Using Chain Writing Method to Improve the Students' Skills in Writing Descriptive Texts

Aninda Nur Cahyaningtyas [1] * iD, Slamet Riyadi [2] iD, Mustasyfa Thabib Kariadi [3] iD

[a] Universitas Jenderal Soedirman, Indonesia

[b] Universitas Jenderal Soedirman, Indonesia

[c] Universitas Jenderal Soedirman, Indonesia

KEYWORDS	ABSTRACT
	Chain writing is an active and fun learning by doing activities which enable the students to negotiate and allow them to express their ideas to certain topics with their classmates. This research aimed to (1) figure out the implementation of chain writing method to the students' writing skill, (2) prove whether or not the chain writing method improves the students' writing skill, and (3) reveal that the students' responses to the implementation of chain writing method on students' writing skill. This research uses a quantitative quasi experimental design. The subjects of this research were the seventh-grade students of SMP Muhammadiyah 1 Purwokerto with the research samples of two classes (Grade 7C as the control class and Grade 7D as the experimental class. The research data were collected though observation, tests, and questionnaire. The results showed that (1) the implementation of chain writing method was successful had no serious problems, the teacher's explanation was clear, and the students well understood the explanations. 2) the use of chain writing method improved the students' ability to write descriptive texts+ proven by the students' test results from the pre-test and post-test scores increasing from the mean of pre-test score (40 points from the total score of 1.328) and that of post-test score (70 points from the total score of 1.891). 3) The students gave positive response to the chain writing method proven by 81% of students gave positive response on 8 question items in the research questionnaire. Thus, it can be concluded that chain writing method improved the students' skills in writing descriptive texts. Keywords: Chain Writing, Descriptive Text, Experimental Study

---

* Corresponding author name: Mustasyfa Thabib Kariadi
E-mail address: mtkariadi_pbi@unsoed.ac.id

Introduction

In countries where English is a foreign language, developing English skills is not an easy task. Different language systems and lack of exposure to English may become some reasons for this matter. In Indonesia, the status of English is as a foreign language. It means that English is not used as a medium of instruction at any level but it is only taught as a compulsory subject at the primary until senior high school level(Law Number 32 Year 2013 Article 77k).

Indonesian government begin to use English in every aspect of life, including the educational field since 2003 said National Education Ministry and the Indonesian government has issued of law Number 20 of 2003 on National Education Systems said, "Government and local government carry out at least one education unit in all education level to develop into international standard education unit". The educational government made this policy because Indonesian people of level study has poor English ability proven by the English Proficiency Index (EPI) from Education First Training Organization. EPI looking toward the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) for counting the score. EPI count as the standard score from 2.3 million people in 100 countries in the world and the mean from Indonesian people score is 50.06, and those scores make Indonesia in the 61st rank. English is not a new subject for students at schools. In the last few years, some students learned English since they were at Elementary School, this situation happen because the Indonesian government issued law Number 32 2013 clause 77k stating that English is a compulsory subject from Elementary School? The obligation of learning English is also written in curriculum of 2013 or well known as K13. It is a new curriculum adopted by the Ministry of Education to renewing the latest curriculum, KTSP.

This curriculum focuses more on the students than the teachers or student-centered learning as written on the syllabus. The curriculum designers expect that this curriculum can help the students become more active in improving their knowledge. According to The National Middle School Association (1995), teenager- type learners are curious, like a challenge, and have critical and complex thinking. Based on these characteristics, the teachers should not only implement more challenging and active teaching techniques to their students but also relate to K13. The researcher chooses to implement the Chain Writing Method to the Junior High School students because the researcher thinks that this method is appropriate to the current condition, students' characteristics, and has fulfilled the K13 aspects in learning English for Junior High School. According to Heriawan, (2012: 147), chain writing is an active learning which aims to enable the students to associate learning as a fun activity. This method is intended to enhance the ability of learners to identify words to make a descriptive text (Syathariah, 2011: 19).

Based on the preliminary observation, K13 in Junior High Schools has some different aspects when compared to the previous curriculum. The number of hours in learning English in the classroom in this new curriculum is less than those in the KTSP curriculum. This time allocation written in the syllabus of K13. This brings a big challenge for both teachers and students to work harder to achieve the learning goal in a limited time. So, it can make the students become more active in improving their knowledge using K13.

In this K13 curriculum, there are many teachers said, some students think that writing is difficult to do, proven from their writing score. Based on the preliminary observation, the researcher found some factors causing the students difficulties writing in English, because the method that the teacher used was not appropriate with students' behaviors and conditions. These conditions make the students not interested in learning English, especially writing. These factors impeded the students to write properly in English

Method

Research Type
In this research, the researcher uses quasi-experimental quantitative research. Consuelo (1993: 95) states that the experimental class will get the treatment while the control class will get a different treatment or method usually done before in order to give fair treatment. The researcher used this quasi-experimental method because this method is considered appropriate for this research. The researcher will find the effect of a chain writing method to improve the student's descriptive writing skill..

Data Sources
Bungin (2008: 122) stated, the data sources are data which are collected directly from the first data source in the field or research object. This research conducted at SMP Muhammadiyah 1 Purwokerto located at Jl. Perintis Purwokerto. The research objects were the students' writing ability of 7th grade students' at SMP Muhammadiyah 1 Purwokerto.

Population and Samples
This research used cluster random sampling. According to Sugiyono (2008: 119), the technique of sampling was divided into two groups, they are probability sampling and non-probability sampling. Both of them were still elaborated into some other kinds of sampling. Probability Sampling involves simple random sampling, stratified random sampling, and cluster sampling. It means that students' selection of 7 grade of SMP Muhammadiyah 1 Purwokerto was knowing by the level and considering well. The samples are class 7 D and class 7 C. The researcher took class 7 D as the experimental class and class 7 C as the control class. The researcher chose the classes as the samples because both classes have many similarities such as the number of students, the students' and class characteristics. Besides, both classes were identified as the intensive classroom-type   at SMP Muhammadiyah 1 Purwokerto. In this case, the researcher found interesting cases. In both of the classes which are considered as intensive classes, the students' English score was lower than those in other classes.

Data Collection Technique
In this research, the researcher used three data collection techniques that were used to get empirical data. They are as follows:
1. Observation
   The researcher will do the observation 5 times. First, observing the learning and teaching process before implementation and give the pre-test section. The second, observation purposes to find out the students' characteristics, class characteristic

and the learning and teaching process itself and also giving the first treatment. The third, give the second treatment. The fourth is give the third treatment. And the last one the researcher will give the post-test and questionnaire to the students'.

2. Test

Before giving the test to the students of the experimental and control class, the researcher conducted a tryout test first in a different class. In this research, the researcher uses two testing methods, pre-test and post-test to measure the students' understanding. They are as follows:

a. Pre-test

The pre-test conducted before the treatment to the students. The purpose is to obtain the first condition of both experimental and control classes. In this research, the researcher will use an open-ended task, such as writing a short paragraph. The pre-test will give both of classes, experimental and control classes.

The test type will ask the students to write a descriptive text in 10 minutes, minimal consist of 10 sentences or 100 words in 2 paragraphs. The topic of the text is animals. The test topic was chosen because refer to the English K13 syllabus K.D. 4.13.

b. Post-test

After the researcher has done the treatment in the experimental class, the researcher will give a post-test to measure the treatment effect. In this case, the researcher will use the same method with the pre-test. The post-test will be given in both classes. The post-test was used to measure the ability in writing skill after using and without using the chain writing method.

The test type asked the students to make a descriptive text in 10 minutes, minimal consist of 10 sentences or 100 words in 2 paragraphs. The topic is about animals. The researcher also referring to the K13 English syllabus at K.D. 4.13.

Questionnaire

To complete the obtained data, the researcher also distribute questionnaire to students. This technique is used to find the students' opinions before and after the treatment. Beside the researcher need to measure the students' understanding of the method. In this research, the researcher chose closed questionnaire type, the purpose is, to make the students feel easier when answering the questions, just by choosing between yes or no optional answer to finish the

Test Validity

There are five kinds of validity by Karl (1895: 240-242) such as content, criterion, constructs, consequence, and face. In this research, the researcher will use construct and content validity. So, the test item will look right. Besides it, a test said to have content validity if the content representative the sample of language skills, structures, which is meant to be concerned. In this research, the researcher will check between the test and content syllabus with the teaching and learning material to find the validity of the test. Furthermore, to have construct validity the researcher used Pearson Product Moment Formula. To measure Pearson Product Momen Formula, the researcher will use SPSS. If r count is higher than r table, it means that the test is

valid. If r count is lower than r table, it means the test is not valid. Those were ways to make the test more valid before the researcher use the test for the research.

Test Reliability

To measure the reliability of the test, the researcher conducted the test twice. Brown (1996: 193) states, test- retest reliability is one of the most appropriate for estimating the stability of the test. The researcher used the formula of Cronbach's Alpha by SPSS.

Data Analysis

Data display is important in research, with data display the researcher can inform the reader what the researcher gets from the research and from technique of data. In this research data display focused on the result of questionnaire, observation and interview which is displayed in chart form, table, and brief description.

Results

The research results were obtained from three research instruments consisting of observations, tests, and questionnaires. The results were presented as follows.

Observation Results

1. First Meeting

   This observation was conducted on Tuesday, 22 October 2019 from 08.50 until 11.10 a.m. In this first meeting, the researcher did the observation and pre-test section. The first observation in 7D class as the experimental class was to observe the learning and teaching situation and gave pre-test section to students same with the first treatment at 7C class before. In the first 40 minutes, the researcher observed the teaching and learning process with the observation sheet, the observation method was used to know the situation inside the class. In this meeting, all the students' were come to the class. In the next 40 minutes, the teacher asked the researcher to distribute the pre-test section. The pre-test paper was a media for answering the pre-test questions for students. The students did the pre-test in 10 minutes only and lead by the teacher. In this pre-test, the students had to write a descriptive text with the topic of animal. In this class, the students felt interested so the learning and teaching process becomes fun to do. And there was no obstacle when did this first observation.

2. Second Meeting

   The second meeting was conducted on Wednesday, 23 October 2019 from 12.40 until 02.00 p.m. for the first treatment. In this meeting, all the students were coming to the class luckily. The first 5 minutes before the learning and teaching began the teacher checked the students' readiness and attendance. Then, the teacher started the lesson by asked many questions related to the descriptive writing orally in 5 minutes. After that, in the next 20 minutes the teacher started explaining the descriptive text, started with the description of descriptive text, social functional, the text structure and, language features. Besides, the teacher also gave description text example about people entitled "Who is Larry?". The teacher used LCD to make the teaching-learning process more interesting. Then, the teacher usually checked the students' understanding by asking the material. After that, the teacher started to describe the chain writing method together with the researcher in about 20 minutes. The next activity was the group task. Before the group task began, the teacher divided the class into 5 groups, each group contain of 5-6 students. After the students gathered with their group mates, the teacher and the researcher started to explain

the group task activity. This group task preparation finished in 10 minutes. Then, after all the students understood how to do their group task, the group task begin. The students had to make descriptive writing with the chain writing method in 10 minutes with the theme of placed. In the last 10 minutes, the teacher filled the time to evaluate the students' group activity. The total number of students who followed this first treatment was 27 students.

3. Third Meeting

In the third meeting conducted in Friday, 25 October 2019 from 08.50 until 11.10 a.m. In the first 7 minutes, the teacher asked the readiness of the students and also asked who was absent. There was one student who cannot joining the class because feeling not well, so the total number of students who following this third treatment was 26 students. Then, the teacher also checked the students' understanding on the use of the chain writing method too. This review material and method of study occurred in 15 minutes. Then, in the next 10 minutes, the teacher showed another example of descriptive text. The topic for this meeting was 'things. The teacher explained how to identify the text and checked the students' vocabulary by translating the text. The next activity was a group task. Before the group task was conducted, the teacher divided the class into 5 groups by counting 1 - 5. Then, the teacher gives an instruction to did the group task. In this second group task, the researcher choose animal as the topic of the task, and it is written in the exercise book. In this activity, the teacher needs the researcher to help distribute the text for the groups. And this preparation was done in 8 minutes. Then, the students did the group task in 10 minutes. After that, the teacher did the evaluation section in 6 minutes. The last activity was reviewing the material before closing the teaching and learning activity, this activity done in 5 minutes. In this treatment, the researcher also took notes, videos, and pictures for the document of research.

4. Fourth Meeting

The fourth meeting was done the same way as the last 2 treatments. Conducted on Tuesday, 29 October from 08.50 until 11.10 a.m. In this meeting, the teacher did the explanations both the descriptive text and the chain writing method, and the researcher did the observation and took the picture and video. This meeting started with checking the students' condition, of course, the teacher asked the readiness of the students and check the attendance, and in this fourth meeting, there was no student who absent from this class. So, the member of the class was 27 students. This activity was done in 10 minutes. After that, the teacher did the same things as the last meeting, he asked about the previous material about the descriptive text and how to use the chain writing. This activity finished in 25 minutes.

The next activity was checked the students' understanding deeply from the basic descriptive text until how to analyze it. The students needed 19 minutes to do this activity. This activity included translating a descriptive text with the title "My School". In the next 3 minutes, the teacher started to make a group task by dividing the students as usual. The students had 10 minutes only to finishing the group task to made the descriptive text by the chain writing method with the topic of animal too. After that, the teacher did the evaluation text in 13 minutes and closed the class at the bell ringing. In this meeting, there was some obstacle during the teacher

explanation of the material, the electricity was off in the middle of the explanation because of electrical repairs near the school. So, the explanation delayed in around 1 minutes. The teacher continues the study without LCD projector but, by writing on the whiteboard.

5. Fifth Meeting

This last treatment was conducted on Wednesday, 30 October 2019 from 07.30 until 08.50 a.m. This fifth treatment was the last treatment. The researcher still became an observer and took some notes regarding the learning and teaching processes. Besides, the researcher also took some photos and video too. The teacher opened the class as usual. Then the teacher checked the students' readiness to follow this class. After that, the teacher checked the students' attendance. Those activity took 11 minutes. For the first step, the teacher will check the students' if they still remembered the descriptive writing material, this activity finished in 17 minutes. Then, the teacher asked the researcher to lead the class did the post-test activity. In the next 5 minutes, the researcher distributed the paper sheet to the students to answer the task Then the researcher explained the theme that the students had to use and the time allocation to finished the posttests. Then, the students did the post-test in 10 minutes. After the students did the post-test, the teacher asked the researcher to lead the class to fulfill the questionnaire sheet. In this time, the researcher asked the students to fulfill the questionnaire by giving a (V) sign by their opinion in the questionnaire sheet. The students finished the questionnaire paper in around 18 minutes. In the last 19 minutes, the researcher used the time for did some farewell with the students.

Test Results

1. Tryout Test Result

The researcher conducted a tryout test in 7A and 7B class. Both of the class consist of 27 students. The test started from 22 until 23 October 2019. The test was written text and conducted twice. The score was given based on the elements of writing. The total score from the first tryout in 7 A class was 1.329 with the mean score of 49, the highest score of 73 and the lowest score of 40. Therefore, the range of scores between the highest and the lowest was 33 points. The total score from the second tryout in class 7 B was 1.328 with the mean score of 49, the highest score of 70 and the lowest score of 36. Therefore, the range of scores between the highest and the lowest was 34 points.

2. Test Validity Result

To measure the face validity, the researcher matched the test and the content of the syllabus or in the teaching and learning material. To measuring the face validity, the researcher consulted the test to the teacher about the material and did check and re-check both of the syllabus and the material that was given. Besides, the researcher asked the teacher about the material that had been taught. The result showed that it was true that there was a writing skill subject in the syllabus written in K.D. 4.13 and used by the teacher in teaching and learning processes. So, the researcher chooses the question related to K.D. 4.13.

3. Test Reliability Result

The researcher used the test- retest to determine whether the test was reliable or not. The researcher used the formula of Cronbach's Alpha using SPSS. The criterion of reliability was if r-count value was higher that r-table value. The degree of freedom (df) with 5% of sig, the total students of each test was 27 students. For the first test at 7A class, the Cronbach's Alpha was 0.616, the N of items was 6, the df 25, and the R table was 0.388. For the second test at 7B, the Cronbach's Alpha was 0.629, the N of items was 7, the df 25, and the R table was 0.388. So, in this research, the researcher could conclude that N = 27, the degree of freedom (N - 2) was 25, with the significance level of 5% and the r table of 0.3809. Based on the calculation of Cronbach's Alpha using SPSS, the first test result was 0.629 and the second test was 0.616. Cronbach's Alpha results mean higher than the R table it could be concluded that the test was reliable and included as high reliability because the test result was more than 0.60.

4. Pre-test Result
   a. Experimental Class Pre-test Result
      The total number of students who following the pre-test in the class 7D was 27 students. The total score of the experimental pre-test was 1,328 that the mean was 49. The highest score was 66, while the lowest was 40. Therefore, the range between the highest and lowest score was 26 points.
   b. Control Class Pre-test Result
      The total pre-test score of the control class was 1,326 that the mean was 49. The highest score was 76, while the lowest was 0. Therefore, the range between the highest and lowest score was 76 points.

5. Post-test Result
   a. Experimental Class Post-test Result
      The post-test mean score of the experimental class was 70 from the total score of 1.891 of 27 students. The highest score was 86, while the lowest score was 56. The range between the highest and the lowest score was 30 points. This score had taken after the students gave the chain writing method. The ability of the students improved significance than before. It could be seen from the pre-test mean score (49) and the post-test mean score (70). The range between the pre-test and post-test score was 21 points improved using the chain writing method. The improvement score meant that the use of the chain writing method improved the students' descriptive writing skill.

   b. Control Class Post-test Result The post-test mean score the control group was 48, from the total score of 1.301. The highest score was 60, while the lowest score was 6. The range between the highest and the lowest score was 40 points. It meant that there was no score improve from both pre-test until the post-test of the control class without using the chain writing method.

Questionnaire Results

<div align="center">

TABLE OF QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSIS

</div>

ITEM NUMBER	Yes		No	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1	26	96.3%	1	3.7%
2	21	77.8%	6	22.2%
3	20	74.1%	7	25.9%
4	25	92.6%	2	7.4%
5	22	81.5%	5	18.5%
6	18	66.7%	9	33.3%
7	19	70.4%	8	29.6%
8	24	88.9%	3	11.1%
TOTAL:	175	648.3%	41	151.7%
MEAN:	26	96.3%	1	3.7%

The answer "Yes" meant a positive response and the answer "No" meant a negative response. Based on the table above, 81% of the answers were yes. It meant that the students gave positive responses to the used of chain writing method in teaching and learning.

Discussion

This discussion of this result gained the use of a chain writing method to improving the students' descriptive writing skill in the seventh-grade students of SMP Muhammadiyah 1 Purwokerto was divided into three parts. First, the implementation of chain writing method to improve the students' descriptive writing skill. Second, whether or not chain writing method improve the students' descriptive writing skill, third, the students' response to the chain writing implementation.

1.   The Implementation of Chain Writing Method to the Students' Descriptive Writing Skill

Based on the research questions, the first question was on how the chain writing was implemented in the student's descriptive writing skill in the seventh grade of SMP Muhammadiyah 1 Purwokerto in the academic year of 2019-2020. Harmer (2001:79) stated that writing was a form of communication to deliver thoughts. So, when the students did the chain writing they made a spot to communicate. From the observation result on experimental class, the researcher could conclude that the teacher had already implemented all teaching and learning steps. Before conducting the teaching-learning process using the chain writing method, the researcher gave some briefing including giving some materials and tools to the teacher including the power point materials, for the students' exercises and answer sheet. According to Syathariah (2011: 41-42), chain writing was a kind of active learning or learning by doing to enable the students to negotiate in learning as interesting activity and allow them to express their ideas to a certain topic with their classmates. The steps of classroom observation in experimental class:

1. Pre-activity:
   a) Teacher came to the classroom.
   b) Teacher greeting the students.
   c) Teacher checked the students' attendance.
   d) Teacher checked the readiness of the students to study.

   e) Teacher gave warming up to the students (gave some questions related to the material) in this case, the teacher asked about vocabulary related to the text topics and also checked the students with the questions related to English writing.

   f) Teacher explained the students about the goal of today's learning and teaching session.

2. While Activity:

   a) The teacher explained the writing in English, especially on descriptive text. From the description, social function, generic structure, and the sample of the text.

   b) The teacher explained about the use of chain writing, from the goal, step, making the group discussion, and how to used it.

   c) The teacher made a group discussion consisting of 5-6 students in each group and asked them to sit in letter U.

   d) Teacher explained the theme that students had to use to made their descriptive text, and the time allocation too.

   e) Teacher distributed the answer sheets to the students.

   f) Asked the first student to make an opening sentence.

   g) After the first student did with the opening sentence, the teacher asked the students to hold their paper, and on the second count the teacher told the students to hand over the paper to a friend next to her/him.

   h) Then, these students became the second person to continue his/her essay by adding further sentences. Learners were required to see the previous sentences to continue the next essay.

   i) After the second students had finished writing, the teacher asked the students to do the same things until the paper came to the last student.

3. Post-activity:

   a) After the time was up, the teacher and the students corrected the sentences in whiteboard together.

   b) Then, reviewing today material.

   Beside it, the researcher also did the observation in control class. In control class, the teacher used their own method to teach descriptive material.

The steps of classroom observation in control class:

1. Pre-activity:

   a) Teacher came to the classroom.

   b) Teacher greeting the students.

   c) Teacher checked the students' attendance.

   d) Teacher checked the readiness of the students to study.

   e) Teacher gave warming up to the students (gave some questions related to the material).

   f) Teacher explained the students about the goal of today's learning and teaching session.

2. While Activity:

   a) Teacher explained about descriptive writing.

   b) Teacher gave an example of descriptive writing text.

    c) Teacher asked the students to made a descriptive text
3. Post-activity:
    a) After the time was up, the teacher and the students corrected the sentences in whiteboard together.

The differences located in teacher methodology when using chain writing method and using the conventional one. In this case, the students of experimental class are able to understood in the use of chain writing method.

2. The Use of Chain Writing as a Method to Improve the Students' Descriptive Writing Skill

The second research question was to find the improvement result after the students used the chain writing method. This research question was to find differences between the two mean scores of both experimental and control group which were statistically significance while the obtained t-value should be consulted with the critical value in the t-table.

In this research, there were 27 students in the experimental class and 27 students in the control class. Therefore, the total number of both classes was 54 students. From the samples, the degree of freedom (df) was 52, which was obtained from the formula N (total students) - 2 = df so, 54 - 2 = 52. The critical value of df 52 at 5% alpha level of significant was 0.268 which stood above the minimal validity number, 0.250 points. Furthermore, it was seen that the pretest mean score of the experimental class was 49 while that of the post-test was 70 by the different score between those two tests was 21 points. Beside the experimental class, the control class which used the conventional method by the teacher got the mean score for pre-test 49 and for the post-test was 48, the score was decreased. It means that the used of chain writing method improved the students' descriptive writing skill, and this result answered the hypothesis too. From the result, it could be implied that the used of chain writing method had a significant effect in descriptive writing skill at the 7th grade of SMP Muhammadiyah 1 Purwokerto, it refers to alternative hypothesis or Ha.

Besides, some factors influenced the improvement score of the students' writing ability after using the chain writing method. From the observation result, the researcher found that students in the experimental group became more active and interactive in the learning and teaching process. It could be seen from their behavior during learning writing while using the chain writing method. The other reason why this method was well improved the students' descriptive skills could be seen in the questionnaire. The questionnaire showed that more than 80% of the students gave positive responses on the use of the chain writing.

3. The Students' Responses in the Use of Chain Writing Method in Improving their Descriptive Writing Skill

The third research question was related to the students' responses on the use of chain writing method. The researcher used the questionnaire to know the students' responses in using the chain writing method in improving their descriptive writing skills. The questionnaire was given to the students after conducting the treatments

in the experimental class only after the post-test. The questionnaire was given on 30 October 2019 and done in 18 minutes only. The questionnaire consisted of 8 questions. The students had to choose yes or no to answer the questions.

After the data was processed, it could be inferred that most of the students in the experimental class had positive responses on the implementation and the used of chain writing method to improve their descriptive writing skills.

The data was processed in descriptive analysis type from the questionnaire sheet by the answered of experimental students. For the first question, "*Apakah anda merasa senang menggunakan metode chain writing dalam pembelajaran bahasa Inggris di kelas*" From the result of the students' answers for the item number 1, the students who gave negative response was only 1 the percentage was 3.7% while the students who gave positive responses were 26 students the percentage was 96.3%. It meant that the students were really interested in using chain writing method.

For the second question "*Apakah Anda memahami metode pembelajaran chain writing?*". From the result of the students' answers, 21 students gave positive responses the percentage was 77.8% while the students who gave negative responses were 6 students the percentage was 22.2%. It means that the students were really understood in the used of chain writing method as the learning methodology.

Then, for the third question "*Apakah penggunaan metode chain writing mempengaruhi kemampuan Anda dalam menulis dalam Bahada Inggris?*". From the result of the students' answers for item number 3, 20 students gave positive responses the percentage was 74.1%, while the students who gave negative responses were 7 students the percentage was 25.92%. It means that the students were influenced by the used of chain writing method in English writing skill.

Then for the fourth question, "*Apakah penggunaan metode chain writing membuat Anda lebih tertarik untuk menulis dalam Bahada Inggris?*". From the result of the students' answers on item number 4, 25 students gave positive responses the percentage was 92.6% while the students who gave negative responses were 2 students the percentage was 7.4%. It means that the students were really interested in writing English by using chain writing method.

The next question will be question number five, "*Apakah penggunaan metode chain writing membuat Anda lebih menguasai menulis dalam Bahada Inggris?*". The result of the students' answer for the item number 5, 22 students choose positive response and the percentage was 81.5%. Then, for students who answered negative response was 5 students and the percentage was 18.5%. It means that students were more mastering writing English by using the chain writing method.

For question number six, "*Apakah belajar bahada Inggris menggunakan teknik chain writing meningkatkan pemahaman anda dalam menguasai ejaan* (spelling), *tata bahasa* (grammar), *kapitalisasi penulisan* (capitalization), *kosakata* (vocabulary), *struktur teks* (structure)". The result of the students' answered for the item number 6, 18 students choose positive response and the percentage was 66.7%. Then, for students who answered negative response was 9 students and the

percentage were 33.3%. It means that the students improved their ability in spelling, grammar, capitalization, vocabulary and structure in writing descriptive in English.

Then, for question number seven, "*Menurut anda, apakah penggunaan metode chain writing efektif dalam pembelajaran menulis dalam Bahada Inggris?*". The result of the students' answered for the item number 7, 19 students choose positive response and the percentage was 70.4%. Then, for students who answered negative response was 8 students and the percentage were 29.6%. It means that the chain writing method was effective to be used as English writing skill learning methodology.

For the last question, "*Setelah menggunakan metode pembelajaran chain writing apakah kamu merasa kemampuan menulis dalam Bahada Inggrismu meningkat?*". The result of the students' answered for the item number 8, 24 students chose positive response and the percentage was 88.9%. Then, for students who answered negative response was 3 students and the percentage were 11.1%. It means that the students improved their writing skill in English after using the chain writing method.

The result above proven by the increase of the students' average scores that could be seen in the result of the post-test. So, the students' responses on the use of chain writing method were good due to the answers given from the first until last question. Based on the calculation, the positive responses were more than 80%. From all the explanations above, it could be concluded that the used of chain writing method helped and improved the students' descriptive writing skill.

Conclusions and Suggestions

Based on the result of the data from the analysis in, the researcher concludes that (1) As English is a foreign language, in our country and our education system does not put much emphasis on teaching writing, it is recommended that writing should be properly taught by appropriate methods and techniques, especially Chain Writing. Chain Writing method can best be developed with practice in classroom through activities, which promote interaction between students. The implementation of the chain writing method to the students' descriptive writing skill, had no serious problem in the implementation process from the first until the last steps. The teacher was more communicative in delivering the explanation and well implemented the chain writing method. The students understand the use of Chain Writing method. It can indicate that the implementation of the chain writing method clearly understood to the students to use especially in descriptive writing skill. (2) There was a significant difference from students writing achievement between those who were taught by using Chain Writing method and those were taught by the conventional technique. The students' who were taught by the Chain Writing method have higher score than who don't. It can be proved from the mean of writing test achievement score. The writing achievement score for the pre-test score was 40 points from the total score 1.328 increased until 70 points from the total score 1.891. From the result score, it can indicate that the chain writing method has a positive influence to improve the students' writing ability, especially in descriptive writing skill. The sig (2¬tailed) score of SPSS calculation from the mean score both of pre-test and post-test was 0.043, mean that the alternative hypothesis (Ha) has a significant effect related to the use of chain writing method to improve the

students' descriptive writing skill. So, the use of the chain writing method improves the students' descriptive writing skill. (3) The students' response after the implementation of chain writing method to improve the students' writing ability, especially in descriptive text was positive. Based on the calculation, the total percentage of students giving positive responses was 81% obtained from 8 questions. In questionnaire sheet. It means that the use of chain writing method helps the students improve their writing elements, such as spelling, grammar, capitalization, vocabulary, and structure proven by the increase of the students' achievement score test. So, they are more confident and easier to write in English.

From the conclusion of the research, there are several suggestions: (1) the teachers should use an interesting and appropriate technique to make the students interested and more motivated in learning. So, they would learn more enthusiastically. Since this research shows that Chain Writing method is better than conventional technique for teaching writing, it is recommended for teacher to use Chain Writing method in teaching writing. (2) The students should be active in the teaching and learning process and do more practice in the class. The students have to improve their competence of writing with various activities individually and in groups, because writing is not only a complex skill but also very important to academic and as requirement for many occupations, with practicing the students' will be able to writing English easily. (3) The researchers who interested to do research in the teaching-learning process, the researcher hopes they could make a better improvement on the students' improvements of any aspect of English skill.

References

Ary, D. Jacobs, L, & Razavieh, A. (2010). Introduction to Research in Education: Eight Edition. Canada: Nelson Education.

Brown, H. Douglas (2001). Teaching by Principle an Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy. San Fransisco: Longman.

Brown, J.D. (1996). Testing in Language Programs. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents.

Brown, J.D. (2005). Testing in Language Programs. Singapore: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.

Brown, J.D. (2007). Understanding Research in Second Language Learning. New York: Cambridge University Press.

BSNP (Badan Standar Nasional Pendidikan). (2006). Panduan Penyusunan Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan Jenjang Pendidikan Dasar Hingga Menengah. LOKESYEN

Burhan, Bungin. (2008). Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif. Jakarta: Kencana.

Consuelo, et al. (1993). Pengantar Metode Penelitian [Introductional to Research Methods]. Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia Publisher.

Creswell, J.W. (2009). Research Design (Quantitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches). California: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Dewi, Tika Sari. (2017). The Implementation of Chain Writing Method to Increase the Students' Ability in Writing Narrative Text at MTS, Al-Muttaqin. Thesis. Sumatera Utara: State Islamic University of North Sumatera Medan.

Feez, S., & Joyce, H. (1998). Text- based syllabus design. Sydney: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research, Macquarie University.

Fidered, A. (2002). Paragraph Power. New York: Scholastic Professional Books.

Gerlach, Vernon S. (1980). Teaching and Media: Systematic Approach (2ndedition). United States: Pearson College.

Harmer, Jeremy. (2001). The Practice of English Language Teaching. New York: Longman Publishing.

Harris D.P. (1969). Testing English as a Second Language. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Hartono. (2009). Statistik untuk Penelitian [Research Statistical Method]. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

Heaton, J.B. (1989). Oxford Advance Learner's Dictionary of Current English. Oxford University Press.

Heriawan, Adang. (2012). Metodologi Pembelajaran [Learning Methodology]. Banten: LP3G.

Hidayat, Sholeh. (2013). Pengembangan Kurikulum Baru [The New Curriculum Expansion]. Bandung: Rosdakarya. Hidayati, Umi Fadhilah. (2010). The Use of Chain Picture as a Medium for Improving Students Writing Skill of Narrative Text. Thesis. Semarang: State Institute for Islamic Study Semarang.

Hughes, M., Cooper. (2008). Analysis of notation data. OX: Routledge.

Igak, Wardani, *et al*. (2007). Penelitian Tindakan Kelas [Classroom Research Action]. Jakarta: Universitas Terbuka.

Kunandar. (2011). Penelitian Tindakan Kelas [Classroom Research Action]. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.

Marahimin, Ismail. (2001). Menulis Secara Populer. Jakarta: PT. Dunia Pustaka Jaya.

Mulyasa. (2014). Pengembangan dan Implementasi Kurikulum 2013 [Implementation and the Expansion of New Curriculum of 2013]. Bandung: Rosda Karya.

Nazir, Moh. (2003). Metode Penelitian Research Methodology]. Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia.

Oshima, A & Hogue. (2007). Introduction to Academic Writing. New York: Longman Pearson.

Pallant, J. (2011). SPSS: Survival Manual a Step-by-Step Guide to Data Analysis Using SPSS 4th Edition. New South Walles: Allen & Unwin.

Pearson, Karl (1895). Regression Towards Mediocrity in Hereditary Stature. London: Royal Society.

Rangkuti, Mahmuddah. (2017). The Use of Estafet Writing Method to Improve Students' Ability in Writing Narrative text. Thesis. Sumatera Utara: State Islamic University of North Sumatera Medan.

Richards, C. Jack & Schmidt, R. (2002). Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistic 3rd Edition. Edinburgh: Pearson Education Limited.

Sudjana, Nana & Ibrahim. (2001). Penelitian dan Penelitian Pendidikan [Educational Research]. Bandung: Sinar Baru Algesindo.

Sugiyono. (2008). Metode Penelitian Penidikan: Pendektan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D [Educational Research Methodology-: Quantitative, Qualitative and R&D Approach]. Bandung: Alfabeta Bandung.

Syathariah, Siti. (2011). Estafet Writing (Menulis Berantai) Solusi Dalam Menulis Cerpen Bagi 'Siswa SMA/MA [Estafet Writing (Chain Writing) Short Story Writing Solution for Senior High School Students]. Yogyakarta: Leutika Prio.

Thissen, D., & Wainer, H. (2001). Test Scoring. Mahwah: Lawrence Eribaum.