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ABSTRACT

This research has attempted to describe the ability of the third year English students` ability of FKIP Bung Hatta University to write a cause and effect essay. The design of this research was descriptive. The numbers of population of this research were 122 students. The writer used cluster random sampling technique to determine the sample since the students were separated into four classes (A, B, C, and D). The writer chose one class as a sample of this research. Class B was decided to be the sample of this research. The numbers of this class were 20 students. The writer used writing essay test to collect data. Generally, the result of data analyzing the data showed that the ability of FKIP Bung Hatta University of the third year English students to write a cause and effect essay was moderate. It could be seen that 20% students had high ability, 70% had moderate ability, and 10% had low ability. Finally, based on the result above, the writer suggests the teachers to give more knowledge, explanation, practice in order to help students to improve their ability to write cause and effect essay. And students should do a lot of practices in order to improve their ability to write cause and effect essay.
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INTRODUCTION

Writing should become familiar in students’ daily life because they do writing in order to complete many tasks of their studies. In other words, writing is a skill to organize thoughts and written ideas that are often performed in daily life. And writing is also useful for students when completing education successfully. The students should
get sufficient writing practices. These practices are supposed to stimulate the student’s skill in writing and expressing thoughts in a good message. Without practicing, it is impossible to write well and effectively.

Concerning English Department students of Faculty of Teacher Training and Education (FKIP) at Bung Hatta University, there are four writing subjects offered to the students in four semesters. They are Writing I, Writing II, Writing III, and Writing IV. In writing subjects, the students learn about process of writing that takes many studies and practices. The students are taught how to write a sentence, a paragraph, and then an essay.

They are taught how to write an essay extensively in Writing III. Furthermore, based on the researcher’s experience in order to produce a good and qualified essay the students should have reading habitual. Reading habitual is a way to get information from something that was written and someone do it serious and continuously like a hobby. We can get much information from reading many books, magazines, articles, and reading newspapers to improve the writing skill.

Moreover, writing an essay connecting of several paragraphs and each paragraph has information that relates the paragraphs. In many ways, the form of essay is very similar to a paragraph. The essay has three main parts: thesis statement in introductory paragraph, supporting paragraphs in the body, and concluding session. Just like a paragraph, an essay also has several patterns in its organization. There are four patterns, namely chronological order, logical division, cause and effect, and comparison and contrast.

Based on the researcher’s observation when she studied Writing III in a class of English Department at Bung Hatta University, there are several reasons that make the students difficult in writing an essay. First, they have a problem in expressing their ideas in writing since an essay has long and complex topic to be discussed than topic of a paragraph. Likewise, Goldman (1986: 11) states that most people seem to think that essay varies in length from two hundred and fifty to twenty thousand words. Second, it is less of reading activity of the students. While, it is known that reading activity gives many inputs in writing. Third, the students do not have motivation and interest in writing because they having less the vocabulary and sometimes they lazy read English
books and articles of English. Also, the various patterns of organizing an essay still make the students confused in their writing.

The researcher is interested in conducting a research on students’ ability to write an essay especially cause and effect essay. This pattern is rather different from among the four patterns because the special one is the essay has block organization and chain organization but the other essays does not have. There are two main ways to organize a cause and effect essay; block organization and chain organization (Oshima and Hogue, 1991). In block organization, the researcher first discusses all of the causes as a block in one, two, three, or more paragraphs, depending on the number of causes. Then, the researcher discusses all of the effects together as a block. In chain organization, the researcher discusses a first cause and its effect, a second cause and its effect, a third cause and its effect, in a chain. On the other, especially no more essays have block organization and chain organization.

Besides, the situations or events that shows cause and effect relationship are often found in the daily life such as why the teacher teaches in the class, the causes and effects of smoking, the causes and effects of global warming, and many others. In addition, the structure of words or the transition signals used in this essay are very essential in showing cause and effect relationship. So that, the researcher wants to know the third year English Department students’ ability of FKIP Bung Hatta University in writing a cause and effect essay.

The purposes of this research were to describe the difficulties found by English Students of FKIP Bung Hatta University in writing the content, organizing, After finding the students’ difficulties in writing argumentative essay, the researcher hopes that this study has contribution to lectures and students. The lectures can solve this problem with action, for example giving more explanation about argumentative essay and use interesting explanation to their students.

**METHOD**

This chapter focused on research design, population and sample, instrumentation, technique of gathering data, and technique of analyzing data.

1. **Research Design**
The design of this research was descriptive research. According to Gay (1987) descriptive research involves collecting data in order to answer question concerning the current status of the subject of the study. Besides, Seliger and Shohamy (1989) state that descriptive research involves a collection of techniques used to specify, delineate, or describe naturally occurring phenomena without experimental manipulation. This research described about the ability of the third year students’ ability of Bung Hatta University to write a cause and effect essay.

2. Population and Sample

Population is the group to which the writer would like the result of the study to be generalized (Gay, 1987). The population of this research was the third year students of English Department at FKIP Bung Hatta University in academic year 2010/2011 because they had finished studying Writing I, Writing II, and Writing III. They were separated into four classes; A, B, C, and D. The total number of population was 122 students.

For getting the sample of this research, the researcher took the sample by using cluster random sampling technique. It was used because the members of population were grouped into classes. Cluster random sampling was used because the population was assumed homogeneous, they learnt same subject and were taught by the same lecturer. In addition, class B and class C were taught by the same lecturer; Mr. Yandri, S.Pd., M.Pd. According to Gay (1989), cluster sampling is sampling technique in which the sample is in group, not in individuals. All the members of selected groups have similar characteristics. Gay (1989) states that descriptive study the sample should be at least 10% of the population. Here the researcher chose one class as a sample by putting the name of classes (B and C) on the small papers and then the researcher mixed them to get the sample. After following the steps above, the researcher took one class as sample. The researcher chose class B as the sample. And the number of sample was 20 students or 17%.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
The instrument used to collect data was writing essay test. In this test, the researcher gave several topics to be chosen by the students to write cause and effect essay. The topics were: Causes and effects of internet, Causes and effects of air pollution, Causes and effects eating fast food, Causes and effects of smoking, Causes and effects of global warming, Causes and effects of watching many `Sinetron` series on TV, Causes and effects of stress and Students cheating. The test was administrated in 50 minutes. Before researcher giving the real test, the researcher has tried out test to the students out of sample. Class D has done the try out test. In this case the researcher gave the students try out the instruction of the test to find out whether or not the students understand what they will do with the test and the time allocation.

In order to see validity of the test, the researcher used content validity. It means that the content of the test is included in syllabus and has been taught for students. Furthermore, the eight topics were familiar for students. Then to see the reliability of the test, the researcher used two scorers. It means that there were two scorers (score 1 and score 2). They were the researcher and her friend; Vina Fitria. The researcher chose Vina Fitria as second scorer because in Vina Fitria`s thesis she did writing test and she used Pearson Product Moment Formula of Arikunto too, same with the researcher. And for more addition, Vina F always got very high correlation in her writing subject and that was why the researcher believed and know with Vina`s skill in writing. The function used two score was to minimize the subjectivity of scoring test. To calculate the coefficient of correlating among two scores, the researcher used the product moment formula suggested by Arikunto (1999) as follows:

$$r_{xy} = \frac{n \sum xy - (\sum x)(\sum y)}{\sqrt{(n \sum x^2 - (\sum x)^2)(n \sum y^2 - (\sum y)^2)}}$$

Where: $r_{xy}$ = the coefficient correlation between variable x and y
n = the number of the students who follow the test
x = the score given by the first scorer
y = the score given by the second scorer

To know the coefficient correlation of the test, the result was analyzed by Spearman- Brown formula (Arikunto, 2002:156):

$$r_{ii} = \frac{2 \ r_{xy}}{1 + r_{xy}}$$

Where : $r_{ii}$ = reliabilities instrument
\[ r_{xy} \] = the coefficient correlation between variable x and y

The coefficient correlation of test was categorized as follows (Arikunto, 1999):

- **0.81 – 1.00**: very high correlation
- **0.61 – 0.80**: high correlation
- **0.41 – 0.60**: moderate correlation
- **0.21 – 0.40**: low correlation
- **0.0 – 0.20**: very low

### 4 Technique of Gathering Data

The researcher collected the data by using writing test through some procedures as follows:

1. The researcher gave the test to the sample of the research
2. The researcher collected the test
3. The researcher and the second scorer gave the score to the students’ essay based on the certain criteria as shown in 3.1 table. The following criteria suggested by Heaton (1989).
4. The researcher calculated the average score of two scores.

#### Table 3.1: Criteria for Scoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Criteria of each item</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1  | Content          | Excellent to very good: Knowledgeable – substantive – etc  
Good to average: some knowledge of subject – adequate range, etc  
Fair to poor: limited knowledge of subject – little substance  
Very poor: does not show knowledge of subject, non – substantive, etc | 22-25 |
<p>|    |                  |                                                                                                           | 18-21 |
|    |                  |                                                                                                           | 14-17 |
|    |                  |                                                                                                           | 11-18 |
| 2  | Organization:    |                                                                                                           | 0-25  |
|    | General Statement| If the students write the subject to attract reader’s attention.                                          | 0-7   |
|    |                  | If the students write thesis statement to state the specific subdivision of the topic or the plan of our paper. | 0-8   |
|    | Thesis Statement | If the students write supporting paragraph that develops a subdivision of the topic.                     | 0-5   |
|    | Supporting Paragraph | If the students write concluding paragraph, which is summary or review of the main points discussed in the body | 0-5   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Excellent to very good: affective complex construction</th>
<th>Good to average: effective but simple constructions</th>
<th>Fair to poor: Major problems in simple/complex constructions</th>
<th>Very poor: virtually no mastery of sentence construction rules.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>20-18</td>
<td>17-14</td>
<td>13-10</td>
<td>9-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vocabulary (choice of words)</th>
<th>Excellent to very good: effective word / idiom choice and usage</th>
<th>Good to average: occasional errors of word / idiom form, choice, usage but meaning not obscured</th>
<th>Fair to poor: frequent errors of words / idiom form, choice, usage</th>
<th>Very poor: little knowledge of English vocabulary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>8-10</td>
<td>5-7</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>0-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Transitional Words</th>
<th>Excellent to very good: effective choice and usage of appropriate transitional words.</th>
<th>Good to average: occasional errors of transitional word choice, usage but meaning not obscured</th>
<th>Fair to poor: frequent errors of transitional words choice, usage</th>
<th>Very poor: little knowledge of transitional words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>8-10</td>
<td>5-7</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>0-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mechanics</th>
<th>Excellent to very good: demonstrates mastery of convention</th>
<th>Good to average: occasional errors of spelling, punctuation</th>
<th>Fair to poor: frequent errors of spelling, punctuation, and capitalization</th>
<th>Very poor: no mastery of conventions dominated by errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>8-10</td>
<td>5-7</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>0-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes about scoring:**

1. Taken from J. B Heaton
2. The researcher modified the criteria in Mechanics to make it more suitable with the test that the researcher conducts

**3.5 Technique of Analyzing Data**

To analyze the data, the researcher used some steps:

1. The researcher presented raw data in table of frequency distribution
2. The researcher used Calculate Mean and Standard Deviation (SD) to calculate students` grade. They were as the follows:

\[ \bar{X} = \frac{\sum x}{N} \]

\[ SD = \sqrt{\left[ \frac{\sum x^2}{n} \right] - \left[ \frac{\sum x}{n} \right]^2} \]

Where: \( M \) = Mean  

\( \sum x \) = Total score  

\( n \) = number of sample  

\( Sd \) = standard deviation

3. The researcher classified the student`s ability into High, Moderate, and Low by using the following categories (Arikunto, 2003:264)

- \( > M + 1 \ SD \) = High  
- \( M - 1 \ SD \rightarrow M + 1 \ SD \) = Moderate  
- \( < M - 1 \ SD \) = Low

4. The researcher calculated the percentage of the students who get High, Moderate, and Low ability by using the following formula:

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

\( P \) = Percentage of the students who get each score  

\( R \) = the sum of the students who get high, moderate, and low.  

\( T \) = the sum of the students

Finally, the researcher got conclusion based on the percentage of the students who get High, Moderate, and Low

**CONCLUSION**

After having the data, the researcher has some conclusions about this study as following:

1. In general, the researcher found the students` ability in writing cause and effect essay was moderate. This conclusion was indicated by the fact that there were 4 students (20%) had high ability, 14 students (70%) had moderate ability, and 2 students (10%) had low ability.

2. The researcher found the students` ability to organize cause and effect essay was moderate. This conclusion showed that 4 students (20%) had high ability, 13 students (65%) had moderate ability and 3 students (15%) had low ability.
3. The researcher found the students’ ability in using grammar was moderate. This conclusion showed that 4 students (20%) had high ability, 14 students (70%) had moderate ability and 2 students (10%) had low ability.

4. The researcher found the students’ ability in using appropriate vocabulary was high. The result showed that 8 students (40%) had high ability, 7 students (35%) had moderate ability and 5 students (25%) had low ability.

5. The researcher found the students’ ability in using appropriate transitional signals was moderate. The result showed that 3 students (15%) had high ability, 13 students (65%) had moderate ability and 4 students (20%) had low ability.

6. The researcher found the students’ in using appropriate mechanics was moderate. The result showed that 1 student (5%) had high ability, 15 students (75%) had moderate ability and 4 students (20%) had low ability.
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