

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF REWRITING TECHNIQUE IN TEACHING DESCRIPTIVE TEXT

⁽¹⁾*M. Hudri*, ⁽²⁾*Mardiah*

⁽³⁾ *Lecturer of English Department University of Muhammadiyah Mataram*

⁽⁴⁾ *Student's of English Department University of Muhammadiyah Mataram*

Abstract

The objective of this research was to observe the effectiveness of using paraphrasing technique in academic writing course at sixth semester of Muhammadiyah University of Mataram in Academic Year 2014/2015. The method used in this research was quantitative method namely quasi experimental design. The number of population of this research was 43 students. The writer took 43 students as the sample and divided into two classes namely class VI.A-VI.B which consist of 23 students as an experimental class that showed their English ability in paraphrasing technique and the second class B which consist of 20 students as a control class that showed their English in summarizing technique. The writer here employed t-test to obtain the data. The tests were pre-test and post-test. Pre-test was given in the first meeting; the aim was to know the student's ability in paraphrasing technique. Then, post-test was given after students got treatment for 6 meetings for each class. After collecting and computing the data, the writer found that class A obtained higher score than class B. The mean score of class VI.A (experimental) was 9.95 while for class VI.B (control) was 6.2. The standard of deviation of the class was computed by using t-test. T-test was 5.95; the critical value was higher than t-table. The t-table was 2.021 at the confidence level of 0.05 (95%) and 2.704 at the confidence level of 0.01 (99%). The consultation of t-test to t-table were found that the t-test is $5.95 > t\text{-table } 2.021$ (95%) and $t\text{-test } 5.95 > t\text{-table } 2.704$ (99%). It means that the alternative hypothesis is accepted and null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, the rewriting technique is effective in teaching descriptive text at the sixth semester of Muhammadiyah University of Mataram in academic year 2014/2015.

Key words: *Effectiveness, Descriptive Text, Rewriting*

INTRODUCTION

Writing is one of the language skills that should be mastered by Indonesian students in learning English. Among the four skills of English, students find that writing is the most difficult skill to be mastered. Many students have difficulty in writing especially to improve ideas, recasting ideas in writing, arranging the precise vocabulary, arranging the sentence and the precise subordinating to connect sentence by sentence. As Nunan (2003:88) states that

writing is the process of thinking to invent ideas, thinking about how to express into good writing, and arranging the ideas into statement and paragraph clearly. It indicates that the learners are expected to explore the ideas and make them into good writing.

Moreover, Irwin (1991) acknowledges that writing is defined as a transaction between writers and the text in a specific context, and it can create in the creation of a new text in the mind of the writers.

Based on the writer's experience in fourth semester students of Muhammadiyah University of Mataram, numerous students have problems in grasping writing subject, because it was not easy for students to write and to understand what they write in English well, especially in connecting ideas, insight, and to know the correct forms of language, writing accurately involves spelling correctly, forming letters correctly, writing legibly, punctuating correctly, using correct layouts, choosing the right vocabulary, using grammar correctly, joining sentences correctly and using paragraphs correctly. Accordingly, the writer attempted to employ rewriting technique in teaching descriptive text at the sixth semester to know the effectiveness of this technique in this research.

However, there are many techniques that can be used to help students generate ideas and gather details for their descriptive text writing. In writing process, rewriting technique can be a solution to solve the students' difficulties in writing descriptive text, because rewriting technique plays an important role in restating other ideas, meaning and information in our own words. According to Hastings (2002) rewrite is a technique of providing feedback on written work to second language students. Its purpose is to promote the acquisition of high-intermediate proficiency in the written language. Rewriting is to write something such as a book or speech again, in order to improve or change it because new information is available (Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary).

The study of using rewriting technique had been conducted by a few researchers. The first study was conducted by Rahmanil Fitri (2013) entitled "The Effect of Rewriting Technique toward Students' Writing Descriptive Paragraphs Ability at the Eleventh Grade of Islamic Boarding School Darun Nahdhah Thawalib Bangkinang Kampar Regency. The research was a quasi-experimental research. It was used in order to collect data of students' writing ability in descriptive paragraphs. The writing test was scored by two raters. The technique of data analysis used Independent Sample T-test formula in order to find out the significant effect of students' mean score between experimental class and control class by using SPSS 17.0 version. It can be seen from $t_0 = 3.002$ is higher than T table either at significant level of 5% = 2.01 or significant level of 1% = 2.68. We can read $2.01 < 3.002 > 2.68$. It H_0 was rejected and means H_a was accepted. So, it can be concluded that there was a significant difference on the ability in writing descriptive paragraphs those who were taught by using rewriting technique and those who were not. In other words, there was a significant effect of rewriting technique to improve the ability on students' writing descriptive paragraphs ability at the eleventh grade of Islamic Boarding School Daarun Nahdhah Thawalib Bangkinang Kampar Regency.

The second study was conducted by Ika Kurniawati Khasanah (2013) entitled “The Use of Rewriting Technique in Implementing Think-Pair-Share technique to improve the students’ ability to write descriptive text (Classroom Action Research at *SMA Negeri 1 Subah* for Grade X in the Academic Year of 2012/2013). The result of tests showed that after doing the action of cycle one, the students’ ability improved. The average score of the cycle one test was 71.68 exceeding the standard score criteria of 70.00. To elevate the students’ ability, the researcher did minor revision in the action of cycle two. The students’ average score of the cycle two test was 79.15. In this test the students produced better writing. Their attention to the aspects of good writing was better than the previous tests. Finally, it could be concluded that rewriting technique in implementing think-pair-share technique was good to teach writing descriptive text, and the use of it could improve the students’ ability in writing. Teachers can use it as the alternative technique in teaching writing. It can also give information for readers and become reference for other researchers.

The third study was conducted by Rosyidah (2013) entitled “The Effectiveness of Rewriting Technique in Writing Descriptive Text at MTs N Pulosari in the Academic Year (2012/2013)”. The result showed that the students’ score in writing descriptive text before they are taught using rewriting technique was 5.09. While the students’ score after they are taught using rewriting technique was 74.2. The T_{count} was -6.734. Whereas, the T_{table} with significant level 0.05 was 1.697. So T_{count} was greater than T_{table} . This means that H_a which states that there is significant effect in using rewriting technique in writing descriptive text to the VIII b graders at MTsN Pulosari is accepted. Whereas, H_0 which states that there is no significant effect of using rewriting technique to teach writing descriptive text to VIIIb graders at MTsN Pulosari is rejected. In other words, rewriting technique can be used as an alternative to teach writing descriptive text to the students at junior high school level.

All of the previous studies above showed that rewriting techniques were technique which is effective in teaching reading descriptive text. All of the previous studies investigated the technique at the students at the Junior/Senior High School; they were different from the writer because the writer intended to investigate this technique to the sixth semester of Muhammadiyah University of Mataram in academic year 2014/2015.

Based on the explanation above, in this case, the writer was interested in conducting the research under the title “The Effectiveness of Rewriting Technique in Teaching Descriptive Text at the Sixth Semester of Muhammadiyah University of Mataram in Academic Year 2014/2015”.

This study attempted to answer the following research question: “Is rewriting technique effective in teaching descriptive text at the sixth semester of Muhammadiyah University of Mataram in academic year 2014/2015?”

The purpose of the study was to observe the effectiveness of rewriting technique in teaching descriptive text at the sixth semester of Muhammadiyah University of Mataram in academic year 2014/2015.”

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Descriptive Text

According to Blaylock (2006:1) says that in descriptive text, you are writing about what a person, place, or thing is like. Oometimes you may describe where a place is located. Pardiyono (2006: 163) says that descriptive text is about description of something or someone that consist of characteristics, something special, quality and quantity.

Meanwhile, according to Oshima and Hogue (2007: 61) define that descriptive writing appeals to the senses, so it tells how something looks, feels, smells, tastes and For sound. A good description is a word picture; the reader can imagine the object, place, or person in his or her mind. It can be used as technique to enrich other form of writing or as a technique to enrich other form of writing or as a dominant strategy for developing picture “how and what it looks like:”

From the definition of descriptive text above, it can be concluded that descriptive text is the text that has a purpose to describe a person, place or thing that tells how something looks, feels, smells, tastes and for sound, so the reader is able to imagine the object that is described in descriptive text. it is factual types of text which consists of generic structure and lexico-grammatical.

Rewriting Technique

Serbanuta, (2011: 4) rewriting is an intuitive which specifies the evolution of a system by matching and replacing parts of the system state according to rewrite rules. Besides being formal, it is also executable, by simply repeating the process of rewriting the state. Additionally, an initial state together with a set of rules defines both an execution of the system (if remembering only one state at a time), or a transition system which can be explored and model checked for safety properties. Meanwhile, according to Zinsser (2001), rewriting is the essence of writing well—where the game is won or lost.

Furthermore, Hastings (2002) reveals that rewriting is a technique of providing feedback on written work to second language students. Moreover, rewriting is to write something such as a book or speech again, in order to improve or change it because new information is available.

From the statement above, the writer concluded that rewriting technique is a collection of papers dealing with the construction of canonical rewrite systems, constraint handling in logic programming, and completion algorithms for conditional rewriting systems.

The Procedures of Rewriting

According to Hughes, (2011) there are a few procedures which distinctly identified in rewriting texts or sentences among others:

1. Synonyms

It is the easiest way to rewrite an article and choose some words and replace them with words of equivalent meaning. That is actually how an article spinning software works at the very basic level. The problem with that software is

that they don't understand the context at hand and hence wrongfully choose synonyms that make the sentence no longer comprehensible.

2. Active to Passive Voice

The sentences take the form of either the active voice (the subject is the doer of the action) or the passive voice (the subject is the receiver of the action).

3. Affirmative to Negative Sentences

To explain it briefly, negative sentences have a "not" or "no" in their sentence and therefore indicate negative response or tone. The absence of any of these two gives sentences a positive tone.

4. Object to Subject

Similar to the conversion from one voice to another, another rewriting technique is done by making the object in the sentence as the subject or the other way around.

5. Quotations to Direct Statements

Sentences which are written in dialogue form (quotations) can be transformed into direct statements.

6. Anecdotes and Experiences

When the required material is not restricted to a formal tone, you can add personal experiences to your writing. Similar to examples, you can elongate your article by relating your own life with what has been previously written.

7. Repetition

Repeating a sentence is done to add emphasis to an idea or to remind readers with such. Conclusions in some composition are merely reiteration of previously mentioned ideas but may add something more. Repetition must not be abused that the same keywords or phrases appears within a few sentences.

8. Restructuring

Some plagiarism checking software takes note of the arrangement of words. When rewriting, it is recommended to rearrange placement of examples, reasons, and the like to illustrate the point.

METHOD

In this research, the writer employed a quasi-experimental design nonequivalent control group design because the writer did not take the sample of both classes through randomization. Therefore, the data was collected based on the result of pre-test and post-test for each class, namely: Experimental class and control class. The experimental class was a class taught by using rewriting technique and the control class was a class that used another method. The writer attempted to test the causal effect between two variables. So, in this study, the researcher focused on the effectiveness of rewriting technique in teaching descriptive text at the sixth semester of Muhammadiyah University of Mataram.

Therefore, the data from the pre-test and post-test were compared to the t-test calculation to investigate the effectiveness of rewriting technique and application in this research.

The population of this research was taken from the sixth semester students of English Department at Muhammadiyah University of Mataram in Academic Year 2014-2015. They consist of 2 (two) classes, namely class VI.A and class VI.B that consist of 43 (forty three) students. In this study, the writer used cluster sampling to determine the experimental class and control class. In which the experimental class, was class VI.A consisted of 23 students and control class was class VI.B consisted of 20 students.

This research used writing text as instrument. In the test, the students rewrite a text. The highest score was 100. Furthermore, to obtain student's score, the writer used a scoring rubric as suggested by Jacobs et al. (1981) which involve content, organization, vocabulary, languageuse, and mechanics. Technique of collecting data in this research was pre-test and post-test.

After obtaining scores of the both classes, the writer processed the data scores with the following steps: calculating the mean and deviation of experimental group and control group. After obtaining those scores, it comes to compute of formula coefficient of the two mean score, whether it was significant or not.

RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION

Findings

Before the writer gave treatment or teaching and learning activities, the writer gave a pre-test for two classes. It was followed by 43 students, 23 students as experimental class and 20 students as control class. The writer provided 40 minutes for pre-test. The result of pre-test for experimental class and control class as followed:

Table 01. The Result of Pre-test for Experimental Class

No	Name	Component's score					Score
		C	O	V	LU	M	
1.	Hurniatun	30	20	10	10	4	74
2	Eli hermawati	25	20	10	10	5	70
3	M. Sahril	25	20	14	15	4	78
4	Nurhayati	25	15	13	12	4	69
5	Ipan susanto	25	17	14	15	4	76
6	Fitri Andriani	25	15	10	15	4	69
7	Dewi Safarwati F	25	20	15	15	5	80
8	Hambali	20	13	10	10	3	56
9	Hamzan Yadi	20	13	10	10	3	56
10	Indra Ayu R	20	20	14	13	3	70
11	Kurnia Harisanti	20	15	13	10	3	61
12	Nuni Yuriani	25	15	13	13	4	70

13	Juhari	20	15	13	12	3	63
14	Mukjizat Lailatul Q	22	15	15	14	4	70
15	Mariana Ulfa	25	20	13	15	5	78
16	Merlin Arisanti	25	20	10	14	4	73
17	Nirwana	20	15	13	13	3	64
18	Niskayanti	22	15	13	10	3	63
19	Nur Rahma	20	15	13	11	4	63
20	Darul Aqsha	20	15	13	10	3	58
21	Mahrati Imaniar	20	15	10	10	4	59
22	Neti Andriani	15	15	10	10	4	54
23	Yeni Andriani	15	15	10	10	4	54
	Total						1528

Table 02. The Result of Pre-test for Control Class

No	Name	Component's score					Score
		C	O	V	LU	M	
1.	Asma Ul Husna	13	7	9	9	4	42
2	Suhada	17	15	10	10	3	55
3	Rahmat Hidayatul A	20	15	10	12	3	60
4	Rahmawati	20	13	9	10	3	55
5	Rosalia	20	15	13	10	3	56
6	Yuli Ismiati	20	12	10	10	3	55
7	Sakinah	15	10	9	9	3	46
8	Evi Yasa Esi Noari	15	15	10	11	4	55
9	Rumedan	15	10	10	10	3	48
10	Romi Khairul Abadi	20	12	10	10	3	55
11	Wiliandus	20	15	15	13	3	66
12	Saporniati	15	10	15	12	3	55
13	Reni Puji Astuti	13	10	7	7	2	49
14	Suharti	13	10	9	6	3	41
15	Buyung Ardiansyah	20	13	10	10	3	56
16	Sri Niningsih	17	13	10	10	2	52
17	Rahma	17	13	10	10	2	52
18	Yayu Puspitasari	15	8	9	10	2	44
19	Riska Apriliana	20	10	10	15	3	58
20	Yuli Ismiati	17	9	10	10	3	49
	Total						1057

Post Test Result Analysis

Table 03. The Result of Post-test for Experimental Class

No	Name	Component's score					Score
		C	O	V	LU	M	
1.	Hurniatun	30	20	15	10	4	79
2	Eli hermawati	25	20	15	10	4	74
3	M. Sahril	30	20	20	15	5	90
4	Nurhayati	25	17	15	13	3	73
5	Ipan susanto	30	20	15	15	3	83
6	Fitri Andriani	30	20	15	10	4	79
7	Dewi Safarwati F	30	17	17	15	4	83
8	Hambali	20	13	15	10	3	61
9	Hamzan Yadi	25	15	13	10	3	66
10	Indra Ayu R	30	17	15	13	4	79
11	Kurnia Harisanti	25	15	14	12	4	70
12	Nuni Yuriani	25	20	15	15	3	78
13	Juhari	20	15	20	13	3	71
14	Mukjizat Lailatul Q	30	20	15	15	4	84

15	Mariana Ulfa	25	20	20	13	4	82
16	Merlin Arisanti	25	20	15	15	4	79
17	Nirwana	25	20	17	13	3	78
18	Niskayanti	25	20	15	14	3	77
19	Nur Rahma	25	18	20	10	4	77
20	Darul Aqsha	20	15	18	13	3	69
21	Mahrati Imaniar	20	17	15	13	4	69
22	Neti Andriani	21	17	10	10	3	61
23	Yeni Andriani	20	15	15	10	3	63
	Total						1725

Table 04. The Result of Post-test for Control Class

No	Name	Component's score					Score
		C	O	V	LU	M	
1.	Asma Ul Husna	15	15	10	9	3	52
2	Suhada	20	12	10	12	3	57
3	Rahmat Hidayatul A	25	20	10	12	3	70
4	Rahmawati	20	13	14	10	3	60
5	Rosalia	22	20	10	10	3	65
6	Yuli Ismiati	20	12	11	12	3	58
7	Sakinah	20	13	10	9	3	55
8	Evi Yasa Esi Noari	20	13	13	10	3	59
9	Rumedan	20	10	10	10	3	53
10	Romi Khairul Abadi	20	13	15	10	3	61
11	Wiliandus	25	20	15	12	3	70
12	Sapornati	20	20	13	10	3	66
13	Reni Puji Astuti	20	15	15	9	3	62
14	Suharti	20	20	10	9	3	62
15	Buyung Ardiansyah	20	13	15	10	3	61
16	Sri Niningsih	17	15	15	10	2	59
17	Rahma	17	13	15	10	3	58
18	Yayu Puspitasari	20	12	15	10	3	60
19	Riska Apriliana	20	10	13	15	3	61
20	Yuli Ismiati	17	15	10	10	3	55
	Total						1204

In the process of analyzing the data, the writer firstly computed the deviation scores of pre-test and post-test of individual sample for each class, and then followed by the computation of mean scores of the sample classes. The two mean scores were then compared by employing the formula which previously asserted.

The Computation of the Mean Scores

In analyzing the data from the test, the score of pre-test and post-test of two classes could be seen in the following tables.

Table 05. The students' pre-test and post-test score of experimental Class

Experimental Class			
No	Name	Pre-test (O_1)	Post-test (O_2)
1.	Hurniatun	74	79
2	Eli Hermawati	70	74
3	m.sahril	78	90
4	Nurhayati	69	73
5	Ipan Susanto	76	83

6	Fitri Andriani	69	79
7	Dewi Safarwati F	80	83
8	Hambali	56	61
9	Hamzan Yadi	56	66
10	Indra Ayu R	70	79
11	Kurnia Harisanti	61	70
12	Nuni Yuriani	70	78
13	Juhari	63	71
14	Mukjizat lailatul Qodri	70	84
15	Mariana Ulfa	78	83
16	Merlin Arisanti	73	79
17	Nirwana	64	78
18	Niskayanti	63	77
19	Nur Rahmah	63	77
20	Darul Aqsha	58	69
21	Mahrati Imaniar	59	69
22	Neti Andriani	54	61
23	Yeni Andriani	50	63
N= 23	Σ	1526	1726

Table 06. The Students' Pre-test and Post-test Score of Control Class

Control Class			
No	Name	Pre-test (O₁)	Post-test (O₂)
1.	Asma ul Husna	42	52
2	Suhada	55	57
3	Rahmat Hidayatul Abror	60	70
4	Rahmawati	55	60
5	Rosalia	56	65
6	Yuli Ismiati	55	58
7	Sakinah	46	55
8	Evi Yasa Esi Noari	55	59
9	Rumedan	48	53
10	Romi Khairul Abadi	55	61
11	Wiliandus	66	70
12	Saporniati	55	66
13	Reni Puji Astuti	49	62
14	Suharti	41	62
15	Buyung Ardiansyah	65	61
16	Sri Niningsih	52	59
17	Rahma	52	58
18	Yayu Puspitasari	44	60
19	Riska Apriliana	58	61
20	Yuli Ismiati	49	55
N= 20	Σ	1047	1204

Table 07 The Table of Computation the Mean score of Experimental Class

No	Name	Pre-test	Post-test	x	x²
1	Hurniatun	74	79	5	25
2	Eli Hermawati	70	74	10	100
3	M. Sahril	78	90	12	144
4	Nurhayati	69	73	4	16
5	Ipan Susanto	76	83	7	49
6	Fitri Andriani	69	79	10	100
7	Dewi Safarwati F	80	83	10	100
8	Hambali	56	61	5	25
9	Hamzan Jadi	56	66	10	100
10	Indara Ayu R	70	79	10	100
11	Kurnia Harisanti	61	70	9	81
12	Nuni Yuriani	70	78	10	100
13	Juhari	63	71	8	64
14	Mukjijat Lailatul	70	84	14	196
15	Mariana ulfa	78	83	5	25
16	Merlin arisanti	73	79	15	225

17	Nirwana	64	78	14	196
18	Niskayanti	63	77	14	196
19	Nur Rahmah	63	77	14	196
20	Darul Aqsha	58	69	11	121
21	Maharani imaniar	59	69	10	100
22	Neti Andriani	54	61	7	49
23	Yeni Andriani	50	63	13	169
N=23	Sum			$\Sigma x = 229$	$\Sigma x^2 = 2292$

Table 08. The Table of Computation the Mean score of Control Class

No	Name	Pre-test	Post-test	y	y ²
1.	Asma ull H.	42	52	10	100
2	Suhada	55	57	2	4
3	Rahmat H. A	60	70	10	100
4	Rahmawati	55	60	5	25
5	Rosalia	56	65	9	81
6	Yuli Ismiati	55	58	3	9
7	Sakinah	46	55	9	81
8	Evi Yasa E. N	55	59	4	16
9	Rumedan	48	53	5	25
10	Romi K. A	55	61	6	36
11	Wiliandus	66	70	4	16
12	Saporniati	55	66	11	121
13	Reni Puji Astuti	49	62	3	9
14	Suharti	41	62	11	121
15	Buyung A.	56	61	5	25
16	Sri Niningsih	52	59	6	36
17	Rahma	52	58	6	36
18	Yayu P.	44	50	6	36
19	Riska Apriliana	58	61	3	9
20	Yuli Ismiati	49	55	6	36
N= 20	Σ			$\Sigma y = 124$	$\Sigma y^2 = 922$

a. The Mean Scores of the Experimental Class;

$$\text{So, } M_x = \frac{\Sigma x}{N}$$

$$\frac{229}{23} = 9.95$$

b. The Mean Scores of the Control Class;

$$M_y = \frac{\Sigma y}{N}$$

Where:

M_y = the mean score of two classes

Y = the students final score for Control Class

N = the number of sample

Σ = the sum of.....

$$\text{So, } My = \frac{\Sigma y}{N}$$

$$\frac{124}{20} = 6.2$$

The Computation of Standard Deviation

a. The Standard Deviation of Experimental Class;

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma x &= \Sigma x^2 - \frac{(\Sigma x)^2}{N^x} \\ &= 2292 - \frac{(229)^2}{23} \\ &= 2292 - \frac{52441}{23} \\ &= 2292 - 2280.04 = 11.96 \end{aligned}$$

The Standard Deviation of Control Class;

$$\begin{aligned} \text{So, } \Sigma y &= \Sigma y^2 - \frac{(y)^2}{N^y} \\ &= 922 - \frac{(124)^2}{20} \\ &= 922 - \frac{15376}{20} \\ &= 922 - 768.8 \\ &= 153.2 \end{aligned}$$

The Computation of t-test

$$\begin{aligned} t - \text{test} &= \frac{Mx - My}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\Sigma x^2 + \Sigma y^2}{Nx + Ny - 2}\right) \left(\frac{1}{Nx} + \frac{1}{Ny}\right)}} \\ &= \frac{9.95 - 6.2}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{11.96 + 153.2}{23 + 20 - 2}\right) \left(\frac{1}{23} + \frac{1}{20}\right)}} \\ &= \frac{3.75}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{165.16}{41}\right) (0.04 + 0.05)}} \\ &= \frac{3.58}{\sqrt{(4.028)(0.09)}} \\ &= \frac{3.58}{\sqrt{(36.252)}} \end{aligned}$$

$$t = \frac{3.58}{0.60}$$

$$t = 5.96$$

The result of the t-test formula above was 5.96. This figure was also considered as one finding of the research. Finally, this analysis of the data eventually lead to the conclusion of this research that using rewriting technique has significant in

teaching in English Department at the sixth semester of Muhammadiyah University of Mataram.

Discussion

Viewing of the result of data analysis above which showed that the sixth semester students of Muhammadiyah University of Mataram showed some phenomena that the students' still encountered various kind of difficulties in writing.

From 43 (forty three) students at the sixth semester students of Muhammadiyah University of Mataram, the writer took 43 (forty three) students as sample and divided into two classes namely experimental class and control class. The writer gave two tests for the students. Pre-test had given in the first meeting to know students basic knowledge in writing while post-test had given in the last meeting to know the effective of treatment.

The result of this research was experimental class got high score than control class. The mean score of experimental class was 9.95 than control class was 6.2. It showed that the spread of subject's score of experimental class was closed to each other.

After calculating data by using a t-test formula and the result were 5.95. The critical value of t-test was compared to the t-table with the degrees of freedom $df (N_x + N_y - 2) = (23 + 20 - 2) = 41$. The degree of freedom of 41 was at the competence interval of 0.05 (95%) was 2.021 and 0.01 (99%) was 2.704 the comparison was done between t-test formula with t-table in which the result of t-test was 5.95. It was found out that the t-table of "t" indicated $t\text{-test } 5.95 > t\text{-table}$.

Table 4.9. The comparison between the t-test and t-table

t-test		t-table	
	Df	0.05	0.01
5.95	41	2.021	2.704

Based on the data analysis above, it was found that the result of t-test was higher than t-table. It means that alternative hypothesis (H_a) which asserted that there was effective on rewriting technique was accepted, whereas the null hypothesis (H_0) which asserted that there was no effective on rewriting technique was rejected.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Based on the research finding, it can be concluded that the use of rewriting technique in teaching descriptive text is effective. It was proved by the obtained score of t test. The t test showed that t score 5.95 was higher than t table 2.021, it means that H_a (Alternative hypotheses) was accepted and H_0 (Null hypotheses) was rejected. There was a significant difference in the achievement between class VI.A (experimental class) who were taught descriptive text using rewriting technique and class VI.B (control class) who were taught without rewriting

technique. The mean score of experimental class was 9.95.65 than the mean score of control class was 6.2. It meant that experimental class was better than control class.

REFERENCES

- Arikunto, S. (2013). *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktek*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Brown, H.D. (2000). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. (2nd Edition) San Francisco: Addison Wesley Longman Inc.
- Brown, H.D. (2007). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*: Fifth Edition, San Francisco State University.
- Brown, H.D. (2004). *Electric Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*. Harlow: Longman.
- Blaylock, (2006) in Haswell, R.H. (2007). *Testing ESL composition: A Practical Approach*. Newbury House, Rowley, MA.
- Creswell, J.W., (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. Fourth Edition: New York San Francisco: University of Nebraska–Lincoln.
- Cambridge Advanced Learner’s Dictionary. Third Edition
- Fitri, R. (2014). *The Effect of Rewriting Technique toward Students’ Writing Descriptive Paragraphs Ability at the Eleventh Grade of Islamic Boarding School Daarun Nahdhah Thawalib Bangkinang Kampar Regency*. An Unpublished thesis of Faculty of Education and Teacher Training State Islamic University of Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau Pekanbaru.
- Graham, S. & Perin,. (2007). *Writing Next*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education
- Hyland, K. (2004). *Second Language Writing*. New York, Cambridge University Press.
- Harmer, J., (2001). *How to Teach English*. Harlow: Longman
- Harsyaf et al (2009). *Teaching Reading: Better Education through Reformed Management and Universal Teacher Upgrading*: Center for Development and Empowerment of Teachers and Education Personnel.
- Oshimo, A. and Hogue, A. (2007). *Writing Academic English*. 2nd ed. New York: Pearson Education.
- Harmer, J., (2007). *How to Teach Writing*. Pearson Education Limited: Longman.
- Hastings, A. (2002). The Focal Skills Approach: An Assessment. In F. Eckman et al. (eds), *Second Language Acquisition: Theory and Pedagogy*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 29-44.
- Hughes, C. (2011). *Rewriting Techniques as a Unified Model of Concurrent Technical Report SRI-CSL-90-02, SRI International, Computer Science Laboratory, February 2011. Submitted.*

- Irvin, L.L., (2010) in Ilham (2013). *What is Academic Writing: The Academic Writing Task*. Parlor Press
- Jacobs et.al. (1981) in Haswell, R.H. (2007). *Testing ESL composition: A Practical Approach*. Newbury House, Rowley, MA (1981).
- Khasanah, Ika. k.(2013) *The Use of Rewriting Technique in Implementing Think-Pair-Share Technique to Improve the Students' Ability to Write Descriptive Text (Classroom Action Research at SMA Negeri 1 Subah for Grade x in the Academic Year of 2012/2013)*. An unpublished thesis of English Department Faculty of Languages and Arts Semarang State University.
- Lee, J.F & Vanpatten, B. (1995) in Harsyaf et al (2009). *Making Communicative Language Teaching Happen*. USA: McGraw Hill.
- Mardianah, (2014). *The Effectiveness of Using Basic Principles to Improve Students Speaking Ability at the Second Year Students of SMPN 21 Mataram in Academic Year 2014/2015: An Unpublished Proposal of S1 English Education Program Faculty of Teacher Training and Education Muhammadiyah: UMM. Mataram*
- Nunan, D. (2003). *Practical English Language Teaching*. New York. The McGraw-Hill
- Pardiyono (2006) in Suryana, N & Sari, R. K., (2012). *Teaching Writing Descriptive by Using Everybody Write in Junior High School*.
- Parkins, Z. & Yulia, M. (2005) . *Progress: A Contextual Approach to Learning English*. Jakarta: Ganeca Exact.
- Rosyidah, A. (2013) *The Effectiveness of Rewriting Technique in Writing Descriptive Text at MTs N Pulosari in the Academic Year 2012/2013*. An Unpublished thesis of English Educational Program Department of Islamic Education State Islamic College (Stain) Tulungagung.
- Sugiyono, (2014). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung. Alfabeta.
- Serbanuta, T. F. (2011). *A Rewriting Approach to Concurrent Programming Language Design and Semantics*. An Unpublished Dissertation of University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
- Zinsser, W. (2001). *Rewriting and Word Processing: On Writing Well*. 6th ed. New York: HarperCollins.