

THE EFFECT OF ENGAGE, STUDY, ACTIVATE (ESA) METHOD TO WRITING RECOUNT TEXT IN EIGHT GRADES OF MTSN 1 PONTIANAK

Yokie Prasetya Dharma
STKIP Persada Khatulistiwa, Jl Pertama, Sengkuang, Sintang.
punyaoki@gmail.com

Abstract: The objectives in this research are; to find out whether there is significant difference in writing skill between the students who are taught by using ESA and those who are taught without using ESA. This research is an experimental research which held at MTs N 1 Pontianak, West Kalimantan. The research subjects are eight grade students. There are two groups in this research those are experimental group and control group, which class VIII B as the experimental group, that was taught by using Engage Study Activate (ESA) and class VIII A as the control group that was taught without using ESA. The mean score of the posttest in the experimental group is higher than pretest $50.60 > 35.93$ and the mean score of the posttest in the control group is higher than pretest $43.27 > 40.67$. It shows that the mean score of the posttest in the experimental group is higher than posttest of the control group $50.60 > 35.93$. The result of t-test shows the result of p value is lower than the significant level $.00 < .05$ and t-test is higher than t table $5.934 > 2.045$. therefore, the hypothesis is accepted. There is significant difference of writing recount text between the students who are taught using ESA and the students who are taught without using ESA of the Eight Grades Students of MTS N 1 Pontianak.

Keywords: Engage Study Activate (ESA), Writing Recount Text, Effect.

Abstrak: Tujuan dalam penelitian ini adalah untuk mengetahui apakah ada perbedaan yang signifikan dalam keterampilan menulis antara siswa yang diajar dengan menggunakan ESA dan mereka yang diajar tanpa menggunakan ESA. Penelitian ini merupakan penelitian eksperimental yang diadakan di MTs N 1 Pontianak, Kalimantan Barat. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan rata-rata nilai posttest pada kelompok eksperimen lebih tinggi dari pretest $50,60 > 35,93$ dan nilai rata-rata dari posttest pada kelompok kontrol lebih tinggi dari pretest $43,27 > 40,67$. Hal ini menunjukkan bahwa nilai rata-rata posttest pada kelompok eksperimen lebih tinggi dari posttest dari kelompok kontrol $50,60 > 35,93$. Hasil uji t menunjukkan hasil p value lebih rendah dari tingkat signifikan $0,00 < .05$ dan t-test lebih tinggi dari t tabel $5,934 > 2,045$. Dapat disimpulkan bahwa ada perbedaan yang signifikan dalam menulis teks recount antara siswa yang diajarkan menggunakan ESA dan siswa yang tidak diajarkan menggunakan ESA di murid kelas delapan MTs N 1 Pontianak.

Kata Kunci: Mengajak, Mempelajari, Menggerakkan (ESA), Menulis Teks Recount, Pengaruh.

INTRODUCTION

Writing is one aspect of teaching and learning English, and one of most important skills that language learners must master as an essential component not only for their academic practice but also later in their professional life. Brown (2003: 218) stated that students should master writing for their output of what they have learned because writing skills are necessary for papers, articles, dissertation, books and professional journals.

Realizing that knowledge of writing is vital, teachers should pay attention to teaching writing. Nunan (2003: 88) stated that writing is the mental work of inventing ideas, thinking about how to express them, and organizing them into statements and paragraphs that will be clear to reader. So, a teacher must have effective and efficient methods, media or teaching aids in order that teaching writing is successful.

Writing ability is not something obtained naturally, but that which needs practice and step-by-step training. Nunan (2003: 92) stated that writing almost always improves with practice. Therefore, a student must be involved and motivated, in the teaching and learning process, especially in exercises and evaluations so that they become more competent in writing skills. Teachers play a main role in

teaching and learning; he or she demands certain abilities and skills of students, which are planned for and practiced in each unit of a lesson program.

Although writing is critical, the subject is often difficult for a student. The reason is in writing we must share ideas from our minds, and transferring ideas in our minds to a written text is sometimes difficult. We must be able to choose and to combine vocabulary to create something meaningful. Heaton (1990: 135) stated that writing skills are complicated and sometimes difficult to teach, requiring mastery not only of grammatical and rhetorical devices but also conceptual and judgmental elements.

Broughton et al. (cited in Bilal, et al., 2003: 116) pointed out four kinds of problems related to developing English writing skills. These include 1) mechanical problems with the script of English, 2) problems of accuracy of English grammar and lexis, 3) problems relating the style of writing to the demands of a particular situation, 4) problems of developing ease and comfort in expressing what needs to be said. These problematic areas can be overcome through effective planning and guided writing.

Moreover, Byrne (1995: 4) explained other types problems related to writing that included psychological, linguistic and cognitive issues.

Psychological problems refer to the fact that writing is essentially a solitary activity. Writers are required to write on their own without interactions or the benefits of feedback. This solitude can make the act of writing difficult. Second, linguistic problems occur because in writing no direct interaction between is present between writers and readers, so writers must keep the channel of communication open. This may be done through effort expended through the choice of sentences structures. Sentences are linked together and sequenced with the result that text produced can be read on its own.

Third, cognitive problems are related to the fact that writing is learned through the process of instructions. Writers must learn and master the written form and certain structures that are less used in speech but which are important for effective communication in writing. Writers also must learn how to organize ideas in order readers understand those ideas.

In this case, teachers are supposed to be creative in developing their teaching process to create a good atmosphere in which to teach students writing skill. Several ways exist to teach writing in Junior High school. One is by using the Engage, Study and Activate (ESA) method. ESA has three parts. First, engage is the point in a teaching sequence at

which teachers build the students' interest, thus involving their emotions and making the learning more fun and creating better learning. When students are amused, stimulated, challenged, they will not only have more 'fun', but also learn better. Second, study is the activity in which the students are asked to focus on language (or information) and how it is constructed. The construction of language is the main focus, but the topics can be words, sounds or verbs tenses. Third, activate describes exercises and activities that are designed to get the students using language as freely and communicatively as they can.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research is an experiment. The aim of this research is to determine the effectiveness of using the ESA instructional method in teaching writing skills to eight grade students. Herbert and Shohamy (1989: 136) have said that experimental research is concerned with studying in effect of specified and controlled treatments that is given to subjects usually formed in groups. The method used in this research is quasi-experimental design.

There are two groups in this research method, experimental group and control group. The design is illustrated in the following table.

Table 1 Research Design

Group	Test	Treatment	Test
Experimental (VIII B)	Pre-Test	ESA Method	Post-Test
Control (VIII A)	Pre-Test	Conventional method	Post-Test

Cresswell (2008: 46) points out that quantitative research is a type of educational research in which the researcher decides what to study, asks

specific, narrows questions, collect quantifiable data from participants, analyzes these numbers by using statistics, and conducts the inquiry in an unbiased.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

A. Result of the research

1. Descriptive Analysis

The instrument analysis of the study is test which consists of pre-test and post-test for the experimental and control group. In the pre-test of the control group, the mean score is 40.67, the standard deviation is 10.587, and the ideal mean is 42. This result does not show a significant improvement in the post-test, which the mean score is 43.27, and the standard deviation is 12.523. It is because there is no treatment in the control group.

The condition above is different from the experimental group. In the pretest of experimental group, the ideal mean is 42, the mean score is 35.93, and the standard deviation is 11.123. After doing pre-test, the researcher gave the treatment for the experimental group. In the treatment, the researcher helped student to write, and in the post-test, there is significant improvement in the post-test while the mean score is 50.60 and the standard deviation is 14.763. The value of ideal mean was 60% from possible maximum score, while the value of standard deviation was $\frac{1}{4}$ from ideal mean.

Table 2.The Conversation Criterion

No.	Sigma Scales	Scale Number	Category
1	1.5	$X \geq Mi + 1.5 Sdi$	Very Good
2	0.5	$Mi + 0.5 Sdi \leq X < Mi + 1.5 Sdi$	Good
3	-0.5	$Mi - 0.5 Sdi \leq X < Mi + 0.5 Sdi$	Fair
4	-1.5	$Mi - 0.5 Sdi \leq X < Mi - 0.5 Sdi$	Poor

a. Pre-Test

In this study, the researcher used test as the instruments. The test consists of pre-test and post-test. The pre-test was done on August, 13rd for control (VIII A) and August, 14th for the experimental (VIII B).

1) Result of Pre-Test of the Control Group

The result description presented here consists of the mean, the standard deviation, the maximum score and the minimum score. The summary of the distribution of the pre-test in the control group can be seen in the table 3.

Table 3. Result Description of the Pre-Test in the Control Group

Control Class	Number of students	Mean	Standard Deviation	Maximum Score	Minimum Score
Pre-Test	30	40.67	10.587	64.00	28.00

The total number of students who belong to the control group in this research is 30. Based on the table above, it can be seen that mean of 40.67

and standard deviation of 10.587 are for the control group. Furthermore, the maximum and minimum score for the control group are 64.00 and 28.00

Table 4. The Scale Number of Pre-Test in the Control Group

No.	Sigma Scale	Scale Number	Category
1	1.5	$X \geq Mi + 1.5 Sdi$ s.d score maximal $42 + 1,5.10,5.70 \geq 57.6$	Very Good
2	0.5	$Mi + 0.5 Sdi \leq X < Mi + 1.5 Sdi$ $42 + 0,5.10,5 s.d < 42 + 1,5.10,5$ $47.26 - 57.5$	Good
3	-0.5	$Mi - 0.5 Sdi \leq X < Mi + 0.5 Sdi$ $42 - 0,5.10,5 s.d < 42 + 0,5.10,5$ $36.76 - 47.25$	Fair
4	-1.5	$Mi - 0.5 Sdi \leq X < Mi - 0.5 Sdi$ $42 - 1,5. 10,5 s.d 42 - 0,5.10,5$ $26.26 - 36.75$	Poor

Based on table, the researcher categorizes the student score in four scales. The value of ideal mean for the pre-test was 42 and the ideal standard deviation was 10.5. The account result of the classification of the student's score was based on the ideal mean and ideal standard deviation was presented in the table below.

The categories are poor, fair, good and very good. The distribution the control Group students' Pre-Test score, poor if the score is higher or same than 26.26 and lower than 36.75, fair if the score is higher or same than 36.76 and lower than 47.25, good if the score is higher or same than 47.26, and lower than 57.75, very good if the score is higher or same than 57.76.

Table 5. The Frequency Distribution of Pre-Test in the Control Group

No	Scores	Frequency	Percentage	Category
1	≥ 57.76	2	6.67 %	Very Good
2	47.26 – 57.75	8	26.67 %	Good
3	36.76 – 47.25	9	30 %	Fair
4	26.26 – 36.75	11	36.66 %	Poor
	Total	30	100%	

Based on the table above, it can be described that 30 students, there are 2 students (6.67%) achieved very good, 8 students (26.67%) achieved good, 9 students (30%) achieved fair category, 11 students (36.66%) achieved poor category.

2) Result of Pre-test of the Experiment Group

The result description presented here consists of the mean, the standard deviation, the maximum score and the minimum score. The summary of the distribution of the pretest in the

experimental group can

be seen in the table 6

Table 6. Result Description of the Pre-Test in the Experiment Group

Experiment Class	Number of students	Mean	Standard Deviation	Maximum Score	Minimum Score
Pre-Test	30	35.93	11.123	70.00	28.00

The total number of students who belong to the experimental group in this research is 30. Based on the table above, it can be seen that mean of 35.93 and

standard deviation of 11.123 are for the control group. Furthermore, the maximum and minimum score for the control group are 70.00 and 28.00

Table 7. The Scale Number of Pre-Test in the experimental Group

No.	Sigma Scale	Scale Number	Category
1	1.5	$X \geq Mi + 1.5 Sdi$ s.d score maximal $43 + 1,5.10,5$ s.d $70 \geq 57.6$	Very Good
2	0.5	$Mi + 0.5 Sdi \leq X < Mi + 1.5 Sdi$ $42 + 0,5.10,5$ s.d $< 42 + 1,5.10,5$ $47.26 - 57.5$	Good
3	-0.5	$Mi - 0.5 Sdi \leq X < Mi + 0.5 Sdi$ $42 - 0,5.10,5$ s.d $< 42 + 0,5.10,5$ $36.76 - 47.25$	Fair
4	-1.5	$Mi - 0.5 Sdi \leq X < Mi - 0.5 Sdi$ $42 - 1,5. 10,5$ s.d $42 - 0,5.10,5$ $26.26 - 36.75$	Poor

Based on table, the researcher categorizes the student score in four scales. The value of ideal mean for the pre-test was 42 and the ideal standard deviation was 10.5. The account result of the

classification of the student's score was based on the ideal mean and ideal standard deviation was presented in the table below:

The categories are poor, fair, good and very

good. The distribution the Experiment Group students' Pre-Test score, poor if the score is higher or same than 26.26 and lower than 36.75, fair if the score is higher or same than

36.76 and lower than 47.25, good if the score is higher or same than 47.26, and lower than 57.75, very good if the score is higher or same than 57.76.

Table 8. The Frequency Distribution of Pre-Test in the experimental Group

No	Scores	Frequency	Percentage	Category
1	≥ 57.76	2	6.67 %	Very Good
2	47.26 – 57.75	3	10 %	Good
3	36.76 – 47.25	5	16.67 %	Fair
4	26.26 – 36.75	20	66.66 %	Poor
	Total	30	100%	

Based on the table above, it can be described that 30 students, there are 2 students (6.67%) achieved very good, 3

students (10%) achieved good, 5 students (16.67%) achieved fair category, 20 students (66.66 %) achieved poor category.

b. The Treatment

In this section, the researcher provided the material based on the curriculum, and then the researcher gave a treatment to the experimental group by teaching recount writing Engage, Study, and Activate (ESA) as a teaching method.

The treatments which are focus on recount text are given by the researcher started from second meeting until seventh meeting. Furthermore, the researcher gave an exercise based on the material which related to recount text. The schedule shown in the table 9

Table 9. The schedule of the treatment in Experimental Group (VIII B)

Meeting	Time	Material	Group
2nd	August, 15 2014	Past Tense	Experimental
3rd	August, 21 2014	Past Tense	Experimental
4th	August, 22 2014	Recount Text	Experimental
5th	August, 28 2014	Recount Text	Experimental

6th	August, 29 2014	Recount Text	Experimental
7th	September, 4 2014	Recount Text	Experimental

c. Post Test

The other instrument is post-test. The post-test was done on September, 5th for both of group but in different schedule.

1) Result of Post-Test in The Control Group

The data analyzing of writing test score consisted

of the mean, the standard deviation, the maximum scores, minimum scores and the range of group. The summary of the distribution of post-test in the experiment group can be seen in the table 10

Table 10.Result Description of the Posttest in the Control Group

Control Class	Number of students	Mean	Standard Deviation	Maximum Score	Minimum Score
Post-Test	30	43.27	12.523	70.00	28.00

The total number of students who belong to the control group in this research is 30. Based on the table above, it can be seen that mean of 43.27 and

standard deviation of 12.523 are for the control group. Furthermore, the maximum and minimum score for the control group are 70.00 and 28.00.

Table 11.The Scale Number of Post Test in the Control Group

No.	Sigma Scale	Scale Number	Category
1	1.5	$X \geq Mi + 1.5 Sdi$ s.d score maximal $42 + 1,5.10,5$ s.d 70 ≥ 57.6	Very Good
2	0.5	$Mi + 0.5 Sdi \leq X < Mi + 1.5 Sdi$ $42 + 0,5.10,5$ s.d < 42 + $1,5.10,5$ $47.26 - 57.5$	Good
3	-0.5	$Mi - 0.5 Sdi \leq X < Mi + 0.5 Sdi$ $42 - 0,5.10,5$ s.d < 42 + $0,5.10,5$ $36.76 - 47.25$	Fair
4	-1.5	$Mi - 0.5 Sdi \leq X < Mi - 0.5 Sdi$ $42 - 1,5. 10,5$ s.d 42 - 0,5.10,5	Poor

		26.26 – 36.75	
--	--	---------------	--

Based on table, the researcher categorizes the student score in four scales. The value of ideal mean for the pre-test was 42 and the ideal standard deviation was 10.5. The account result of the classification of the student's score was based on the ideal mean and ideal standard deviation was presented in the table below:

The categories are poor, fair, good and very

good. The distribution the Control Group students' Post-Test score, poor if the score is higher or same than 26.26 and lower than 36.75, fair if the score is higher or same than 36.76 and lower than 47.25, good if the score is higher or same than 47.26, and lower than 57.75, very good if the score is higher or same than 57.76.

Table 12. The Frequency Distribution of Post-Test in the Control Group

No	Scores	Frequency	Percentage	Category
1	≥ 57.76	5	16.67 %	Very Good
2	47.26 – 57.75	6	20 %	Good
3	36.76 – 47.25	10	33.33 %	Fair
4	26.26 – 36.75	9	30 %	Poor
	Total	30	100%	

Based on the table above, it can be described that among 30 students, there is 5 students (16.67 %) achieved very good, 6 students (20 %) achieved good category, 10 students (33.33%) achieved fair

category, 9 students (30%) achieved poor category.

2) Result of Post-Test in the Experimental Group

The data analyzing of writing test score consisted of the mean, the standard deviation, the maximum scores, minimum

scores and the range of group. The summary of the distribution of post-test in

the experiment group can be seen in the table 13

Table 13. Result Description of the Post-test in the Experimental Group

Experimental Class	Number of students	Mean	Standard Deviation	Maximum Score	Minimum Score
Post-Test	30	50.60	14.736	70.00	28.00

The total number of students who belong to the experimental group in this research is 30. Based on the table above, it can be seen that mean of 50.60 and

standard deviation of 14.736 are for the control group. Furthermore, the maximum and minimum score for the control group are 70.00 and 28.00.

Table 14. The Scale Number of Post-Test in the experimental Group

No.	Sigma Scale	Scale Number	Category
1	1.5	$X \geq Mi + 1.5 Sdi$ s.d score maximal $42 + 1,5.10,5$ s.d 70 ≥ 57.6	Very Good
2	0.5	$Mi + 0.5 Sdi \leq X < Mi + 1.5 Sdi$ $42 + 0,5.10,5$ s.d $< 42 + 1,5.10,5$ $47.26 - 57.5$	Good
3	-0.5	$Mi - 0.5 Sdi \leq X < Mi + 0.5 Sdi$ $42 - 0,5.10,5$ s.d $< 42 + 0,5.10,5$ $36.76 - 47.25$	Fair
4	-1.5	$Mi - 0.5 Sdi \leq X < Mi - 0.5 Sdi$ $42 - 1,5. 10,5$ s.d $42 - 0,5.10,5$ $26.26 - 36.75$	Poor

Based on table, the researcher categorizes the student score in four scales. The value of ideal mean for the pre-test was 42 and the ideal standard deviation was 10.5. The account result of the

classification of the student's score was based on the ideal mean and ideal standard deviation was presented in the table below:

The categories are very poor, poor, fair,

good and very good. The distribution the Experiment Group students' Post-Test score, poor if the score is higher or same than 26.26 and lower than 36.75, fair if the score is

higher or same than 36.76 and lower than 47.25, good if the score is higher or same than 47.26, and lower than 57.75, very good if the score is higher or same than 57.76.

Table 15. The Frequency Distribution of Post-Test in the experimental Group

No	Scores	Frequency	Percentage	Category
1	≥ 57.76	13	43.33 %	Very Good
2	47.26 – 57.75	6	20 %	Good
3	36.76 – 47.25	5	16.67 %	Fair
4	26.26 – 36.75	6	20 %	Poor
	Total	30	100%	

Based on the table above, it can be described that among 30 students, there are 13 students (43.33%) achieved to very good, 6

students (20%) achieved good category, 5 students (16.67%) achieved fair category, 6 students (20%) achieved poor category.

2. Inferential Analysis

To find out the effectiveness of teaching recount writing by Engage Study Activate (ESA) between experimental and control groups, the researcher uses t-test while finding the normality and homogeneity, namely;

a. Test of Normality

The normality test is aimed to know whether the distribution of the

sample in the population meets the normal distribution requirements or not. The test of normality used in this research was Kolmogorov-Smirnov test formula. The research decided 0.05 for the significant value in this test. The distribution can be said to be normal if the result of the obtained probability value Asymp-

sig (2-tailed) was higher than 0.05.

1) Pre-Test

A normality test is used to analyze whether the data distribution is normal or not. The researcher decides 0.05 for the

significant value in this test. The normality test for the pre-test in the experimental class and control class, the data can be seen in the table below:

Table 16. The normality test result of the pre-test

Group	Kolmogorov-Smirnov z	Sig (2-tailed)
Experimental class	1.303	.067
Control class	.877	.572

According to the table above, it can be described that the data of the pre-test in the experimental group and pre-test in

control group are normal. It is because the value of significance is higher than 0.05.

2) Post-test

A normality test is used to analyze whether the data distribution is a normal or not. The researcher decides 0.05 for the significant value in this test. The

normality test was conducted by using Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. The result of the normality test for the post-test in the experimental class and control class, the data can be seen in the table below.

Table 17. The normality test result of the Post-test

Group	Kolmogorov-Smirnov	Sig (2.tailed)
Experimental Class	.893	.572
Control Class	.783	.403

Based on the table above, it can be described that the data of the post-test in experimental group and post-test in control group are normal. It is because the value of significance is higher than 0.05 that is .572 and .403.

b. Test of Homogeneity

Test of homogeneity is conducted to analyze whether the data is homogeneous or not. The test is analyzed using Levine Statistic. The result of the homogeneity test can be seen in the table below.

Table 18. Test Homogeneity of Variance

Group	Levine Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Pre-Test	.197	1	58	.659
Post-Test	1.687	1	58	.199

As visualized in the table above, by using significance level 0.05, the result can be conclude that the data is homogeneous because the value of Sig. is higher than 0.05, that is .659 and .199. The result can be concluded that the data were homogeneous because value of sig was $.659 > .05$ for the pretest and $.199 > .05$ for the pre-test. Therefore, the variance of the two groups in pre and posttest was homogeneous and the sample has the variance,

so the data met the requirement of a research analysis.

c. Hypothesis Testing

1) Control Group

To compare the result of pre-test between experimental and control class the researcher has to count t-test. The t-test was applied to test whether there are significance different results of the two groups. The result of the t-test can be described in the following table 19

Table 19. The result of t-test of Control Group

	Paired Differences					t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Control Group	-2.600	12.241	2.235	-7.171	1.971	-1.163	29	.254

The table 22

shows that the value of p or the level of significance is 0.441. The value of p is higher than $t_{0.05}$ or $0.441 > 0.05$ it means that in control group is not significant different or the score of writing test between pre-test and post-test is not significant different in the control group.

2) Experimental group

To compare the result of post-test between experimental and control class the researcher has to count t-test. The t-test is applied to test whether there are significant different results of the two groups. The result of the t-test can be described in the following table:

Table 20. The result of t-test of Experimental Group

	Paired Differences					t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Experimental Group	-14.667	13.538	2.472	-19.772	-9.612	-5.934	29	.000

The table 23

shows that the result of the data analysis shows that the value of p is 0.000. It is lower than

0.05 ($0.000 < 0.05$). it can be said effective, if the value is lower than 0.05 and the value of t observed was higher

than value of t table ($-5.934 > -2.045$). It means that there was a significant different between experimental group and control group.

Therefore, it can be concluded that the score of the students 'vocabulary, organization, content, language use and mechanics mastery between the experimental group and control group is significantly different. So the hypothesis was accepted

B. Discussion

The experimental research takes the eighth grade students of MTS N 1 Pontianak to find out the effectiveness of Engage Study Activate (ESA) on English writing. The research can be summarized as a follow:

1. There was significant difference between the students who were taught by using ESA and the students who were taught without using ESA. The mean

score of the experimental group of the students who were taught using ESA were higher than the mean score of the control group who were taught without using ESA. It can be seen in explaining below:

- a. The result of experimental group students who were taught using ESA and the control group students who were taught without using ESA was different. The result of the students who taught using ESA or the experimental group can be seen that the mean score of the pre-test was 35.93 and the mean score of post-test was 50.60. From the mean score of pre-test and post-test of the experimental group, it can be seen that there was a progress from the pre-test to the post-test. Before the treatment, there are 2 students (6.67%) achieved very good, 3 students (10%) achieved good, 5 students (16.67%) achieved fair category, 20 students (66.66 %) achieved poor category. After conducted the

treatment, the result of the data showed differences. Mean score after treatment was 50.60 and standard deviation was 14.736. There are 13 students (43.33%) achieved to very good, 6 students (20%) achieved good category, 5 students (16.67%) achieved fair category, 6 students (20%) achieved poor category. It means that there was a decrease in the number of poor category in experimental group.

- b. The result of the students who are taught without using ESA or the control group can be seen that the mean score of pre-test was 40.67 and the post-test was 43.27, it can be seen that there are 2 students (6.67%) achieved very good, 8 students (26.67%) achieved good, 9 students (30%) achieved fair category, 11 students (36.66%) achieved poor category. Meanwhile, post-test in control group does not show a significant improvement. The mean

score in post-test was 43.27 and standard deviation was 12.523. There is 5 students (16.67 %) achieved very good, 6 students (20 %) achieved good category, 10 students (33.33%) achieved fair category, 9 students (30%) achieved poor category.

- c. The hypothesis testing indicated that the score of the experimental group are significant difference than control group. It can be seen from the result of value of p is lower than the level of significant ($.00 < .05$) and t-test is higher than t table ($5.934 > 2.045$).

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

A. Conclusion

Teaching writing recount text by using Engage, Study, Activate (ESA) method was effective, as showed by increase of the mean score of the test. Based on the result of pre-test and post-test in control group, it was shown that the pre-test mean score was 40.67 and the post-test mean

score was 43.27, it means that there was an increase of 2.60. The result of pre-test and post-test in experimental group showed that the pre-test mean score was 35.93 and the post-test mean score was 50.60, it mean that there was an increase of 14.67. It was also supported by the hypothesis testing, the hypothesis testing indicated that the score of the experimental group are significant difference than control group. It can be seen from the result of value of p is lower than the level of significant (.00 < .05) and t-test is higher than t table (5.934 > 2.045).

B. Suggestion

Engage, Study, Activate (ESA) can be used by the teacher as an alternative solution in explaining the material especially writing ability. It can give benefit in raising student's interest and motivation because between teacher and students had emotional closeness. This condition

helps students to develop their writing ability. Because the English class must be fun and enjoyable to make the students can enjoy their English class and easy to understand and memorize the material given by the teacher.

REFERENCES

- Bilal, Hafiz Ahmad, et.al. August 2013. *Investigating The Problems Faced By The Teachers In Developing English Writing Skills. Asian Journal Of Societies And Humanities*. Vol.2,No.3.
- Brown, Douglas. 2003. *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practice*. San Francisco: Longman.
- Byrne, Donn. 1995. *Teaching Writing Skill*. New York: Longman.
- Creswell, John W. 2008. *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. New Jersey: Pearson International Edition.
- Heaton, J.B. 1990. *Writing English Language Test*. New York: Longman.
- Nunan, David. 2003. *Practical English Language Teaching*. New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies.
- Selinger, H.W and Elana Shohamy. 1989. *Second Language Research Method*. Oxford: Orford University.

