## CHAPTER IV

## FINDING AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the researcher presents about the finding and the discussion of the research. This chapter covers the description of data, the result of normality and homogeneity, hypothesis testing, and discussion.

## A. The Description of Data

In this chapter the researcher wanted to know the effectiveness of scaffolding technique towards students skill in writing descriptive text. It is presented, the result of the students' writing descriptive text in term of pre-test and post-test.

The test wes given to seventh grade of SMP Negeri 1 Sumbergempol. The number of students as the respondent were 34 . The students' score of pre-test and post-test can be seen in table 4.1. In addition, the test was conducted before and after the researcher used scaffolding technique as the treatment in teaching writing descriptive text.

Table 4.1 The result of Students' Score in Pre-Test and Post-Test

| No | $\begin{gathered} \text { Students' } \\ \text { Name } \end{gathered}$ | Pre-Test |  |  | Post-Test |  |  | Gained Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Grammar | Vocab | Total | Grammar | Vocab | Total |  |
| 1 | SWC | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 8 |
| 2 | LF | 4 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 1 |
| 3 | MDA | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 12 |
| 4 | MFZ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 9 |
| 5 | MEZ | 3 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 5 |
| 6 | TN | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 10 |
| 7 | NT | 2 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 5 |


| 8 | AP | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9 | DMAZ | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 8 |
| 10 | SBF | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 11 |
| 11 | AWAY | 2 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 8 |
| 12 | FAR | 2 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 4 |
| 13 | MHAN | 2 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 5 |
| 14 | RKA | 3 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 3 |
| 15 | LGS | 3 | 4 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 3 |
| 16 | MDM | 3 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 2 |
| 17 | MZNA | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 6 |
| 18 | LAS | 4 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 1 |
| 19 | NFLA | 3 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 8 |
| 20 | FIP | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 7 |
| 21 | AD | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 6 |
| 22 | ASP | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 9 |
| 23 | MSF | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 8 |
| 24 | HNAS | 2 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 4 |
| 25 | VAN | 3 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 4 |
| 26 | MFM | 3 | 4 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 4 |
| 27 | MYSR | 3 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 5 |
| 28 | IPNH | 4 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 1 |
| 29 | FSE | 3 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 2 |
| 30 | GR | 4 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 1 |
| 31 | DW | 2 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 4 |
| 32 | FPA | 3 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 3 |
| 33 | ANAS | 2 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 5 |
| 34 | AVNS | 2 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 70 | 5 |
|  | Total | 80 | 94 | 173 | 103 | 115 | 281 | 187 |

Based on the table 4.1, it could be seen the lowest and the highest scores of the seventh grade students. The lowes score in pre-test was 20 and the highest one in pre-test was 80. After the reasearcher gave 34 treatment of scaffolding technique in teaching writing descriptive text, the researcher administered posttest to measure whether there were significant different score or not. Based on the above table, the lowest score in post-test is 30 and the highest one was 80 . The score gotten in the post-test was the same as the pre-test. The differences of the students number who got score 80 .

## 1. The Students' Grammar and Vocabulary Score Before Being Taught by

## Using Scaffolding Technique

In this part of this chapter, the researcher wanted to know the students' score before being taught by using scaffolding technique especially in grammar and vocabulary mastery. The reseracher allocated the time about 50 minuts to finish thre pre-test. The purpose of conducting pre-test was intended to know the basic competence of the students before the students getting the treatment process. The pre-test was held on $29^{\text {th }}$ of january 2019.

Table 4.2 The Descriptive Pre - Test of Grammar and Vocabulary
Statistics

|  | GRAMMAR | VOCABULARY |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| N $\quad$ Valid | 34 | 34 |
| Missing | 0 | 0 |
| Mean | 2.35 | 2.76 |
| Median | 2.00 | 3.00 |


| Mode | 2 | 3 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Std. Deviation | .917 | .955 |
| Variance | .841 | .913 |
| Range | 3 | 3 |
| Minimum | 1 | 1 |
| Maximum | 4 | 4 |
| Sum | 80 | 94 |

Table 4.3 Frequency Distribution Pre-Test of Grammar
GRAMMAR

|  | Frequency | Percent | Valid <br> Percent | Cumulative <br> Percent |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid 1 | 6 | 17.6 | 17.6 | 17.6 |
| 2 | 14 | 41.2 | 41.2 | 58.8 |
| 3 | 10 | 29.4 | 29.4 | 88.2 |
| 4 | 4 | 11.8 | 11.8 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 34 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Based on the table 4.3 , it showed the numbers that describe the categorization of Grammar based on frequency distribution by considering on qualification of the scoring rubric. There were 6 students (17.6\%) getting 1 score, 14 students ( $41.2 \%$ ) getting 2 score, 10 students (29.4\%) getting 3 score, 4 students (11.8\%) getting 4 score.

Table 4.4 Frequency Distribution Pre-Test of Vocabulary
VOCABULARY

|  | Frequency | Percent | Valid <br> Percent | Cumulative <br> Percent |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid 1 | 4 | 11.8 | 11.8 | 11.8 |
| 2 | 8 | 23.5 | 23.5 | 35.3 |
| 3 | 14 | 41.2 | 41.2 | 76.5 |
| 4 | 8 | 23.5 | 23.5 | 100.0 |
| Total | 34 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Based on the table 4.4, it showed the numbers that described the categorization of Vocabulary based on frequency distribution by considering on qualification of the scoring rubric. There were 4 students (11.8\%) getting 1 score, 8 students ( $23.5 \%$ ) getting 2 score, 14 students (41.2\%) getting 3 score, 8 students ( $23.5 \%$ ) getting 4 score.

## 2. The Students' Grammar and Vocabulary Score After Being Taught by

## Using Scaffolding Technique

In this part of this chapter, the researcher wanted to know the students' score after being taught by using scaffolding technique especially in grammar and vocabulary mastery. The reseracher allocated the time about 50 minut to finish post-test. The post test was conducted on the purpose on knowing the
basic competence of the students after the students get the treatment process.

Table 4.5 The Descriptive Post - Test of Grammar and Vocabulary

| Statistics |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | GRAMMAR | VOCABULARY |
| N Valid | 34 | 34 |
| Missing | 0 | 0 |
| Mean | 3.03 | 3.38 |
| Median | 3.00 | 4.00 |
| Mode | 3 | 4 |
| Std. Deviation | . 904 | . 853 |
| Variance | . 817 | . 728 |
| Range | 3 | 3 |
| Minimum | 1 | 1 |
| Maximum | 4 | 4 |
| Sum | 103 | 115 |

Table 4.6 Frequency Distribution Post-Test of Grammar

|  | GRAMMAR |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
|  Frequency Percent Valid <br> Percent <br> Valid 1 2 5.9 5.9 <br> Percent    |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 7 | 20.6 | 20.6 | 5.9 |
| 26.5 |  |  |  |  |



Based on the table 4.6, it showed the numbers that described the categorization of Grammar based on frequency distribution by considering on qualification of the scoring rubric. There were 2 students (5.9\%) getting 1 score, 7 students ( $20.6 \%$ ) getting 2 score, 13 students ( $38.2 \%$ ) getting 3 score, 12 students ( $35.3 \%$ ) getting 4 score.

Table 4.7 Frequency Distribution Post-Test of Vocabulary
VOCABULARY

|  | Frequency | Percent | Valid <br> Percent | Cumulative <br> Percent |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid 1 | 1 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 2.9 |
| 2 | 5 | 14.7 | 14.7 | 17.6 |
| 3 | 8 | 23.5 | 23.5 | 41.2 |
| 4 | 20 | 58.8 | 58.8 | 100.0 |
| Total | 34 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Based on the table 4.7, it showed the numbers that described the categorization of Vocabulary based on frequency distribution by considering on qualification of the scoring rubric. There was 1 student ( $2.9 \%$ ) getting 1
score, 5 students ( $14.7 \%$ ) getting 2 score, 8 students ( $23.5 \%$ ) getting 3 score, 20 students (58.8\%) getting 4 score.

## 3. The Combination of Student Scores Before Being Taught by Using Scaffolding Technique (Pre-Test)

In this test, the researcher asked the students to choose one topic from three topic. Each topic has three title that has been prepared and the student wrote the description about what they had choosen. The researcher allocated 50 minutes to finish the post-test. There were 34 students as the sample of this research. The purpose of conducting post-test was intended to know the basic of the students before the students get the treatment.

Table 4.8 The Combination of students score (Pre-Test)

## Statistics

PRE-TEST

| N Valid | 34 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Missing | 0 |
| Mean | 5.09 |
| Median | 5.00 |
| Mode | 5 |
| Std. Deviation | 1.747 |
| Variance | 3.053 |
| Range | 6 |
| Minimum | 2 |
| Maximum | 8 |
| Sum | 173 |

Table 4.9 Frequency Distribution of Pre-Test

PRETEST

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative <br> Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | 2 | 2 | 5.9 | 5.9 | 5.9 |
|  | 3 | 5 | 14.7 | 14.7 | 20.6 |
|  | 4 | 6 | 17.6 | 17.6 | 38.2 |
|  | 5 | 8 | 23.5 | 23.5 | 61.8 |
|  | 6 | 5 | 14.7 | 14.7 | 76.5 |
|  | 7 | 4 | 11.8 | 11.8 | 88.2 |
|  | 8 | 4 | 11.8 | 11.8 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 34 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Based on the table 4.8 , consist of 34 students. It was clearly showed that the mean score was 5.09 and the median score was 5.00 and the mode score was 5. In addition, the minimum score was 2 the maximum score was 8 . Then the frequency of pre-test after being distributed there were 2 students (5.9\%) getting 2 score, 5 students ( $14.7 \%$ ) getting 3 score, 6 students (17.6\%) getting 4 score, 8 students ( $23.5 \%$ ) getting 5 score, 5 students (14.7\%) getting 6 score, 4 students (11.8\%) getting 7 score, and 4 students (11.8\%) getting 8 score.

After knowing the result of pre-test, the researcher gave the treatment or taught the students using scaffolding technique on the purpose on testing wether or not this technique is effective. In the last, the researcher administered the posttest to know the differences on students' scores or achievement after giving the treatment.

## 4. The Combination of Student Scores After Being Taught by Using Scaffolding Technique (Post-Test)

In this test, the researcher asked the students to choose one topic from three topic. Each topic has three title that has been prepared and the student wrote the description about what they had choosen. The researcher allocated 50 minutes to finish the post-test. There were 34 students as the sample of this research. The purpose of conducting post-test was intended to know the basic of the students before the students get the treatment.

## Table 4.10 The Descriptive Statistic of Post-Test Scores

## Statistics

POSTTEST

| $\mathrm{N} \quad$Valid <br>  <br> Missing | 34 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Mean | 0 |
| Median | 6.41 |
| Mode | 7.00 |
| Std. Deviation | 8 |
| Variance | 1.654 |
| Range | 2.734 |
| Minimum | 5 |
| Maximum | 3 |

Table 4.11 Frequency Distribution of Post-Test
POSTTEST

|  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative <br> Percent |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid 3 | 3 | 8.8 | 8.8 | 8.8 |
|  | 4 | 2 | 5.9 | 5.9 |

Based on the table 4.10, the sample consited of 34 students. It showsed that the mean score was 6.41 , the median score was 7.00 and the mode score was 8 . In addition, the minimum score was 3 and the maximum score was 8 . Then the frequency of post-test after distributed there are 3 students ( $8.8 \%$ ) getting 3 score, 2 students ( $5.9 \%$ ) getting 4 score, 5 students ( $14.7 \%$ ) getting 5 score, 4 students (11.8\%) getting 6 score, 8 students ( $23.5 \%$ ) getting 7 score, and 12 students (35.5\%) getting 8 score.

## B. The Result of Normality and Homogeneity

In this sub chapter, the researcher presented the result of pre-test and post-test that had been administered before and after treatment. The researcher wanted to know the result of normality and homogeneity testing by using SPSS 16.0. It is
used to check wether the the data has been normal contributed or not. Meanwhile, homogeneity testing was used to make sure whether the sample of data is homogen or heterogen. By knowing the result of both testing, the researcher was able to decide what appropriate hypothesis testing type that was needed to be used.

To know the effectiveness of scaffolding technique towards students writing in descriptive text, the data were collected from students' score in pre-test and post-test, and those data would be analysed by T-test computation. If the result of significant value was lower than level of significance level 0.05 ,the null hypothesis would be rejected and alternative hypothesis would be accepted. It indicated that scaffolding technique was effective towards students skill in writing descriptive text. By contrast, if significant value was higher than the level of significance level 0.05 , the alternative hypothesis would be rejected and the null hypothesis was accepted. It indicating that scaffolding technique was not effective towards students skill in writing descriptive text.

## 1. The Result of Normality Testing

Normality testing was conducted to know whether the data distribution was normal or not. The result can be seen below:

Table 4.12 Normality Result
One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

|  |  | PRETEST | POSTTEST |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| N |  | 34 | 34 |
| Normal Parameters $^{\text {a,b }}$ | Mean | 50.8824 | 64.1176 |
|  | Std. Deviation | 17.47165 | 16.53603 |
| Most Extreme Differences | Absolute | .138 | .227 |
|  | Positive | .138 | .168 |
|  | Negative | -.098 | -.227 |
| Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z |  | .803 | 1.325 |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .539 | .060 |

a. Test distribution is Normal.

From the table 4.12, it was known that the significance value (2-tailed) of pre-test was 0.539 , it is bigger than 0.050 . Then for the post-test score 0.060 . The data distribution of pre-test and post-test also normal. It also that Ho is accepted.

## 2. The Result of Homogeneity Testing

Homogeneity testing conducted to know whether or not the data has been normal distributed. The purpose of this testing is toknow whether the data includesto homogeneous or heterogeneous data. The researcher used Test
of Homogeneity of variances with SPSS by the value of significance $(\alpha)=$ 0.05 . The result can be seen below:

## Table 4.13 Homogenity Result

## Test of Homogeneity of Variances

| Levene <br> Statistic | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1.143 | 6 | 27 | .365 |

a. $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ : Data is Homogeneous
b. $\mathrm{H}_{1}$ : Data is Homogeneous

The standard significant of education is $0.05(\alpha=5 \%)$. Based on the output from SPSS above is known that the test called homogeneous if the significant score more than 0.05 . According to the table above, the test is homogen because $0.365>0.05$ and it means that $H_{0}$ is accepted and $H_{1}$ is rejected. So, it can be conclude that students' of seventh B has homogeny of variances.

Table 4.14 The result of Students' Score in Pre-Test and Post-Test

| No | Students' | Pre-Test |  |  |  | Post-Test |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Scoined |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Grammar | Vocab | Total | Grammar | Vocab | Total | Score |
| 1 | SWC | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 5 |
| 2 | LF | 4 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 8 |
| 3 | MDA | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 4 | MFZ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 5 |
| 5 | MEZ | 3 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 6 |


| 6 | TN | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7 | NT | 2 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 5 |
| 8 | AP | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 10 |
| 9 | DMAZ | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 8 |
| 10 | SBF | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 11 |
| 11 | AWAY | 2 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 8 |
| 12 | FAR | 2 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 4 |
| 13 | MHAN | 2 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 5 |
| 14 | RKA | 3 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 3 |
| 15 | LGS | 3 | 4 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 3 |
| 16 | MDM | 3 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 2 |
| 17 | MZNA | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 6 |
| 18 | LAS | 4 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 1 |
| 19 | NFLA | 3 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 8 |
| 20 | FIP | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 7 |
| 21 | AD | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 6 |
| 22 | ASP | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 9 |
| 23 | MSF | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 8 |
| 24 | HNAS | 2 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 4 |
| 25 | VAN | 3 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 4 |
| 26 | MFM | 3 | 4 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 4 |
| 27 | MYSR | 3 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 5 |
| 28 | IPNH | 4 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 1 |
| 29 | FSE | 3 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 2 |
| 30 | GR | 4 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 1 |
| 31 | DW | 2 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 4 |
| 32 | FPA | 3 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 3 |
| 33 | ANAS | 2 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 5 |


| 34 | AVNS | 2 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 70 | 5 |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | 80 | 94 | 173 | 103 | 115 | 281 | 187 |

Table 4.15 Paired Sample Statistics
Paired Samples Statistics

|  | Mean | N | Std. <br> Deviation | Std. Error <br> Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pair 1 PRETEST | 5.09 | 34 | 1.747 | . 300 |
| POSTTEST | 8.26 | 34 | 11.032 | 1.892 |

The table above showed that the mean score of pre-test was 5.09 and the post-test was 8.26 . Meanwhile, the standard deviation for pre-test was 1.747 and post-test was 11.032

Table 4.16 Paired Sample Test
Paired Samples Test

|  | Paired Differences |  |  |  |  | t | df | Sig. (2- <br> tailed) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mean | Std. <br> Deviation | Std. Error <br> Mean | 95\% <br> Confidence Interval of the Difference |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Lower | Upper |  |  |  |
| Pair 1 PRETEST POSTTEST | -1.324 | 1.492 | . 256 | -1.844 | -. 803 | -5.173 | 33 | . 000 |

Based on the table 4.15, the data presented are the performance scores of the one group students who were taught before and after using Scaffolding Technique towards students skill in writing descriptive text. The output of
paired sample statistics shows that there are mean scores differences between pretest and posttest. The mean score of pretest was 5.09 and the mean score of posttest was 8.26 . Then, the mean score of post-test is higher than the mean score of pretest. It means that Scaffolding Technique towards students skill in writing descriptive text can increase the score of reading comprehension. the number of students of each sample (N) is 34 students. Standard deviation of pretest is 1.747 and post-test was 11.032. Meanwhile, mean standard error for pretest is 0.300 and mean standard error for posttest is 1.892 . It can be conclude that there was the significant different of the students' score between pretest and posttest.

Given that the present test is one-tailed test, so, the Sig. (2-tailed) or $p$ value 0.000 is divided by two $0.000 / 2=0$ and the significance level is 0.05 .

The table 4.16 shows that the $p$ value is 0.000 was less than 0.05 (0.000-0.05). It means that the null hypothesis is rejected. It automatically accept the alternative hypothesis saying that the mean after the treatment is bigger than the or before the treatment. It could be concluded that the used of Scaffolding Technique is effective towards students' skill in writing descriptive text.

## C. Hypothesis Testing

The hypothesis Testing of this study were as follow:

1. $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ : the students' score of writing descriptive text after being taught by using Scaffolding Technique is smaller than or equal to the students' score of writing descriprive text before being taught by using Scaffolding Technique.
2. $H_{a}$ : the students' score of writing descriptive text after being taught by using Scaffolding Technique is bigger than the students' score of writing descriptive text before being taught by using scaffolding technique.

Based on the table 4.15 above, the significant value of this research is 0.000 , standard significant level is 0.050 . It significant value is smaller than significant level ( $0.000<0.050$ ). The interpretation can be concluded by saying "there is significant different of the students score before and after being taught by using Scaffolding Technique in writing descriptive text". In other word, the alternative hypothesis $\left(\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{a}}\right)$ is accepted and the null hypothesis $\left(\mathrm{H}_{0}\right)$ is rejected. According to that evidence, it can answer the research problem or question that there is significant difference on students' writing descriptive text achievement before and after being taught by using Scaffolding Technique to seventh grade student at SMP Negeri 1 Sumbergempol.

## D. Discussion

In this last part of the chapter, the researcher would fully reviewed the result of this research dealing with the finding up to the hypothesis testing. The
researcher conducted the research by using one sample of population. It is seventh grade B students of SMP Negeri 1 Sumbergempol. The number of the students are 34 . Here the researcher used three steps to fo this treatment. The first step is pre-test, pre-test used to know the students' knowledge about descriptive text before being taught by using scaffolding technique. The second step is treatment. In this treatment the researcher apply their teachnique in teaching descriptive text. The treatment was conducted in three meting. The last step is post-test, in this post-test is the result of applying the scaffolding technique in teaching writing descriptive text.

Now, the researcher wanted to reviewed the result this research, about the data what the researcher known. According to previous study that was found by a researcher from Yulis Yasinta (UIN Syarief Hidayatullah Jakarta 2014) Entitled "The Effectiveness of Using Scaffolding Technique Towards Students Skill In Writing Descriptive Text" The researcher used quantitative research (A Quasy Experimental design) as the research design. Using scaffolding techniques in writing descriptive text is effective. In this research, the signiticant effect was proved by the students' post-test mean score (77.02) of the experimental class which was treated by scaffolding techniques which was greater than the post-test mean score (73.79) of the controlled class which was not treated by scaffolding teciniques. The result of statistical hypothesis test on the level of significance 5\% found that $t_{\text {value }}$ was 3.837 while $t_{\text {table }}$ was 2,021 or $t_{\text {value }}>t_{\text {table }}$. Thus, the $H_{0}$ (Null Hypothesis) was rejected and the $\mathrm{H}_{1}$ (Alternative Hypotiesis) was accepted. In the
other word, it means that there was a positive effecet of using seaffolding techniques toward studentst skill in writing descriptive text B.

Previous study that was found by a resarcher from journal by Tiara Maria Dewi and Yuseva Ariyani Iswandari entitled "The Implementation of Scaffolding in Writing Recount Texts in SMP Joannes Bosco Yogyakarta". In this research the researcher used qualitative research. There are three benefits after the implementation of scaffolding. The benefits are challenging students through deep learning and discovery, engaging students in meaningful and dynamic discussions in the small and the large classes, and motivating learners to become better students. In conclusion, scaffolding benefits the students. This research proves that scaffolding gives benefits for learning writing a recount text. The writers suggest that teachers can use scaffolding as one of their techniques in teaching writing for students. It does not only able to help the students, but it is interesting for them. because it is a new thing for them. Scaffolding does not only need seniors as the ones who scaffold. It can also be done by the students' friends. Therefore, it is also suggested that scaffolding among students is also implemented.

Another previous study from journal by Tiara Maria Dewi and Yuseva Ariyani Iswandari entitled "The Implementation of Scaffolding in Writing Recount Texts in SMP Joannes Bosco Yogyakarta". In this research the researcher used quantitative research, the researcher applied quasi-experimental research with nonrandomized control group design. The researcher would analyse about the statistical of pre-test in Independent Sample T-Test revealed that the
significance values were $\mathrm{t}_{\text {count }}=-0.140<\mathrm{t}_{\text {table }}=-1.69092, \mathrm{p}=0.890$, where $\alpha<$ 0.05. It indicated that there was no significant difference between the experimental group and the control group since $t_{\text {count }}$ was lower than $t_{\text {table }}$. Besides, the $\mathrm{F}_{\text {value }}=1.809$ and significance value $\mathrm{p}=.188$ were higher than $\alpha=$ 0.05. Then, after conducting the treatment to the experimental groups, the researcher gave posttest to the experimental group and the control group. Then the scores of posttest from both groups were analyzed using Independent Sample TTest. The results of analysis indicated that the obtained significance value $\mathrm{t}_{\text {count }}=$ 2.318 was higher than $\mathrm{t}_{\text {table }}=1.69092$ with $\mathrm{df}=34, \mathrm{p}=0.027<\alpha=0.05$. From the statement of the researcher, this research indicate that scaffolding techniques significantly affect students' writing achievement. Therefore, the alternative hypothesis stating the students who are taught using scaffolding techniques have better score in writing achievement than the students who are taught without using scaffolding techniques is accepted.

Now, the researcher want to reviewed the result this research, about the data what the researcher known. To know the result of this research whether this technique is effective or not, the researcher used pre-test and post-test then the compute both of the test into spss 16.0. As the requirement of hypothesis, if the significant value is smaller than significant level (0.050), it means that the alternative hypothesis $\left(\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{a}}\right)$ is accepted and the null hypothesis $\left(\mathrm{H}_{0}\right)$ is rejected. It can be said that there is significant difference score on the students' writing adescriptive text before and after being taught by using scaffolding technique. In
fact based on the table of paired sample $t$-test, the result shows that the number of significant value is 0.000 at significant level is 0.050 . It means that there is a significant difference between pre-test and post-test. The difference can be seen deeply in the result of pre-test and post-test scores below:

## 1. The Students' Grammar and Vocabulary Score Before Being Taught By Using Scaffolding Technique

The first meeting the reasearcher was administering pre-test. It was done before a treatment at process that was teaching descriptive text by using scaffolding technique was being conducted. It was given to the students to know the students' description of grammar and vocabulary mastery by administering pre-test. The pretest was given to the seven class consisted of 34 students. The pre-test contained 3 themes. The result showed that the mean of Grammar 2.35 and Vocabulary 2.76.

## 2. The Students' Grammar and Vocabulary Scores After Being Taught

## By Using Scaffolding Technique

The first meeting the reasearcher was do post-test. It was done after a treatment at process that was teaching descriptive text by using scaffolding technique was being conducted. It was given to the students to know the students' description of grammar and vocabulary mastery by administering post-test. The post-test was given to the seven B class consisted of 34 students. The post-test contained 3 topic. Every topic it has three title that has been prepared and the next the student wrote the
description about what they choosen. The result showed that the mean of Grammar 3.03 and Vocabulary 3.38.

Based on Pre-test and Post-test that has been explained by the researcher, the researcher conclude that the grammar and vocabulary in pre test and post test there are any significant differences.

After know the componen of Grammar and Vocabullary in pre-test and posttest, overall the researcher want to explain this research. Based on this data, the mean of pre-test 5.09 becomes 6.41 in post-test. The increasing score above related with the benefit using scaffolding technique on writing. From this result it can answer the research objective, that it is scaffolding technique effective in teaching writing descriptive text at the seventh grade of SMP Negeri 1 Sumbergempol? It means that there is significant different on the student acievement in narrative writing skill before and after by using scaffolding technique because the value of post-test more higher that pre-test. Here the advantages of using scaffolding in writing. From the students the advantages are: 1. Challenging but reasonable tasks that stimulate thingking and motivate efforts to learn, 2. Meaningful instruction and feedback that helps drive further development at an appropriate pace, 3. A learning environment where they are valued as individuals, a collaborative group, and a class, 4. A learning environment where their creativity and thought processes are acknowledged and accepted. From the teacher are : 1. Identify and use areas of strenght and weakness to tailor learning experiences at the individual and group level, 2. Engage students in social interactions to enable learning, 3. Better understand
students as individual learners, learners in a small group setting and learners in a larger social setting, 4. Discover unique thought processes that different students may use to solve problem.

Finally, from the previous study and what the researcher found, it can be said that the Scaffolding Technique gives positive effect to the student' writing ability, especially in this research in descriptive text. It was evidenced from the score before and after being taught by using scaffolding technique. This statement was supported by Wood et al (1976:19) used the term scaffolding to refer to the instructionally supportive activities and social interactions that occur between the child and other individuals as they guide effective learning and development in the ZPD. It can be said that teaching writing descriptive text using scaffolding technique is effective towards students skill in SMP Negeri 1 Sumbergempol.

