy and it supports the research hypothesis that there is any significant effect on students' writing skilll between the students who are taught by Quick Writing strategy. And the mean scorer of control class is 69.29 that taught by conventional strategy without using Quick Writing strategy.

Finally, it can be said that the findings of this research proved that there is any significant effect on students' writing skill between the students who were taught by using Quick Writing strategy and those who
were taught without using Quick Writing strategy and then, this strategy also can improve the students' writing.

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { UIN IMAM BONJOL } \\
\text { PADANG }
\end{gathered}
$$

## CHAPTER V

## CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

## A. Conclusion

Based on the finding of the research derived from the data analysis as reported in the previous chapter that the students' writing skill got better improvements after using Quick Writing strategy in every aspect, such as: Content, Organization, Vocabulary, language use and Mechanic. The students' writing skill of experiment class by using the Quick Writing strategyin post test got 79.59 while the mean score of control class by using without QuickWritingstrategy in post test got 69.59 . It showed that, the mean of writing score in post of experimental class had increased than control class. It showed that, the use of Quick Writing strategy had significant effect towards students writing skill.

The results of this research also showed that there was an increased in students' skillon writing in every component of writing; content organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanic after using of Quick Writing strategy.Moreover, from the finding of this research above, it was concluded that the use of Quick Writing Strategy is one of English teaching strategy to solve the student's problem on writing. This strategy can be to improve student's writing.

## B. Suggestions

Dealing with the problems that explained in the previous part, researcher tries to porpoises some suggestion. First, the English teacher should consider the use of Quick Writing strategy as an alternative strategy in teaching writing especially in organizing text.

For the other researcher it is suggested to carry out further studies about the use of Quick Writing strategy in improving students writing skill since this study only concern about the use Quick Writing strategy in developing student's writing skill that refers to content, organization, language use, vocabulary and mechanic.

The other researcher is suggested to do the experimental research by using Quick Writing strategy in other skill in English like speaking, listening and reading.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { IMAM BONJOL } \\
& \text { PADANG }
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$$

