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Abstract

This study is aimed to know the improvement in writing background of Classroom Action Research proposal by using Scientific Approach done by the sixth semester students of English Department of Nommensen University Academic Year 2020/2021. In conducting this classroom action research, the writer divided the action into two cycles. The instrument of collecting data were qualitative data from observation, interview, diary notes, and documentation. Quantitative data were taken from students writing of CAR proposal, which was carried out in the end of every cycle. It is applied for students’ learning in writing Classroom Action research proposal. The students are expected to have logical thinking aspects, data objectivity, vocabulary mastery, use of Enhanced Spelling (EYD), use of effective sentences, and paragraph development. The result showed that Scientific Approach can improve students’ ability to write background of Classroom Action research proposal since in applying Scientific Approach found that students are very active in doing observation, questioning, experimenting, associating and communicating so it motivated students to achieve the maximum learning outcomes.

Abstrak

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui peningkatan di dalam penulisan latar belakang dari proposal penelitian tindakan kelas oleh mahasiswa semester enam prodi pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Universitas HKBP Nommensen Medan tahun akademik 2020/2021. Metode penelitian yang digunakan adalah Penelitian tindakan kelas dengan pendekatan scientific. Dalam melakukan penelitian tindakan kelas, peneliti membagi pengajaran menjadi dua siklus. Alat mengumpulkan data yakni data qualitative melalui observasi, tanyajawab, catatan harian dan dokumentasi. Data kuantitatif diperoleh dari penulisan proposal penelitian tindakan kelas oleh mahasiswa yang diterapkan dalam kelas penelitian tindakan kelas. Mahasiswa diharapkan memiliki aspek-aspek pemikiran logis, keobjektivan data, penguasaan kosakata, penggunaan kata yang telah disempunakan, penggunaan kalimat-kalimat yang efektif, dan pengembangan paragraf. Hasil penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa pendekatan sientifik dapat meningkatkan kemampuan mahasiswa dalam menulis latar belakang proposal penelitian tindakan kelas karena dalam penerapannya ditemukan bahwa siswa sangat aktif dalam melakukan pengamatan, bertanya, menguji coba, mengasosiasi dan berkommunikasi sehingga memotivasi mahasiswa untuk mencapai hasil pembelajaran yang maksimal.
INTRODUCTION

Language is one of the most important aspects of human's life. Without language, people cannot communicate with the others. By language, people can share their experiences, their feelings, their opinions, and also their needs to each other by spoken and written. All people in this world use language as their tool of communication. No one people who have the same language in this world. One of the International language in this world is English.

English as an International language plays an important role in communication. The global communication is made by each country exchange the information on various issues and people can communicate with the others from different countries by English in Indonesia.

Teaching English in Indonesia starts from playgroup, primary school, junior high school, senior high school up to university level. The English curriculum in primary school until senior high school using Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan (KTSP). There are four languages skill in teaching English, they are: reading, listening, speaking, and writing.

Teaching writing is an activity where the focus is on something such as language practice in expressing our feelings. The purpose of teaching writing is to develop student's skill in writing English effectively. Teachers ask the students to write the dialogues as good possible. Students work to make a dialogues and where possible the teachers goes to help the students in writing. In teaching writing, teacher should introduce the material to the students. One material that learned in English Department is making scientific writing of Classroom Action Research. Students are expected to be able to write a proposal of classroom action research that can be described and narrated based on students experience.

Writing is one of the important skills because it takes a part as an important communications tools. Through writing, everybody is not only to express feeling and ideas, but also to communicate with others and have remembering facts and ideas.

Scientific writing in Education is important for human life. Someone who has a good education will have good mindset and good attitude. To invent a good education, Indonesian government set curriculum make students thinking scientific, logical and objective. Writing in academic can take many forms. It can be a detailed diary produced over time in which can be explored through the medium of writing we thoughts, feelings and intentions. This is sure we are already saying, time-consuming and involved, and therefore every bit of writing done, just as in the collection of data, every piece of evidence gathered has to be worthwhile and meaningful. One product of academic writing in education is classroom action research proposal.

Action research is any research into practice undertaken by those involved in that practice, with the primary goal of encouraging continued reflection and making improvement. It can be done in any professional field, including medicine, nursing, social work, psychology, and education. Action research is particularly popular in the field of education. When it comes to teaching, practitioners may be interested in trying out different teaching methods in the classroom, but are unsure of their effectiveness. Action research provides an opportunity to explore the effectiveness of a particular teaching practice, the development of a curriculum, or students' learning, hence making continual improvement possible. In other words, the use of an interactive action and research process enables practitioners to get an idea of what they and their learners really do inside of the classroom, not merely what they think they can do. By doing this, it is hoped that both the teaching and the learning occurring in the classroom can be better tailored to fit the learners’ needs.
Based on the writer’s experience in teaching classroom action research especially in writing action research background, it was found that the students mostly got weaknesses in making problem analysis so that it was not sharp. The sharpness in analyzing problem influenced on the action taken. The weaknesses were caused by the problem which was not taken from the real class, the students did not put the data which supported the problem, it was not found way out or treatment to solve the problem, the problem is too large and formulation of problem could not focused well, the background of problem could not show the reason of choosing the alternative problem and problem formulation did not reflect the available of action/behaviour figure changing. The students are also difficult in organizing ideas in paragraph which loaded expectation and real happened situations so it makes them unmotivated to write.

To overcome the problem happened, the writer found that the implementation of KKNI 2016 and Curriculum 2013 is intended to Scientific approach. The application of this approach makes the students to learn possibly in creating a thought skill of science, the development of sense of inquiry and students thinking ability actively the observing, questioning, experimenting, associating, and communicating. According to Dyer (2011) in Ridwan (2015:53), scientific approach is learning that has the components, they are observing, questioning, exploring, associating and communicating. This approach is used in teaching and learning process where the teachers play roles as facilitators. In the process of learning, the learners are facilitated to be actively involved in developing their potentials to be learning competencies.

The Formulation of Problem

The problem of this study is “Does the scientific approach improve the ability of sixth semester English department students academic year 2020/2021 of Nommensen university in writing background of action research?”

The Objective of The Study

The objective of this study is to know the improvement done by students sixth semester English department academic year 2020/2021 of Nommensen HKBP university in writing action research background by using scientific approach.

The Significances of the Study

Theoretically, The result of the research can be used as an input for teaching and learning process classroom action research class and as the reference for those who want to conduct a research in writing action research background. This study is conducted to enable students of English pedagogic in improving their ability in writing action research background.

Practical benefit of this study are:

1. The research finding will be used by the teacher who are interest in doing action research.
2. This study can be used by the teacher to provide the better method in increasing writing classroom action research.

According to Hyland (2002:19), good writing is that discovered combination of words which allows a person the integrity to dominate his subject with a pattern both fresh and original. Good writing must be discovery by a responsible of his unique within his subject. When students learn how to write, they can put their thoughts down in a journal, write a letter to a friend, and create a story that comes from their imagination. They can compose more extensive pieces where they have a chance to write it, read, review and revise it.
Good writing is the result of much practice and hard work. This fact should encourage students. If the students willing to work, they can improve their writing. The regular practice will make them a better writer.

**Classroom Action Research**

A good teacher has competence standard which must be achieved dan developed. It is written in *Peraturan menteri Nasional RI Tahun 2007* about academic qualification standard. Classroom action research and teacher competence and one of them is doing classroom action research. Classroom action research is a research to solve problem happened in teaching and learning on class. Creswell (2019: 577) stated that classroom action research is used when a teacher has problem related with education. Creswell also define classroom action research as sistematic procedure done by teacher (or people who take a part in education) to gather information about and then improving, planing, teaching, and the way of students in studying.

**Writing Proposal in Action Research**

In Action Research, writing can fulfil broadly four functions:

1) It documents actions and ideas as they take place for future reference.

2) It can reveal meaning and significance in the act of writing itself.

3) It enables to make substantiated claims over time about your research.

4) It can contribute to other practitioners’ understanding of what constitutes educational practice.

In writing proposal, it is about the written activities of action research like writing background, procedure, time schedule and many more. The preparation of a research proposal or proposal is the first necessary step conducted by researchers before starting CAR activities. The research proposal is a description which contains the steps that will be carried out by researchers to carry out his research. Writing a research proposal can be the most decisive step and most enjoyable in the research process. In the proposal, the researcher shows what to look for and how to perform the search, and explain why the search is useful.

**CAR Proposal Systematics**

Research proposals must be made systematically and logically. Sugiyono mentioned that the research proposal contains at least four main components, namely Problems, Theoretical foundation and hypothesis submission, research methods, organization and research schedule (Sugiyono, 2010). For organization and research schedule as needed, if needed can be added.

The core systematics of the Classroom Action Research (CAR) proposal are as follows.

**CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION**

1. Background

2. Problem Identification and Limitation

3. Research Objectives

4. Research Benefits

**CHAPTER II. LITERATURE REVIEW**

1. Basic Theory

2. Framework

3. Action Hypothesis
CHAPTER III. RESEARCH METHODS

1. Research Setting
2. Research Procedure
3. Research Instruments
4. Data Collection Techniques
5. Data Analysis Techniques
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Writing Background of Classroom Action Research Proposal

(Sugiyono, 2010) stated that this section begins by clearly describing the research problem with support factual data showing a problem in a particular setting, the importance of the problem for solved. Explain that the problem under study is real, within the authority teacher and the consequences if the problem is not solved. The main objectives of action research are to solve learning problems. For that, in the description of the background, the following issues should be addressed.

(1) The problem under study is really a learning problem that occurs in schools. Generally obtained from observations and diagnoses made by teachers or staff other education in schools. It is also necessary to explain the process or conditions that occur.

(2) The problem to be studied is an important and urgent problem for solved, and can be implemented in terms of the availability of time, cost, and power other supports that can facilitate the research.

(3) Identify the problems above, explain the things that are suspected to be the root cause of the that time! Carefully and systematically give reasons (arguments) how can draw conclusions about the root of the problem.

Scientific Approach

Scientific approach is defined as the process of finding out information in science, which involves testing the ideas by performing experiments and making decisions based on the result of analysis (Longman, 2014). It means that scientific approach is a body of techniques for investigating phenomena, acquiring new knowledge, and correcting and integrating previous knowledge. Tang et al. (2009) says that scientific approach has the characteristics of “doing science”. This approach allows teachers to improve the process of learning by breaking the process down into steps or stages which contains detailed instructions for conducting students learning. These two ideas became the basic of using scientific approach to be the basis for implementing the 2013 curriculum. In accordance with the standard competence of the 2013 curriculum, learning objectives should include the development of the realm of attitudes, knowledge, and skills. Attitudes are acquired through activity: accept, execute, respect, appreciate, and practice. Knowledge was gained through the activity of observing, asking, experimenting, reasoning, serving, and creating (Kemdikbud, 2013a). so, the teaching learning process in scientific approach referred to the process of observing, asking, reasoning, experimenting, and establishing network for all subjects. Kemdikbud (2013) and Hosnan (2014) state that there are five steps of
applying scientific approach in teaching learning process, they are observing, questioning, experimenting, associating, and communicating. The activities of each steps can be explain as follows.

1) Observing

There are two main activities that should be done to lead to the observing steps. First, the teachers give students a wide opportunity to do observation. The observation can be done through reading, listening, or seeing the object. Second, the teachers facilitate the students to do observation and train the students to observe the important things from the object. There are seven steps in observing process, (1) determining the object to be observed, (2) determining the purpose, (3) determining the way of observation, (4) limiting the object, (5) doing observation carefully, (6) reporting the result of observation, and (7) comprehending the result.

2) Questioning

Questioning functions to encourage and inspire learners to actively learn and develop questions of and for itself; to raise skills of students in talking, asking questions, and the other can answer logically, systematically using proper and correct grammar; to encourage students’ participation in discussing, arguing, developing the ability to think and draw conclusions; and to build an attitude of openness to give and receive opinions or ideas, enrich vocabulary, as well as developing social tolerance in gregarious.

3) Experimenting

In experimenting, the steps are preparation, working, and follow up. There are five activities that can be done in experimenting, (1) Grouping students into several groups, (2) asking students to discuss, (3) recording the finding, (4) supervising the learning process to ensure that all learners are actively involved in the discussion, and (5) directing the group that need help.

4) Associating

Associating is the ability to analyze and associate the information occurred within the group. Associating is the process of analyzing the information to find the relationship between one information to other information and to find the patterns of interrelationship of the information so that one can make conclusion from the patterns found.

5) Communicating

Communicating is the ability to conclude the facts that have been observed and experimented. There are four activities that can be conducted in communicating steps, (1) asking the students to read their work to the class, (2) asking each group to listen well and provide additional input with regard to the work of each group, (3) giving explanation after the group discussion ended, and (5) structuring tasks and providing opportunities to the students to demonstrate attitude, skills, and understanding of the substance of learning given. From the explanation about the steps of doing scientific approach in teaching learning process above, it can be seen that by doing scientific approach students are hoped to be actively involved in class activities by integrating skills, attitude, and knowledge.

**RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

This research was designed by classroom action research. According to Arikunto (2010: 130), classroom action research is a study toward activities that are intentionally appear and happen in a class. The
reason of using this method is to solve the problem appeared in the class under the research. In this research, there are two cycles where each cycle consist of two actions.

The population of this study is the sixth semester students in English Department of Nommensen University academic year 2020/2021. There are four parallel classes namely grup A, B, c and D. sample were taken randomly and choosing one class namely grup D which consists of 30 students. Qualitative and quantitative data were used in this research. The instrument for collecting the data in this research is writing test, the test is pre-test, post-test, and treatment. Quantitative data is collected through test which is administrated by the writer. The students are asked to write background of action research proposal based on their ideas on first meetings pre test and administrates post test to know the result of the students after getting the material from the writer. Treatment on this research was done in two cycles and each cycle has four steps such as planning, action, observation and reflection. The first cycle has four meetings and the second cycle has two meetings do there is six meetings in this research. The qualitative data is used to describe the situation during the teaching learning process.

The procedure of data collection was performed by administrating for six meeting in two cycles. The first cycle consists of three meetings and the second cycle consists of three meetings. Each cycle contains of four steps namely: planning, action, observation, and reflection.

In cycle I planning is arrangement for doing something. In planning, it is consider everything that will be related to the action and will be done and in teaching and learning process. Any activities were done in planning, such as:
1. Making the lesson plan,
2. Prepare the teaching material of recount text,
3. Prepare the instrument to record and analyze the data as diary notes, observation sheet and questionnaire sheet.
4. Preparing the facilities and media that is used as work sheet.

Action is the process of doing things. It is the implementation of planning. There are some activities in action, such as explaining the definition and importance of doing classroom action research, explaining how to write action research background by applying scientific approach procedure and in the last meeting, the students were given some questionnaires.

Next, observation is purpose to find the information of action, action such as lecturer and students’ attitudes, class events and climate during the teaching learning process. Thus, the observation is done through diary notes and observation sheet. Observation sheet focus on teacher and students’ attitude and the condition of class during teaching learning process is done.

Last, reflection is the feedback process from the action that will do in this research. It is very necessary to help the writer to make decision for what to do and to revise. From the result of observation the problem that exist, the cause of the problem was analyzed.

Based on the result of students work in previous cycle and diary notes, the weakness of the student know. In cycle II the writer is tried to improve it in learning process. The writer prepares lesson plans, prepares some sample of recount writing and prepares the interesting text related to recount. In action the lecturer explained about writing background in classroom action research, and explained what is scientific approach. The concept of scientific approach is the students practice writing by theirselves in which based on their real
experiences. In observing the writer observed while teaching learning process in the classroom. In reflection, the writer evaluated the results score and result of the observation then decided to stop the research for students ability in writing background of action research got improvement.

In assessing the students writing, there are five components in writing assessment according to Jacobs et al, scale (Weigle, 2002:116), namely:

Content refers to the students’ ability to write the ideas and information in the form of logical statement.

| Score | Description |
|-------|-------------|
| 27 – 30 | Very good to excellent; knowledge, substantive, through development of topic sentence, relevant to assign topic. |
| 22 – 26 | Average to good; some knowledge of subject, adequate range, limited, development of topic sentence, mostly relevant to topic, but lack detail. |
| 17 – 21 | Fair to poor; limited knowledge of subject, little substance, inadequate development of topic. |
| 13 – 16 | Very poor; does not show the knowledge of subject, not substantive, no patient, or not enough to evaluate. |

Organization refers to the students’ ability to write ideas and information in good logical order.

| Score | Description |
|-------|-------------|
| 18 – 20 | Very good to excellent; ideas clearly state/support, cohesive, time, sequence, spatial, particular to general to particular. |
| 14 – 17 | Average to good; somewhat copy, loose organize but main ideas stand out, limit support, logical sequencing and development. |
| 10 – 13 | Fair to poor; non-fluent, ideas confuse or disconnect, lacks logical sequencing and development. |
| 7 – 9 | Very poor; does not communicative, no organization, or not enough to evaluate. |

Vocabulary refers stated to the students’ ability in using word or idiom to express ideas logically, and also refers to the ability to use the synonym, antonym, prefix, and suffix exactly.

| Score | Description |
|-------|-------------|
| 18 – 20 | Very good to excellent; effective words idioms choices and usage, word form mastery appropriate register. |
| 14 – 17 | Average to good; adequate range, occasional errors of words/idioms form, choices, usages, but meaning not obscured. |
| 10 – 13 | Fair to poor; limited range, frequent errors of words/idioms form, choice, usage and meaning obscured. |
| 7 – 9 | Very poor; essentially translation, little knowledge of English vocabulary, idioms and words forms, not enough to evaluate. |

Language used refers to the students’ ability in writing sentences simple, complex or compound sentences correctly and logically. It also refers to the ability to use agreement in the sentences and some other words such as nouns, adjectives, verbs and time signal.
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### Table 2.4 Language used refers to the students' ability in writing sentences

| Score | Description |
|-------|-------------|
| 22 – 25 | Very good to excellent; effective complex, construction few errors of agreement tense, number, word order/ function, articles, pronoun preposition. |
| 18 – 21 | Average to good; simple construction minor problems in complex instructions several errors of agreement, tenses, number of words order/ function, articles pronoun, preposition and meeting seldom obscure. |
| 11 – 17 | Fair to poor; major problem in simple complex construction frequent errors of negotiation, agreement, tense, number, and word order/function, articles pronoun, preposition and or fragments meaning confused or obscure. |
| 5 – 10 | Very poor; essentially translation, little knowledge of English vocabulary, idioms and words forms, not enough to evaluate. |

Mechanics refers to the students' competence in using words appropriately; by using function correctly, paragraph, and the text can read used correctly.

### Table 2.5 Mechanics students' competence in using words appropriately

| Score | Description |
|-------|-------------|
| 5 | Very good to excellent; demonstrate mastery of convention, few errors of spelling punctuation, capitalization, writing sentences. |
| 4 | Average to good; occasional errors of spelling punctuation, capitalization, writing sentences, but meaning not obscure. |
| 3 | Fair to poor; frequent errors of spelling punctuation, capitalization, poor handwriting, meaning obscure or confuse. |
| 2 | Very poor; no mastery convention, dominate by errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing, handwriting illegible, or not enough to evaluate. |

The technique of analyzing data are:

1. Scoring the students' test cycle I and cycle II.
2. Tabulating the students' score cycle I and cycle II.
3. Comparing the students' score cycle I and cycle II.
4. Calculating the percentage of the students' score.
5. Making the conclusion.

Formula:

\[
\bar{X} = \frac{\sum X}{N} \times 100 \%
\]

Where: \( \bar{X} \) = The mean of the students

\( \sum X \) = The total score

\( N \) = The number of the students

The score percentage of each cycle was calculated by using this formula:

\[
P = \frac{R}{T} \times 100 \%
\]

Where: \( P \) = the percentage of the students who get point up 75
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DATA ANALYSIS

The data were taken from quantitative and qualitative data. The quantitative data was gotten from writing test of the students and the qualitative data was got based on the diary notes, observation sheet, and questionnaire sheet.

The Quantitative Data

The quantitative data was taken from the result during conducted research in sixth meetings. The test was given three times; a pre-test and post-test in cycle I and cycle II. In the first meeting the writer gave pre-test to the students to know basic skill of students' in writing recount text. After it was done, the writer was scoring the test. The total score of the students in pre-test is 1,752 of 30 students. There were two students who got the lowest score that is 45. There were four students who got 75 until 78 score. It can be seen in table 4.1.

Table 3.1 Students’ Score in Pre-Test

| No | Students’ Initial Name | Pre-Test |
|----|------------------------|---------|
| 1  | BMB                    | 78      |
| 2  | MN                     | 76      |
| 3  | VDS                    | 76      |
| 4  | MT                     | 75      |
| 5  | MRS                    | 74      |
| 6  | NK                     | 70      |
| 7  | NW                     | 68      |
| 8  | EFR                    | 66      |
| 9  | FNG                    | 63      |
| 10 | GRN                    | 60      |
| 11 | HE                     | 60      |
| 12 | IDC                    | 58      |
| 13 | AK                     | 58      |
| 14 | BCM                    | 56      |
| 15 | AF                     | 56      |
| 16 | CYG                    | 56      |
| 17 | AJO                    | 56      |
| 18 | HAG                    | 56      |
| 19 | NOP                    | 53      |
| 20 | AN                     | 63      |
| 21 | BP                     | 63      |
| 22 | YDP                    | 63      |
| 23 | MJS                    | 50      |
| 24 | RS                     | 50      |
| 25 | PTS                    | 50      |
| 26 | RRT                    | 46      |
| 27 | RF                     | 46      |
| 28 | SL                     | 46      |
| 29 | ARH                    | 45      |
| 30 | AS                     | 45      |
|    | Total Score            | 1,752   |
After the pre-test was given to the students, the writer gave one treatment before giving the post test I. In treatment, the writer taught the students about writing background of classroom action research proposal by letting them observing, questioning, experimenting, associating and communicating. After conducting some activities, the writer gave the post-test I to the students in order to know students’ ability in writing recount text. The total scores is 2,157 of 30 students. There was one student who got the lowest score that is 50. There were ten students who got 75 until 85 score. It can be seen in table 4.2.

Table 3.2 Students’ Score in Post-Test I

| No | Students’ Initial Name | Post-Test I |
|----|------------------------|------------|
| 1  | VDS                    | 85         |
| 2  | MN                     | 85         |
| 3  | BMB                    | 83         |
| 4  | MRS                    | 83         |
| 5  | MI                     | 83         |
| 6  | MJS                    | 80         |
| 7  | NW                     | 80         |
| 8  | NK                     | 75         |
| 9  | EFF                    | 75         |
| 10 | FHE                    | 75         |
| 11 | CYE                    | 74         |
| 12 | PYS                    | 74         |
| 13 | RRT                    | 73         |
| 14 | AID                    | 73         |
| 15 | HAG                    | 73         |
| 16 | RS                     | 73         |
| 17 | NDP                    | 73         |
| 18 | AN                     | 73         |
| 19 | YDP                    | 73         |
| 20 | BP                     | 70         |
| 21 | HE                     | 68         |
| 22 | IDC                    | 68         |
| 23 | AK                     | 65         |
| 24 | BCM                    | 65         |
| 25 | GRN                    | 65         |
| 26 | AF                     | 65         |
| 27 | SL                     | 60         |
| 28 | RF                     | 60         |
| 29 | AS                     | 60         |
| 30 | ARH                    | 50         |

Total score 2,157

After the post-test cycle I was given to the students, the writer saw that it was not enough to improve their writing skill. It will be better the writer do the cycle II so that students’ score could be improved significantly. The writer gave treatment more detail before giving test in post-test II. In this phase, the writer made the students into some groups and also let them observing, questioning, experimenting, associating and communicating. In the last meeting of the cycle II, the writer gave the students the post-test II.

In the last of cycle II, the writer gave post-test II to the students in order to know students’ ability in writing recount text. The total scores of the students is 2,383 of 30 students. There was one student who got the lowest score that is 60. There were twenty students who got the highest score 75 until 95. It can be seen in table 4.3.
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Table 3.3 Students’ Score in Post-Test II

| No | Students’ Initial Name | Post-Test II |
|----|------------------------|-------------|
| 1  | BMB                    | 95          |
| 2  | MRS                    | 95          |
| 3  | MI                     | 95          |
| 4  | MJS                    | 92          |
| 5  | NW                     | 92          |
| 6  | NK                     | 90          |
| 7  | VDS                    | 90          |
| 8  | MN                     | 88          |
| 9  | EFR                    | 88          |
| 10 | FHS                    | 85          |
| 11 | CYG                    | 85          |
| 12 | PYS                    | 83          |
| 13 | RRT                    | 83          |
| 14 | ATD                    | 81          |
| 15 | HAG                    | 79          |
| 16 | RS                     | 79          |
| 17 | NDP                    | 79          |
| 18 | AN                     | 79          |
| 19 | YDP                    | 75          |
| 20 | BP                     | 75          |
| 21 | HE                     | 73          |
| 22 | IDC                    | 70          |
| 23 | AK                     | 70          |
| 24 | BCM                    | 68          |
| 25 | GRN                    | 68          |
| 26 | AF                     | 68          |
| 27 | SL                     | 68          |
| 28 | RF                     | 65          |
| 29 | AS                     | 65          |
| 30 | ARH                    | 60          |
|    | Total score            | 2,383       |

The scores of the pre-test, post-test cycle I, and post-test cycle II can be seen in the table 3.4

Table 3.4 Students Score of Pre-test, Post-test I, Post-test II

| No | Students’ Initial Name | Pre-test | Students’ Initial Name | Post-test I | Students’ Initial Name | Post-test II |
|----|------------------------|----------|------------------------|-------------|------------------------|-------------|
| 1  | BMB                    | 79       | VDS                    | 85          | BMB                    | 85          |
| 2  | MN                     | 76       | MN                     | 85          | MRS                    | 85          |
| 3  | VDS                    | 76       | BMB                    | 83          | MI                     | 95          |
| 4  | MI                     | 75       | MRS                    | 83          | MJS                    | 92          |
| 5  | NRS                    | 74       | MI                     | 83          | NW                     | 92          |
| 6  | NK                     | 70       | MJS                    | 80          | NK                     | 90          |
| 7  | NW                     | 68       | NW                     | 80          | VDS                    | 90          |
| 8  | EFR                    | 66       | NK                     | 75          | MN                     | 88          |
| 9  | FHS                    | 63       | EFR                    | 75          | EFR                    | 88          |
| 10 | GRN                    | 60       | FHS                    | 75          | FHS                    | 85          |
| 11 | HE                     | 60       | CYG                    | 74          | CYG                    | 85          |
| 12 | IDC                    | 58       | PYS                    | 74          | PYS                    | 83          |
| 13 | AK                     | 58       | RRT                    | 73          | RRT                    | 83          |
| 14 | BCM                    | 56       | ATD                    | 73          | ATD                    | 80          |
| 15 | AF                     | 56       | HAG                    | 73          | HAG                    | 79          |
| 16 | CYG                    | 56       | RS                     | 73          | RS                     | 79          |
| 17 | ATD                    | 56       | NDP                    | 73          | NDP                    | 79          |
| 18 | HAG                    | 56       | AN                     | 73          | AN                     | 79          |
The Qualitative Data

The qualitative data were taken from diary notes, observation sheets, and questionnaire sheets. Diary notes were used to share the evaluation during the research by the writer. Observation sheet was aimed to describe the situation, the responses of the students and the teacher’s attitude during teaching-learning process. Questionnaire sheet is used to measure the level of the students activities during teaching-learning process. Questionnaire are used to know the respond and perception of the students about diary writing as a media to improve their writing ability.

The Quantitative Data Analysis

The quantitative data were taken from the result of writing test. The first test as pre-test was given without any treatment. The test of the post-test cycle I and cycle II were given to the students after teaching for each cycle had been completely finish. The total score of the students in Pre-test is 1,752 and the number of the student is 30, the mean 58,40. There were 4 students who got 75 scores and the other got under 75. The percentage of the of the pre-test is 13,33%.

After conducting some activities, the writer gave post-test I to the students in order to know students’ writing recount text. The total score in post-test I is 2,157 of 30 students. So, the students’ mean score in post-test I is 71,90. There were 10 students who got 75, and others still low. The percentage of post-test I is 33,33%.

In post-test cycle II, the total score of students in writing recount text is 2,383 of 30 students. So, the students mean score in Post-test II was 79,43. But the students who got 75 were 20 students. So, the percentage of the students score in post-test II is 66,66%.

The table 3.4 showed there was improvement of the students score during the study. The students mean score in cycle I was higher than pre-test. The students mean scores in writing test cycle II was higher from all the students’ mean score during the study. The students’ mean score improved from 13,33% to 33,33% to 66,66%. The mean from each cycle can be seen in the table 3.5

| No | Test Form       | Total Score | Mean  |
|----|-----------------|-------------|-------|
| 1  | Pre-Test        | 1,752       | 58,40 |
| 2  | Post-test Cycle I | 2,157     | 71,90 |
| 3  | Post-test Cycle II | 2,383     | 79,43 |
In pre-test, there were 4 students who got score 75 whereas in Post-test I were 10 students and in Post-test II where 20 students. The result and percentage in each cycle could be seen in the table 4.6.

### Table 3.6 The Result of the score 75-100

| Test                  | Students’ who got the point 75-100 | Total of students | Percentage |
|-----------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|------------|
| Pre-test              |                                    | 4                 | 13.33      |
| Post-test Cycle I     |                                    | 10                | 33.33      |
| Post-test Cycle II    |                                    | 20                | 66.66      |

The improvement from the Pre-test to Post-test I is 6, from Post-test I to Post-test II is 10, from the Pre-test to Post-test II is 16. The percentage from the Pre-test to Post-test I is 20.00%, from Post-test I to Post-test II is 33.33 %. From Pre-test to Post-test II is 43.33%. It can be seen in the table 3.7

### Table 3.7 The Improvement of Students’ Score

| Test Form            | Improvement | Percentage |
|----------------------|-------------|------------|
| Pre-test - Post-test I | 6           | 20.00      |
| Post-test I - Post-test II | 10       | 33.33      |
| Pre-test - Post-test II | 16          | 43.33      |

#### Qualitative Data Analysis

The qualitative data were taken from diary notes, observation sheet, and questionnaire sheet.

1. **Diary Notes**

   The diary notes indicated that the students’ respect and response in learning writing background of action research proposal by using scientific approach. The writer gave pre-test to the students to write background of action research proposal without explanation. The writer gave post-test in cycle I to the students after the writer explained background of action research proposal by using scientific approach. The writer concluded that in the post-test in cycle II had improvement namely writing background of action research proposal by using scientific approach.

2. **Observation Sheet**

   The observation sheets indicated that the most students were active during teaching learning process which uses scientific approach. Firstly, most of the students felt unmotivated to background of action research proposal because the students never used scientific approach. After the writer explained the material by using scientific approach, most of students seem spirit and enthusiastic to study in class also write better than before.

3. **Questionnaire Sheet**

   Questionnaire sheet is used to measure the measure the level of students’ activities during teaching learning process. The writer made question to the students for getting information from observation. From the result questionnaire most of students did not master writing, so the students were difficult to write background of action research proposal, but after taught by scientific approach, they can be well and motivated in writing background of action research proposal.
RESEARCH FINDING

The result of the quantitative data indicated that there was an improvement of students in writing background of classroom action research proposal, which was taught by scientific approach. It can be seen from the data which showed that the mean score of the students. In the post-test II is 79.43 higher than the mean score in post-test I is 71.90 and also the mean score in the pre-test is 58.40. The writer also analyzed qualitative data to support this research finding to know how scientific approach can improve the students ability in writing background of classroom action research proposal during teaching and learning process personally. were taken from diary notes, observation sheet, and questionnaire sheet indicated that the diary writing technique greatly improves the increase an achievement scores of students because it helped them to share ideas and shaped them more creative and active during teaching learning process personally. It was found that scientific approach significantly improves the students ability in writing background of classroom action research proposal of the sixth semester of English department in Nommensen university academic year 2020/2021.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Conclusions

After analyzing the data, there are some conclusion, namely:

1. Scientific approach can be applied in teaching writing especially writing background of classroom action research proposal. To do scientific approach, students need to write their background draft by doing observing, questioning, experimenting, associating and communicating based on their real problem in teaching earning process.

2. The result of quantitative data shows that the mean score of the students in pre-test is 58.40, and percentage in pre-test is 13.33%. In the post-test of cycle I the mean is 71.90 and the percentage is 33.33%. In the post-test of cycle II the mean score is 79.43 and the percentage is 66.66%. The percentages of competent students were also increased from the pre-test until the last test.

3. The qualitative data analysis from the diary notes, observation and questionnaire sheet by applying scientific approach in teaching can help students to share their idea and the students are more creative and active during classroom action research teaching learning process.

4. Scientific approach significantly improves the students ability in writing background of classroom action research proposal of the sixth semester of English department in Nommensen university academic year 2020/2021.

Suggestions

The result of findings contribute valuable suggestions for those who were interested in teaching writing.

1. For the English teachers, the writer suggested that they have to apply scientific approach for teaching writing because the students could get benefits from it and
2. For other researchers who want to conduct the similar research should pay attention in applying scientific approach. It is better that they apply this approach not only in writing background of action research proposal but also in other research to improve the students skills in English.
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