

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **ANALYSIS OF RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

Chapter IV consists of the School's profile, the Subject of the Study, the Analysis of Validity and Reliability, Finding of the Study, Analysis of the Result and the Discussion of Research Finding.

#### **4.1. The School's Profile**

This study was conducted in MA AN-NIDHAM in the academic year 2017/2018. MA AN-NIDHAM is a senior high school which is located in Jl. Demak-Semarang KM 5. Its accreditation is B. This school has 3 grades.

There are 9 classes in the academic year 2017/2018. In the first grade there are 3 classes for social program (X *IPS* 1, X *IPS* 2 X *IPS* 3). In the second grade is the same with the first grade and the third grade has two classes, one class for social program and one class for science program.

#### **4.2. Subject of the Study**

The subject of the research was the tenth grade students. There were 62 students in 2 classes, X *IPS*3 and X *IPS*1 which consisted of 26 and 26 students. Class of X *IPS*3 as the experimental group and class of X *IPS* 1 as the control group. Both the students' age of control and experimental classes were about sixteen years old.

**Table 4.1**  
**Subject of the Study**

No.	Class	Number of the Students	Sex
1.	<i>X IPS 1</i>	14	Male
		12	Female
2.	<i>X IPS 3</i>	8	Male
		18	Female

### 4.3. Tryout Test

Tryout test was conducted on January 10<sup>th</sup>,2018in the class *X IPS 2*. The number of students was 26 students. In the tryout class, the researcher asked the students to make descriptive text in two paragraphs entitled Masjid Agung Jawa Tengah and Lawang Sewu.The text contained four sentences for each paragraph. The time allocation to make the text was 40 minutes.

After conducting the tryout, then the researcher measured the data of tryout to know the data was valid and reliable or not. In this case the researcher used validity and reliability analysis.

#### 4.3.1. Validity

This research used content validity and construct validity. Content validity is when the test was appropriate with the material that has been studied. According to Sugiono (2015:182), content validity compares the instrument with the material that has been taught. The researcher used descriptive text, it is a material that should be learned by the students in the tenth grade of senior high school. Then, content validity

was judged by the expert. The expert decided the instrument, it could be used or it still needed improvement. In this case, the expert judgment was the English Teacher of MA AN-NIDHAM. Then, in measuring the construct validity, the researcher used factor analysis. In order to analyze the data, the researcher used Pearson Product Moment. According to Dharma (2011), Pearson Product Moment was used to connect the factor score with the total score. If the correlation each factor is positive or more than 0.3, it shows that the instrument was valid. The result of construct validity could be seen in Table 4.4 below:

**Table 4.2**  
**Validity Analysis**  
**Correlations**

	Lawang Sewu	Masjid Agung Jawa Tengah	Total
Lawang Sewu	1	.349	.820**
		.080	.000
	1606.115	565.404	2.172
	64.245	22.616	86.861
	26	26	26
Masjid Agung Jawa Tengah	.349	1	.823**
	.080		.000
	565.404	1633.163	2.199
	22.616	65.327	87.943
	26	26	26
Total	.820**	.823**	1
	.000	.000	
	2171.519	2198.567	4.370
	86.861	87.943	174.803
	26	26	26

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Based on that data, it showed that the correlation of factor score with the total score was positive or more than 0.3. Therefore, it could be concluded that the data was valid.

#### 4.3.2. Reliability

In this research, in measuring the reliability of the text, the researcher used Cronbach Alpha formula in SPSS 16 program. The text was reliable if the result was higher than 0.60 (Ghozali, 2011).

**Table 4.3**  
**Reliability Analysis**

<b>Text</b>	<b>Cronbach Alpha</b>	<b>Criteria</b>
Masjid Agung Jawa Tengah	0.842	Reliable
Lawang Sewu	0.846	Reliable

The table 4.5, it was found that the reliability of the test was 0.842 for Masjid Agung Jawa Tengah and 0.846 for Lawang Sewu. It could be concluded that both of the texts were reliable because the result were higher than 0.60.

#### 4.4 Pre-test

The pre-test was conducted both of control group and experimental group. It was conducted on January 11<sup>th</sup>, 2018. The experimental class consisted of 26 students, and the control class consisted of 26 students. The aim of this test was to know the students' ability in writing descriptive text before the treatments were given. The result of the pre test could be seen in the Table 4.4 below:

**Table 4.4**  
**The Pre-Test Result in the Control Class**

No.	Criteria of Mastery	Grade	Frequency	
			$\Sigma$	(%)
1	81-100	Excellent	2	7.69
2	66-80	Good	11	42.31
3	51-65	Average	9	34.62
4	26-50	Fair	0	0.00
5	00-25	Poor	4	15.38
$\Sigma$			26	100
Average			58.35	

Table 4.6 shows that there were 2 students got excellent grade, 11 students got good grade, 9 students got average grade, and 4 students got poor grade. It can be concluded that the average score of students' writing descriptive text in the control class belonged to average grade.

**Table 4.5**  
**The Pre-Test Result in the Experimental Class**

No.	Criteria of Mastery	Grade	Frequency	
			$\Sigma$	(%)
1	81-100	Excellent	1	3.85
2	66-80	Good	8	30.77
3	51-65	Average	15	57.69
4	26-50	Fair	0	0.00
5	00-25	Poor	2	7.69
$\Sigma$			26	100
Average			60.23	

Based on the table, it shows that there was 1 student got excellent grade, 8 students got good grade, 15 students got average grade, and 2 students got poor grade.

It can be concluded that average score of students' writing descriptive text ability in the experimental class belonged to average grade.

**Table 4.6**  
**The Control and the Experimental Pretest Data**  
**Descriptive Statistics**

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Pre Test Control Class	58.3462	26.23424	26
Pre Test Experiment Class	60.2308	18.51336	26

In the pre test, there were control group and experiment group. It was taken by 26 students for each group. The mean score in the control group was 58.35 and the mean score in the experiment group was 60.23.

#### **4.4.1. Standard Normality**

In order to know the data distribution was normal or not, the researcher measured the data by parametric technique. The criteria of the normal data distribution is if the result of parametric technique  $> 0.05$ .

**Table 4.7**  
**One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test**

		Pre Test
N		26
Normal Parameters <sup>a</sup>	Mean	.0000000
	Std. Deviation	18.44466094
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.382
	Positive	.216
	Negative	-.382
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		1.947
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.100
a. Test distribution is Normal.		

Based on the Table 4.9, it shows that K-S score of the pre test was 1.947 with sig 0.100 > 0.05. It means that both of the samples in the pre test based on the K-S score of the experimental and the control groups in teaching techniques were normal.

#### 4.4.2. Homogeneity

In order to know whether the variance of each sample was the same or not, the researcher used homogeneity test. The test was homogen if the significance value was more than 0.05.

**Table 4.8**  
**Test of Homogeneity of Variances**

Pre Test			
Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
1.899	5	6.	.134

Based on Table 4.10, it shows that Levene Statistic score of the pre test was 1.899 with sig 0.134 > 0.05. It means that both of the samples in pre test based on the Levene Statistic score of experimental and control groups in teaching techniques were homogenous.

#### **4.5 Treatment**

The treatment was conducted on January 17<sup>th</sup> – 25<sup>th</sup>, 2018. There were 26 students on class X IPS3 as the experimental group which were taught by using Guided WH Questions technique for 3 meetings. Each meeting took 2x45 minutes. In conducting the treatment, the researcher took a role as a teacher. The first meeting was held on January 17<sup>th</sup>, 2018 at 10.00 am until 11.20 am. The topic was about teaching descriptive text and introducing Guided-WH Questions. Firstly, the researcher gave warming up by asking some WH questions about Masjid Agung Jawa Tengah. After students knew the questions, then the students were asked to make a group of three. They were asked to answer those questions. In this situation, they discussed with their friends what they wanted to write. In this phase, they need a long of time because they also had difficulties to translate their idea into English. After that, the students started to write. When they arranged their answers into a text they still had a problem in the structure of the text. After they finished, the researcher asked them what type of the text belongs to. Then, they answered that the text was descriptive text. After that, the researcher reviewed about descriptive text, and gave evaluation.

The second meeting was held on January 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018 at 08.20 am until 09.40am. The researcher reviewed the previous material about descriptive text and



focus about the definition of descriptive text and the generic structure because the previous meeting they had a problem on that. Then she gave some WH questions about Kota Lama. Then, she asked the students to work in pair to answer those questions. In this phase, the researcher allows them to use dictionary in order to help them in translating their ideas. After they finished, the researcher check their work, they have improvisation when it was compared with the previous meeting. After that, the researcher gave evaluation and showed a picture of Kota Lama to review if the description was correct based on the picture.

The third meeting was held on January 24<sup>th</sup>, 2018 at 10.00 am until 11.20 am. The researcher gave some WH questions about Sampokong. Then, the students were asked to work individually to answer those questions. The students started to create descriptive text based on their answer about Sampokong. In this phase, some students easily in creating the exercise like the previous meeting. In other hand, some students felt lazy to make it, because the previous meeting they just rely to their friends. It makes them just create a little sentences. The last activity was reviewing the students' writing.

#### **4.6. Post-test**

The post-test was conducted after the treatment. The post-test in the control class was conducted on February 1<sup>st</sup>, 2018 and the post test for the experimental class was conducted on February 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2018. The researcher conducted the post-test to measure whether or not the students' writing in descriptive text improved. In the post test, the students were asked to write descriptive text entitled Lawang Sewu, which

contained two paragraphs, four sentences for each. The time allocation to write the text was 40 minutes.

The detail post-test data of the control group are presented in table 4.10.

**Table 4.9**  
**The Post-Test Result in the Control Class**

No.	Criteria of Mastery	Grade	Frequency	
			$\Sigma$	(%)
1	81-100	Excellent	4	15.38
2	66-80	Good	10	38.46
3	51-65	Average	9	34.62
4	26-50	Fair	0	0.00
5	00-25	Poor	3	11.54
$\Sigma$			26	100
Average			61.04	

Table 4.11 shows that there were 4 students got excellent grade, 10 students got good grade, 9 students got average grade, and 3 students got poor grade. In the control group, the post-test was done by 26 students.

Based on the post test result, if it was compared with the result of pre test, there was student's increasing score who got the level excellent. In the pre test, there were 2 students who got score in the excellent grade and in the post test there were 4 students who got score in that grade. There were reduction achievements in the good grade and poor grade, where in the pre test, there were 11 students who got score in the good grade and in the post test there were 10 students who got the score in the good grade. In the poor level in the pre test, there were 4 students who got the score

in poor grade and the post test, there were 3 students who got the score in the category poor grade. It can be concluded that there was a significant difference that indicated the increasing students' ability in the post test of control class.

The detail data of post-test in the experimentgroup is presented in Table 4.12.

**Table 4.10**  
**The Post-Test Result in the Experimental Class**

No.	Criteria of Mastery	Grade	Frequency	
			$\Sigma$	(%)
1	81-100	Excellent	5	19.23
2	66-80	Good	11	42.31
3	51-65	Average	8	30.77
4	26-50	Fair	0	0.00
5	00-25	Poor	2	7.69
$\Sigma$			26	100
Average			66.35	

Table 4.12 shows that there were 5 students got excellent grade, 11 students got good grade, 8 students got average grade, and 2 students got poor grade.

Based on the result of post test in the experimental class, if it was compared with the result of pre test in the experimental class, there was students' increasing score who got the excellent grade and good grade. In the pre test, there was 1 student who got score in the excellent grade and in the post test; there were 5 students who got score in the excellent grade. In the pre test there were 11 students who got the score in the good grade and in the post test there were 8 students who got score in the good grade. There was reduction achievement in the average grade. In the pre test, there

were 15 students who got score in the average grade and in the post test there were 8 students who got the score in the average grade.

The result of the post test could be seen in the Table 4.13 below:

**Table 4.11**  
**The Control and Experimental Post-test Data**  
**Descriptive Statistics**

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Post Test Control Class	61.0385	23.82181	26
Post Test Experiment Class	66.3462	20.95317	26

Based on that data, the mean score of post test in control group was 61.04 and the mean score in experiment group was 66.35.

It can be concluded that there was a significant difference that indicated the increasing students' ability in the post test of experimental class.

#### **4.7. T-test Analysis**

In order to differentiate the students' result in the post test of the control class and experimental class, the researcher used T-test. The purpose of T-test is to know the effectiveness of Guided-WH questions in improving students' writing in descriptive text for the tenth grade students at MA An-Nidham in the academic year 2017/2018. The criteria of T-test is if  $t\text{-value} > t\text{-table}$  and  $\text{sig.} < 0.05$ , it means that  $H_1$  is accepted and  $H_0$  is rejected. If  $t\text{-value} < t\text{-table}$  and  $\text{sig.} > 0.05$ , it means that  $H_1$  is rejected and  $H_0$  is accepted.

**Table. 4.12**  
**Descriptive Statistic**  
**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	69.385	11.715		5.923	.000
	Post Test Control Class	.205	.179	.206	4.028	.003

a. Dependent Variable: Post Test Experiment Class

The result of the data analysis shows that t value  $4.028 > 0.713$  t table and sig  $0.003 < 0.05$ . It means that  $H_1$  was accepted and  $H_0$  was rejected.

#### 4.8 Discussion of the Research Finding

The main purpose of this study was to find out whether or not Guided-WH Questions was effective to improve students' writing in descriptive text for the tenth graders of MA An-Nidham in the academic year of 2016/ 2017. In order to find out the result of this research, the researcher analyzed the data of the post test by using t-test formula, and the result showed that there was a significant difference in the result of students' writing descriptive text ability in experimental class after getting the treatments of Guided-WH Questions technique.

The explanation above was proved by the result of the data that showed the post test mean of the control class was 61.04 and the experimental class was 66.35.

Hence, the obtained of t-test was 4.028, whereas the t table was 0.713 for  $\alpha = 5\%$ . It means that the t-test score was higher than t-table. It could be stated that there was a significant difference between the control class and the experimental class. It could be concluded that H0 was rejected and H1 was accepted.

Based on the result above, it was proved that the students in the experimental class who got treatments by using Guided-WH Questions had better writing ability in creating descriptive text than students who did not get the treatment in the control class. It could be stated that teaching writing descriptive text by using Guided-WH Questions could improve the students' writing ability. Before given the treatment of experimental class, both of class of control class and experimental class were given pre-test in order to know the basic ability of the students. The result showed that the students were in the same condition in the beginning. It was proved by the result of the mean score both of classes control class and experimental class. The mean score of control class was 58.35, where the mean score of experimental class was 60.23. After getting the pre-test, then the students of the experimental class were given treatments continuously for three times during two weeks. The last process, the students were given the post-test which was conducted to find out their improvement after they got the treatments. The result of the Independent Sample T-test showed that there was a significant different in students' writing descriptive text score between the experimental class and the control class.

