

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS

In this chapter, the writer will discuss the result of the research which was conducted from November 23th to December 7th2016. It includes the result of the test, questionnaire analysis, and discussion. This research was conducted at English department of UIN Ar-Raniry.

A. Result of Test

The test was given to the students in order to measure the students' ability in writing a narrative text before and after the treatment given during the experimental teaching. The students participated in two types of tests; the pre-test and post-test. The pre-test was held on November 23th, 2016, while the post-test was conducted on December 7th, 2016. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the analysis of students' writing was used in order to find out the students' skill in writing by comparing the pre-test and the post-test. There were some aspects that the researcher used to assess students' writing, they include organization, content, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanic.

There were 24 students in the class and all of them attended the class on the day of pre-test. The result of pre-test could be seen as follows:

Table 4.1: The Table of Pre-test

No	Students' name	Pre- test score
1	RF	85
2	MBIM	96
3	NM	68
4	AYS	81
5	NA	73
6	RM	73
7	DRA	68
8	NH	90
9	FW	48
10	BM	47
11	SA	67
12	NS	55
13	MR	91
14	ES	84
15	DRM	79
16	DA	45
17	IF	94
18	FR	89
19	MH	57
20	SL	61
21	TAM	95
22	AR	47
23	MRR	45
24	MRFA	47

Source: students' pre-test score

The data in the table above can be calculated by using the following steps.

First, the range (R) determined by using the formula below:

$$R = H - L$$

Where:

R = range of the score

H = the highest score

L = the lowest score

The highest score of pre-test was 96 and the lowest score was 45. Thus, the range was $96 - 45 = 51$

The class interval was identified by using following formula:

$$\begin{aligned}
 I &= 1 + (3,3) \log n && (n = \text{number of students}) \\
 &= 1 + (3,3) \log 24 \\
 &= 1 + (3,3) (1,38) \\
 &= 1 + 4,554 \\
 &= 5,554
 \end{aligned}$$

Then, the range of the interval class was found out by the formula:

$$P = \frac{R}{I}$$

$$P = \frac{51}{5}$$

$$P = 10.2$$

From those results, the frequency distribution table can be seen below :

Table 4.2: The Frequency Distribution Table of Pre-test

Class interval	Fi	Xi	Fixi
45-54	6	49.5	297
55-64	3	59.5	178.5
65-74	5	69.5	347.5
75-84	2	79.5	159
85-94	6	89.5	537
95-104	2	99.5	199
Total	N = 24	447	1718

Where:

fi = refers to frequency

xi = refers to the middle score interval class

$f_i x_i$ = the amount of multiplication between the frequencies and the middle scores of interval class

Based on the frequency distribution table above, the writer determines the mean score by using the following formula:

$$X = \frac{\sum f_i x_i}{\sum f_i}$$

$$X = \frac{1718}{24}$$

$$X = 71.5 \quad 72$$

From the calculation, the mean score for the pre-test in this study was 72.

This score means that the students' writing skills are still poor. Based on the range score in university, this score belongs to the middle standard of students' competency. Thus, the students need to learn and practice more to improve their writing skill.

Similar like in the post-test, all students were joined in this test. The result of post-test could be seen as follows:

Table 4.3: The Table of Post-test Score

No	Students' name	Post-test score
1	RF	93
2	MBIM	98
3	NM	97
4	AYS	95
5	NA	95
6	RM	91
7	DRA	98
8	NH	95
9	FW	72
10	BM	85
11	SA	93
12	NS	79
13	MR	96
14	ES	94
15	DRM	98
16	DA	95
17	IF	98
18	FR	95
19	MH	89
20	SL	83
21	TAM	98
22	AR	50
23	MRR	40
24	MRFA	90

Source: students' post- test score

The data in the table above can be calculated by using the following steps:

First, the range (R) determined by using the formula below:

$$R = H - L$$

Where:

R = range of the score

H = the highest score

L = the lowest score

The highest score of post- test was 98 and the lowest score was 40. Thus, the range was $98 - 40 = 58$.

The class interval was identified by using following formula:

$$\begin{aligned}
 I &= 1 + (3,3) \log n && (n = \text{number of students}) \\
 &= 1 + (3,3) \log 24 \\
 &= 1 + (3,3) (1,38) \\
 &= 1 + 4,554 \\
 &= 5,554
 \end{aligned}$$

Then, the range of the class interval was found out by the formula:

$$P = \frac{R}{I}$$

$$P = \frac{58}{5}$$

$$P = 11,6$$

From those results, the frequency distribution table can be seen below :

Table 4.4: The Frequency Distribution Table of Post-test

Class interval	Fi	Xi	Fixi
40-50	2	45	90
51-61	0	56	0
62-72	1	67	67
73-83	2	78	78
84-94	7	89	623
95-105	12	100	1200
Total	N = 24	435	2058

Where:

f_i = refers to frequency

x_i = refers to the middle score interval class

$f_i x_i$ = the amount of multiplication between the frequencies and the middle scores of interval class

Based on the frequency distribution above, the writer determined the mean score by using the following formula:

$$X = \frac{\sum f_i x_i}{\sum f_i}$$

$$X = \frac{2058}{24}$$

$$X = 85.7 \quad 86$$

From the calculation, the mean score for the post-test in this study was 86. This score means that the students' writing skill has increased. This score includes in high standard of students' competency. Thus, the writer assumes that there is an effect by implementing peer corrective feedback toward students' writing skill.

The aim of determining the mean score was to know the average ability of students in the pre-test and post-test. The writer found out that the mean score between the two tests was different. The mean score of pre-test was 72 while the mean score of post-test was 86. In conclusion, post-test score was higher than pre-test by 14 points. It means that the students' writing score improve significantly in

all test sections. Thus, the writer concluded that Peer Corrective Feedback is effective to apply in writing class to minimize the students' grammar mistake in writing skill.

B. The Analysis of Questionnaires

As been described in the previous chapter, close-ended questionnaire was employed in this study. This questionnaire was aimed at finding out the students' perceptions and describe their personal beliefs toward the implementation of peer corrective feedback in their writing class.

To analyze the questionnaires, the writer used the following formula which is offered by Sudjana (1987):

$$P = \frac{f}{n} \times 100 \%$$

In which:

P :percentage

f : frequency

n : number of sample

100%: constant value

Furthermore, the data can be seen in the following table and description.

Table 4.5: What is your grammar score lately?

Option	Frequency	Percentage
A (86-100)	0	0%
B (73-85)	12	50 %
C (66-72)	8	33.3 %
D (54-65)	4	16.7 %
Total	24	100 %

The table above shows that most students got B score (73-85) in grammar subject. It seemed that most students have no problem to write paragraph by using proper grammar. The students' grammar mastery can help them to produce a good writing text.

Table 4.6: What are your difficulties in learning English especially in writing?

Option	Frequency	Percentage
Difficult in expressing ideas	11	45.8 %
Difficult in mastering grammar	11	45.8 %
Lack of motivation in writing	2	8.3 %
Not at all	0	0%
Total	24	100 %

Based on the table, the first and second option "difficult in expressing the ideas" and "difficult in mastering grammar" gained the biggest percentage. The students provided some reasons such as the difficulties in choosing an appropriate grammar when they are writing, they could not decide the appropriate tenses that

they have to use in their writing. It made students confused to match the appropriate grammar into a sentence.

Table 4.7: What is your opinion about the strategy of teaching writing that was applied by your lecturer at campus?

Option	Frequency	Percentage
Very easy to understand the material	1	4.1 %
Easy to understand the material	22	91.7 %
Difficult to understand the material	1	4.1
Very difficult to understand the material	0	0%
Total	24	100 %

The result of the table above indicates that majority of students said that teaching writing methods were applied by lecturer make the students easy to understand the material. The students stated that beside the lecturer provided some interesting methods, the lecturer also gave them clear explanation, therefore they got what the lecturer taught.

Table 4.8: Does your lecturer apply different strategies in teaching writing?

Option	Frequency	Percentage
Often	19	79.2 %
Sometimes	4	16.7 %
Rarely	1	4.1 %
Never	0	0 %
Total	24	100 %

The tables shows that most of students choose “often” meaning that they agreed that lecturer applied many methods and strategies to teach them in learning writing. They said that different lecturer will provide different method, such as practice writing individually or in group and write a journal every weeks. Thus, it exposed students with various activities in learning writing.

Table 4.9: Does the strategy applied by your lecturer at campus help you to learn writing easily?

Option	Frequency	Percentage
Very helpful	1	4.1 %
Fairly helpful	3	12.5 %
Slightly helpful	5	20.8 %
No help at all	15	62.5 %
Total	24	100 %

The table above indicates that most of students thought that the methods and strategies used by the lecturer did not help them to understand how to produce a good-writing. The teacher gave the example of the text but did not explain in detail about the use of proper grammar. Therefore, it still made them produce a silly mistake in their writing.

Table 4.10: In your opinion, does the implementation of peer corrective feedback improve your achievement in writing ?

Option	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly agree	18	75 %
Agree	4	16.7 %
Disagree	2	8.3 %
Strongly disagree	0	0 %
Total	24	100 %

The table shows that majority of students stated that the implementation of peer corrective feedback could improve students' achievement in learning writing. Most of students stated that learning writing by using peer corrective feedback helped them to learn from their mistakes in writing.

Table 4.11: In your opinion, does peer corrective feedback that is applied by the researcher help you in understanding the use of grammar in writing?

Option	Frequency	Percentage
Very helpful	19	79.2 %
Helpful	4	16.7 %
Slightly helpful	1	4.1 %
No help at all	0	0 %
Total	24	100 %

The table above explains that most of the students agreed that implementing peer corrective feedback is very helpful to make them understand how to use grammar appropriately in paragraphs. They stated that this strategy

help them to correct their mistakes in grammar and make them easy to understand the use of grammar in a sentence. By learning from their peer's correction, they may not repeated the same mistake in the future. Thus, it is assumed that peer corrective feedback strategy is very helpful for students to understand the use of grammar in writing.

Table 4.14: Do you find any obstacles in applying peer corrective feedback in writing class?

Option	Frequency	Percentage
Absolutely yes	16	66.7 %
Mostly yes	0	0 %
Absolutely no	0	0 %
Mostly no	8	33.3 %
Total	24	100 %

The table shows that most students state that they face some difficulties in implementing peer corrective feedback in writing class, such as lack of confident to correct their peers' paper, because they said that they did not understand about grammar at all; thus, they were uncertain about what they wanted to write on their peers' paper.

C. Discussion

In this thesis there is only one research question provided: "How does the peer corrective feedback influences students' grammar accuracy in writing skill?". The answer for this research question can be explained based on the result of the

tests and questionnaire. The writer has analyzed the students' writing by emphasizing on 5 aspects of writing, they are: content, organization, grammar, word choice, and mechanic. The writer analyzed two papers from each students, which was collected during the research process.

Having compared the scores, the writer found that using peer corrective feedback strategy in writing could help the students in improving their writing skill. The different score before and after applying peer corrective feedback showed that this strategy has developed students' achievement. The mean of pre-test score is 72, while the mean of post-test score is 86. Thus, it means that there are significant improvements of students' grammar accuracy in their writing after teaching-learning process through peer corrective feedback strategy.

Then, the researcher analyzed the questionnaire as a support data to find out students' perception about writing itself and implementing peer corrective feedback toward their grammar accuracy in writing. Based on the data of questionnaire, most of students said that they had passed grammar class by getting B score, but still, when they wrote some paragraphs, there were some mistakes in grammatical use. Consequently, it made students could not produce a good writing. In line with this case, students also stated that they faced some problems when they have to match the appropriate grammar in writing a sentence. Without realizing their mistake, students often repeat their silly mistake in similar case. After implementing peer corrective feedback strategy, most of students agreed that this strategy could help them in correcting their grammar mistake in writing and improve their grammar mastery by learning from their peers' correction.

It concludes that, peer corrective feedback is effective to be applied in writing classroom. By implementing this strategy, students could improve their grammar accuracy in writing. As a result, they can write a better paragraph. It was proven by students' writing test result and their perception in questionnaire sheet.

a. Analysis of students' writing before treatment (pre-test)

In the pre-test, which was given before treatment, students' ability in writing narrative text was low. The result of pre-test showed that students faced many difficulties in writing narrative text. It looked when they arranged the paragraphs, they did not know how to write a well-organized paragraphs (introduction, complication, and resolution). The writer found that students have difficulties in grammar, mechanic and word choice, which make students' writing narrative text could not be understood. To minimize the number of students' mistake in their writing, the writer gave them explanation about narrative text, asked them to write a simple paragraph in the second meeting, applied peer corrective feedback, and returned the paper to the owner. From their peer correction, students were supposed to learn more and improve their ability in writing narrative text.

b. Analysis of students' writing after treatment (post-test)

In the post-test, students' score of writing narrative text was higher than the score in pre-test. This means that students' ability after getting treatment was improved. In the treatment, students were given peer corrective feedback to

practice students' understanding of grammar, content, and organization. After the treatment, their paragraphs was complete and relevance to the topic and their ideas were easy to understand.

Based on the scoring guidance of writing assessment as the indicator of the students' ability in writing narrative text, the result showed that students' ability was in a good level after the treatment. Thus, it concludes that the implementation of peer corrective feedback in writing narrative text influence students' grammar accuracy in writing. It was proven by students' score in pre- and post-test.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

A. Conclusion

This study was aimed to find out how the influence of peer corrective feedback on students' grammar accuracy in writing skill. The sample of the research was 24 students in unit 4 at third years of English department of UIN Ar-Raniry. The data was collected by using tests (pre-test and post-test) and questionnaire. According to the result in the previous chapters, some conclusions can be inferred of this research:

1. Based on the data from the tests, it could be concluded that using peer corrective feedback strategy in teaching writing improve their grammar accuracy in writing skill. It was proved by the average score of post-test (86) which is higher than the pre-test (72).
2. From this three-week long research project conducted for English majors in English department of UIN Ar-Raniry, the researchers discovered that most students agreed peer feedback had its effectiveness and should be taken into consideration when teachers design their writing courses.
3. Based on the data presented, the peer corrective feedback strategy provides some advantages both for students and lecturer. The students have the opportunity to share more idea with their partner. Besides, for the lecturer, they can save lecturers' time to correct students' paper.

4. Peer corrective feedback creates positive learning environment because it makes students become more active and responsible about what they have assessed.

B. Suggestion

After conducting this study, the writer would like to propose some suggestions for those who are interested in this study:

1. It is better for lecturers who teach writing subject to choose the appropriate strategy in teaching learning process, because a good strategy applied by lecturers brings a positive effect on students' motivation in learning writing.
2. It is suggested for lecturers to apply peer corrective feedback in learning writing, to raise their responsibility up toward their writing.
3. The students should improve their writing skill in producing good paragraph by reading many books and practicing it. By doing those activities, students can improve their knowledge about how to write a good text and master grammatical aspect in writing.
4. The students should get immediate feedbacks about what is correct and what is incorrect on their writing, because they can learn through their error.
5. This study is not a complete study for analyzing students' problem in writing. Further research is needed to accomplish this study.

REFERENCE

- Amris, N. (2003). *Problematik pengajaran keterampilan menulis lanjut: Upaya menumbuh kembangkan minat menulis di usia dini*. Padang: FBSS UNP Press.
- Anderson, M., & Anderson, K. (1997). *Text Types in English 2*. South Yarra: Macmillan Education Australia PIY LTD.
- Atay, D., & Kurt, G. (2006). *Prospective teachers and L2 writing anxiety*. Turkey: Asian EFL Journal press.
- Ayres, L. (2008). *Narrative Texts*. United states: SAGE publication.
- Baleghizadeh, S., & Gordani, Y. (2012). *Academic Writing and Grammatical Accuracy: The Role of Corrective Feedback*. *Gist Education and Learning Research Journal*, 6, 159-176. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov>.
- Blanchard, K., & Root, C. (2003). *Ready to Write*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Bram, B. (1995). *WRITE WELL, Improving Writing Skills*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Kanisius.
- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching By Principles an Interactive Aproach to Language Padagogy*. San Fransisco: Longman.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Teaching by Principles third edition*. San Fransisco: Longman.
- Caulk, N. (1994). *Comparing teacher and student responses to written work*. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(1), 181-188. Retrieved from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com>
- Coffman, G. A., & Reed, M. D. (2010). *The True Story of Narrative Text: From Theory to Practice*. Kansas: Emporia state university.
- Derewianka, B. (1990). *Exploring How Texts Work*. London: Primary English Teaching Association.
- Grabe, W., & Kaplan, R. (1996). *Theory and Practice of Writing*. USA: Longman.
- Harmer, J. (2002). *The Practice of English Teaching (4th ed.)*. Retrieved from <http://files.du.edu.ge.com/>

- Keh, C. L. (1990). Feedback in the writing process: A model and methods for implementation. *ELT Journal*, 73(4), 203-304. Retrieved from <http://m.elj.oxfordjournals.org>
- Krashen, S. (1987). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. California: Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall International.
- Mackey, A., & Gass, S. (2005). *Second language research: methodology and design*. New York: Routledge.
- Mazda, I. N. (2013). *Improving The Students' Writing Skill By The Use Of Write-Pair-Share Technique*. (E-Journal), Islamic university of Malang, Jawa Timur, Indonesia.
- Mendonça C. O., & Johnson, K. E. (1994). Peer review negotiations: Revision activities in ESL writing instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(4), 745-769. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org>
- Meyers, A. (2005). *Gateways Academic Writing, Effective Sentence, Paragraph, and Essay*. London: Longman.
- Mittan, R. (1989). *The peer review process: Harnessing students' communicative power*. New York: Longman.
- Nunan, D. (1993). *Second Language Teaching and Learning*. USA : Ithenli and Henli Publisher.
- Permana, D. T., & Fauris, Z. (2013). *The Implementation of Picture Series as Media in Teaching Writing of A Narrative Text of the Tenth Graders of Senior High School*. (E-journal Unesa), state university of Surabaya, Jawa Timur.
- Richards, J. C., Platt, J., & Platt, H. (1992). *Dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. Essex: Longman
- Rivers, M. W. (1981). *Teaching foreign-language skills*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Rollinson, P. (1998). *Peer response and revision in an ESL writing group: a case study*. (Unpublished PhD thesis). Universidad Autonoma de Madrid, Spain.

- Rollinson, P. (2005). Using peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *ELT Journal*, 59(1), 23-30. Retrieved from www.script.org
- Rosdiana. (2013). *The Effectiveness of Error Correction Feedback in Improving student's writing skill*. Banda Aceh: UIN Ar- Raniry.
- Spencer, L. (2005). *A Step-By-Step Guide to Narrative Writing*. New York: The Rosen Publishing Group.
- Sudaryanto. (2001). *Peningkatan keterampilan menyusun wacana narasi melalui penerapan pendekatan eklektik*. Yogyakarta: Cakrawala Pendidikan.
- Sudjana. (2002). *Metode Statistika*. Bandung: Tarsito.
- Suharsimi, A. (2008). *Dasar-Dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Tarigan, H. G. (1989). *Pengajaran Kompetensi Bahasa: Suatu Penelitian Kepustakaan*. Jakarta: P2LPTK.
- Topping, K. J. (2000). *Peer assisted learning: A practical guide for teachers*. Cambridge: Bookline Books.
- Ur, P. (1996). *Course in Language Teacing, Practice and Theory*. New York : Cambrige University Press.

LESSON PLAN

Target Audience : English department students of UIN Ar-Raniry at third years
Class : Unit 4
Skill : Writing
Topic : Narrative text
Teachers : Aulia Fitri
Strategy : Peer Corrective Feedback
Duration/ Meetings : 90 minutes/ 3 meetings

TEACHING-LEARNING ACTIVITIES :

Activity number	Description	Time allocation
First meeting	PRE-ACTIVITY (pre-test)	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lecturer gives students pre- writing test • Lecturer teaches the theory of writing narrative text 	90 minutes
Second meeting	MAIN ACTIVITY (Treatment)	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lecturer asks students to write a narrative text • Lecturer gives students a treatment by applying peer corrective feedback • Lecturer asks a student to revise or comment her/ his partner's writing • Lecturer will discuss and clarify the student's correction of writing and then she will give some feedbacks for students. 	90 minutes
Third meeting	POST ACTIVITY (post-test)	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lecturer reviews the material • Lecturer will give the last writing test to evaluate students' improving on grammar accuracy in their writing. • Lecturer closes the class. 	90 minutes

Name :
Class :
Student number :

WORKSHEET

TEST OF FREE WRITING NARRATIVE TEXT

(pre-test)

Subject : Writing II
Kind of text : Narrative Text
Time allotment : 45 minutes
Instruction :

1. Write your name and class on the top of the paper.
2. Make some paragraphs about narrative text in a good structure.

Example :

- a. The most memorable experience in my life

The good arrangement of narrative text :

- a. Introduction (orientation)
- b. Body (complication)
- c. Conclusion (resolution)

3. The duration of writing is 45 minutes
4. If you need, you can open your dictionary
5. Google translate is not allowed in this course.

Name :
Class :
Student number :

WORKSHEET

TEST OF FREE WRITING NARRATIVE TEXT

(Post-test)

Subject : Writing II
Kind of text : Narrative Text
Time allotment : 45 minutes
Instruction :

1. Write your name and class on the top of the paper.
2. Write a free narrative text with a complete structure, at least 300 words.

Theme : Interesting experience since being a PBI students

3. The duration of writing is 45 minutes.
4. If you need, you can open your dictionary.
5. Google translate is not allowed in this course.

Name :

Class :

Student number :

WORKSHEET

TEST OF FREE WRITING NARRATIVE TEXT

(post-test for control class)

Subject : Writing II

Kind of text : Narrative Text

Time allotment : 45 minutes

Instruction :

1. Write your name and class on the top of the paper.
2. Write a free narrative text with a complete structure, at least 300 words.
3. The duration of writing is 45 minutes.
4. If you need, you can open your dictionary.
5. Google translate is not allowed in this course.

QUESTIONNAIRE

Name :

Students' ID :

Gender :

Note: Anda bisa menjawabnya dengan melingkari atau menyilang salah satu dari beberapa pilihan di bawah ini.

1. Setelah anda mengikuti beberapa kelas grammar, berapakah nilai grammar yang anda peroleh terakhir kali?
 - a. A (86-100)
 - b. B (73-85)
 - c. C (66-72)
 - d. D (54-65)

Alasan _____

2. Kesulitan apa yang anda hadapi saat mempelajari bahasa inggris khususnya dalam writing ?
 - a. Kesulitan dalam mengekspresikan ide
 - b. Kurang menguasai tata bahasa (grammar)
 - c. Saya kurang termotivasi dalam menulis
 - d. Tidak ada

Alasan _____

3. Apa pendapat anda tentang metode pembelajaran writing yang diterapkan dosen anda dikampus selama ini ?
 - a. Sangat mudah untuk memahami materi
 - b. Mudah memahami materi
 - c. Sulit untuk memahami materi
 - d. Sangat sulit untuk memahami materi

Alasan _____

4. Apakah dosen anda menggunakan metode-metode atau strategi yang berbeda dalam mengajar writing ?
- Sering
 - Kadang-kadang
 - Jarang
 - Tidak pernah

Alasan_____

5. Apakah menurut anda metode yang digunakan dosen anda di kampus memudahkan anda dalam belajar writing?
- Sangat membantu
 - Membantu
 - Sedikit membantu
 - Tidak membantu sama sekali

Alasan_____

6. Menurut anda, apakah dengan peer corrective feedback strategy yang diterapkan pada kelas ini dapat meningkatkan kemampuan anda dalam menulis?
- Sangat setuju
 - Setuju
 - Tidak setuju
 - Sangat tidak setuju

Alasan_____

7. Apakah menurut anda peer corrective feedback yang diterapkan dosen anda di dalam kelas membantu anda memahami penggunaan grammar dalam menulis?
- Sangat membantu
 - Membantu
 - Sedikit membantu
 - Tidak membantu sama sekali

Alasan _____

8. Apakah anda menghadapi kesulitan dalam penerapan peer corrective feedback strategy di kelas writing ?

- a. Jelas menemukan
- b. Menemukan
- c. Jelas tidak menemukan
- d. Tidak menemukan

Alasan _____

AUTOBIOGRAPHY

1. Name : Aulia Fitri
2. Place / Date of Birth : Takengon / February 5th, 1995
3. Sex : Female
4. Religion : Islam
5. Nationality / Ethnicity : Indonesia / Acehnese
6. Marital Status : Single
7. Address : Jl.Dr. T. Syarief Thayeb, Lambhuk-Banda Aceh
8. Occupation : Student of English Education Department of UIN Ar-Raniry
9. Parents
 - a. Father's name : Muhammad Syakir
 - b. Mother's name : Dra. Asnawani
 - c. Father's occupation : Goverment Employee
 - d. Mother's occupation : Goverment Employee
 - e. Address : Desa Blang Kolak II, Takengon
10. Educational Background
 - a. Elementary School : SDN 7 Takengon (2001 – 2006)
 - b. Junior High School : SMPN 1 Takengon (2006 – 2009)
 - c. Senior High School : SMAN 4 Takengon (2009 – 2012)
 - d. University : UIN Ar-Raniry (2012 – 2017)

Banda Aceh, Jan 20th, 2017
Author

Aulia Fitri