

CHAPTER IV

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents four topics related to research finding that are the descriptive statistic, inferential statistic, discussion and implication.

A. Finding

1. Analysis Descriptive Statistic

Descriptive statistics is the term given to the analysis of data that helps describe, show or summarize data in meaningful way such that. Descriptive statistic do not allow us to make conclusions beyond the data that have analysed or reach conclusions regarding any hypothesis that might have made.

a. The Data of experiment class

In this study, the researcher presented the data of students' score in writing hortatory exposition text test, pretest and posttest. Here, the researcher wanted to know the effectiveness of using four corners strategy towards students' writing ability in hortatory exposition text at MA Al-Muslimun Lamongan. The effectiveness can be seen from the significant different score of students' score in writing hortatory exposition text before and after being taught by using four corners strategy. Here, the researcher conducted pre-test, giving treatment about writing hortatory exposition text by using four corners strategy and post-test. Before and after treatments the

researcher done pre-test and post-test. Pre-test and post-test were done to obtain students' score in writing hortatory exposition text.

The scores are divided into five criterions. They are excellent, good, average, poor, and very poor. The students will categorize into excellent score if they got 85-100 score which means that they are able to do test very well. The students will categorized into good score if they got 71-84 score which means that they are have a little doubt. In this category they are able to do test well. The students will categorize into average score if they got 60-70 score which means that they are able to do test pretty well. The student will categorize into poor score if they got 0-59 score which means that they just do the test. The last criteria are the students will categorize into very poor score if they got 0-39 score which means that they cannot do the test well. (See table 4.1)

Table 4.1 The Score's Criteria

| No | Interval Class | Criteria |
|----|----------------|-----------|
| 1. | 85-100 | Excellent |
| 2. | 71-84 | Good |
| 3. | 60-70 | Average |
| 4. | 40-59 | Poor |
| 5. | 0-39 | Very Poor |

(Adapted from article Riswanto and Haryanto E. 2012)

b. The Data of Pre-test

After conducted pretest, the researcher obtained the data.

The researcher uses SPSS 16.0 version to know the descriptive

statistic and the percentage of students' score of pre-test. The percentage divided into five criterions: excellent, good, average, poor, and very poor (see table 4.1) the result of the calculation as follows:

Table 4.2 Descriptive Statistic of Pre-test

| Descriptive Statistics | | | | | |
|------------------------|----|---------|---------|-------|----------------|
| | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| pre_test | 15 | 25 | 45 | 38.67 | 6.399 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 15 | | | | |

Based on the table 4.2 above, it showed that the minimum score of pre-test was 25, the maximum score was 45, and the mean was 38.67

Table 4.3 The Frequency of Students' Score in Writing Hortatory Exposition Text Before Taught Using Four Corners Strategy

| Student's Score | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | 25 | 1 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 6.7 |
| | 30 | 2 | 13.3 | 13.3 | 20.0 |
| | 35 | 2 | 13.3 | 13.3 | 33.3 |
| | 40 | 5 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 66.7 |
| | 45 | 5 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 15 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

From the table 4.3, The frequency of pretest after being distributed there are 5 students getting score between 0-39 which

means that the students' score in writing hortatory exposition text is failed, there are 10 students getting score between 40-59 which means that on the students' score in writing hortatory exposition text is low, there are not students getting score between 60-70 which means that on the students' score in writing hortatory exposition text is good, there are not students getting score between 71- 84 which means that on the students' writing hortatory exposition text is very good, there are not students getting score between 85-100 which means that on the students' score in writing hortatory exposition text is excellent.

c. The Data of Post-test

After conducted posttest, the researcher obtained the data. The researcher uses SPSS 16.0 version to know the descriptive statistic and the percentage of students' score of post-test. The percentage divided into five criterions: excellent, good, average, poor, and very poor (see table 4.1) the result of the calculation as follows:

Table 4.4 Descriptive Statistic of Post-test

| Descriptive Statistics | | | | | |
|------------------------|----|---------|---------|-------|----------------|
| | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| post_test | 15 | 70 | 92 | 84.47 | 6.578 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 15 | | | | |

Based on the table 4.4 above, it showed that the minimum score of post-test was 70, the maximum score was 92, and the mean was 784.47

Table 4.5 The Frequency of Students' Score in Writing Hortatory Exposition Text After Taught Using Four Corners Strategy

| | | Students' Score | | | |
|-------|-------|-----------------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | 70 | 1 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 6.7 |
| | 75 | 1 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 13.3 |
| | 80 | 3 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 33.3 |
| | 84 | 3 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 53.3 |
| | 86 | 1 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 60.0 |
| | 88 | 1 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 66.7 |
| | 90 | 2 | 13.3 | 13.3 | 80.0 |
| | 92 | 3 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 15 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

From the table 4.7, The frequency of posttest after being distributed there are not students getting score between 0-39 which means that the students' score in writing hortatory exposition text is failed, there are not students getting score between 40-59 which means that on the students' score in writing hortatory exposition text is low, there are 1 students getting score between 60-70 which means that on the students' score in writing hortatory exposition text is

good, there are 7 students getting score between 71-84 which means that on the students' writing hortatory exposition text is very good, there are 7 students getting score between 85-100 which means that on the students' score in writing hortatory exposition text is excellent.

Table 4.6 Descriptive of Pre-test and Post-test.

| Pre-Test | | | Post-Test | | |
|----------------|---------|-----------------|----------------|---------|-----------------|
| N | Valid | 15 | N | Valid | 15 |
| | Missing | 0 | | Missing | 0 |
| Mean | | 38.67 | Mean | | 84.47 |
| Median | | 40.00 | Median | | 84.00 |
| Mode | | 40 ^a | Mode | | 80 ^a |
| Std. Deviation | | 6.399 | Std. Deviation | | 6.578 |
| Minimum | | 25 | Minimum | | 70 |
| Maximum | | 45 | Maximum | | 92 |

a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown

The table above describe the central tendency of students' in pretest score. There are 15 students as participant in pretest group. In column mean it shows 38,67 it means that average of score from total amount students are 38,67. The median score are 40, median is the halfway point of total amount students scores. There are 40 for mode; it means the most frequent score from total students are 40. The standart deviation of score is 6.399. the standart deviation is the deviation of total score it show how the score were spread.

Moreover, table above describe the central tendency of students' in posttest score. There are 15 students as participant in posttest group. In column mean it shows 84,47 it means that average of score from total amount students are 84,47. The median score are 84, median is the halfway point of total amount students scores. There are 80 for mode; it means the most frequent score from total students are 80. The standart deviation of score is 6.578. the standart deviation is the deviation of total score it show how the score were spread.

Two tables above are describing about pre-test and post-test result. The central tendency of pretest are low and the spread are large. Moreover, the central tendency of posttest are high and the spread large. So, central tendency of post-test higher than pre-test and the spread also large.

2. Analysis Inferential Statistic

After the data is collected, the inferential statistic is needed. Before being tested, a requirement test was conducted to find out what the strategy it can be used or not, while the requirements are:

a. Requirement Testing

1. Normality Testing

In this research to measure the normality testing, In normality testing, the researcher used pre-test and post-test score. the researcher using SPSS 16.0 that is non-parametric statistic One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test because the research without

determine specific qualifications about the population parameter which be a sample.

Table 4.8 The Result of Normality Testing

| One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test | | pre_test | post_test |
|------------------------------------|----------------|----------|-----------|
| N | | 15 | 15 |
| Normal Parameters ^a | Mean | 38.67 | 84.47 |
| | Std. Deviation | 6.399 | 6.578 |
| Most Extreme Differences | Absolute | .249 | .138 |
| | Positive | .161 | .126 |
| | Negative | -.249 | -.138 |
| Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z | | .965 | .536 |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | | .309 | .936 |
| a. Test distribution is Normal. | | | |

According to the result of normality testing, it showed that the test given 15 visual students of XI MIA 2. It also showed that the value of Asymp. Sig (2-tailed) in pretest was 0.309 and posttest was 0.936 it was higher than 0.05, so it can be conclude that resulted as H_0 (null hypothesis) was rejected and H_a (alternative hypothesis) was accepted and also can be interpreted that has normal distribution.

2. Homogeneity Testing

Homogeneity testing is used to test whether the group used in the research has the same variance or not. Here, the researcher used one class because the researcher used pre experimental study. So the researcher used pre-test and post-test score to see

the homogeneity (appendix...). To test the homogeneity the researcher used *SPSS Statistic 16*.

Table 4.7 The Result of Homogeneity Testing

| Test of Homogeneity of Variances | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----|-----|------|
| Hasil | | | |
| Levene Statistic | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
| 2.248 | 3 | 7 | .170 |

According to table 4.11 above the result of homogeneity testing, the significance was 0.170 and it was higher than 0.05, so it can be concluded that the data distribution was homogeneity.

b. Hypothesis Testing

1. $H_0 = \mu_1 \leq \mu_2$ or the mean of the pre-test is smaller than or equal to the mean of the post-test.

Null hypothesis of this research is the score of students in writing hortatory exposition text after being taught by using four corners strategy is less than or equal to their scores before being taught using four corners strategy to the second grade of MA Al-Muslimun Lamongan.

2. $H_1 = \mu_1 > \mu_2$ or the mean of post-test is higher than the mean of pre-test.

Alternative Hypothesis (H_a) of this research is the score of students in writing horatatory exposition text after being taught by using four corners strategy is higher than their score before

being taught using four corners strategy to the second grade of MA Al-Muslimun Lamongan.

To know whether the post-test's score is higher than pre-test score before and after using Four Corners Strategy, the researcher computed *paired-sample test* by using SPSS 16.0 Version. The output is as follow:

Table 4.9 The Result of Paired Sample Test

| Paired Samples Test | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------------|--------|--------|----|-----------------|
| | | Paired Differences | | | | | T | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
| | | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | | | | |
| | | | | | Lower | Upper | | | |
| Pair 1 | Posttest – Pretest | 45.800 | 8.239 | 2.127 | 50.363 | 41.237 | 21.529 | 14 | .000 |

Based on table 4.8 above showed the result of analyzing using t-test. The t is 21.529, with the df = 14, and the p-value (two-tailed) is 0.000. Given that the present test is one-tailed test, so the p-value (0.000) is divide to: $0.000 / 2 = 0.000$. The significance level is 0.05. For interpretation of decision based on the result of probability achievement, that is:

- 1) If the probability value (sig) > 0.05 then the null hypothesis is not rejected.

2) If the probability value (sig) < 0.05 then the null hypothesis is rejected.

Since 0.000 is smaller than significance level (α) 5% or 0.05, so the null hypothesis is rejected. In other word, the hypothesis saying that the mean of the pre-test is smaller than or equal to the mean of the post-test is rejected. It automatically accepts the alternative hypothesis saying that the mean of post-test is higher than the mean of pre-test. It means that there is significance differences before and after being taught using four corners strategy.

B. Discussion

As discussed of research method in the teaching and learning process was divided into three steps. The first step was gave pre-test. The researcher wanted to know the students' score in writing hortatory exposition text before being taught using four corners strategy. The second step the researcher gave treatments to the student three meetings. The first treatment the researcher gave explanation about writing hortatory exposition text with theme "education" using Four corners strategy. The second treatment the researcher gave explanation about writing hortatory exposition text with theme "internet" using four corners strategy. The third treatment the researcher gave explanation about writing hortatory exposition text with theme "handphone" using four corners strategy. After all the treatments were done, the researcher

conducted the third step that was posttest to see the score of students is there any differences between pretest's score and posttest's score.

Students' score in writing hortatory exposition text is low. It is proved when they are taught before used four corners strategy. As we know from the research findings, the students' score before used four corners strategy was lower than the students' score of post-test. It is proved by the calculation of mean score on pre-test 38,67 and mean score on post-test 84,47. As we know from the research finding, the students' score of post-test is higher than students' score of pretest. So, the researcher concluded that this strategy is very useful to make students more active and understand about writing hortatory exposition text, to improve students' ability in writing.

Based on table 4.14, the t is -21.529, with the $df = 14$, and the p -value (two-tailed) is 0.000. Given that the present test is one-tailed test, so the p -value (0.000) is divide to: $0.000 / 2 = 0.000$. The significance level is 0.05. Since 0.000 is smaller than significance level (α) 5% or 0.05, so the null hypothesis is rejected. In other word, the hypothesis saying that the mean of the pre-test is smaller than or equal to the mean of the post-test is rejected. It automatically accepts the alternative hypothesis saying that the mean of post-test is higher than the mean of pre-test. It means that there is significance differences before and after being taught using four corners strategy.

The finding of this research stating that four corners strategy is considered as an effective for the students' ability in writing hortatory exposition text. It could be seen in the treatment process, the students are more interested when the researcher applied this strategy. The teacher can help the students writing ability especially in hortatory exposition text by the teacher's control and makes the teacher can correct any mistakes that students make and encourage them to concrete on difficulties at the sometime.

Regarding on the result of data analysis above, it's also strongly with previous study as stating that four corners is considered as an effective strategy toward students' ability in speaking. The first thesis written by Novrianti, Dana Yulianti (2016) doing Teaching Speaking By Using Four Corners Strategy. Find that significant difference on students' post test score in experimental group that though using four corners strategy and control group that using strategy teacher at SMA Karya Ibu Palembang. Second thesis written by Frensisca, Yuliana (2015) Four Corners Strategy In Teaching Speaking. Find that there was significant difference of the spaking skill Before And After Being Though By Using Four Corners Strategy. The third thesis by Yeswita, Afni (2014) The Effect Of Using Four Comers Strategy On Students' Speaking Ability. The researcher conclude that teaching speaking by using four corners strategy was effective to be used for improving the students' speaking ability. And the last thesis written by Rahayu (2013) Conducted Research

About The Use Of Four Corners Strategy In Teaching Speaking. Her study revealed that the Four Corners strategy was very usefull in helping the students to enhance their speaking ability.

From the explanation above, it can be conclude that four corners strategy is effective in teaching speaking ability. But in this research the researcher used four corners strategy to teaching writing especially in hortatory exposition text. And the result of this research is four corners strategy effective to teach writing hortatory exposition text. This strategy above is accepted by the researcher, especially it can improve students' ability in writing hortatory exposition text at second grade of MA Al-Muslimun Lamongan.

C. Implication

Based on the research finding, Four Corners Strategy can help he students to improve their writing achievement in hortatory exposition text, beacause it can activate the students' ideas about topic. Students have appropriate "think time" the quality of their responses involves, it makes students stay on track because they are accountable for sharing with the rest of the class. In addition students have more critical thinking which is retained after lesson in which students have had an opportunity to discusss and reflect the topic.

It supports by Monet (2001) state that four corners strategy shown some advantages such as; Four Corners has some advantages when it is applied in teaching English process especially in teaching writing. Firstly,

four corners is useful for building the knowledge, secondly, it can build oral language skills, it means that this strategy can make the learners share their ideas to their friends in a group. Thirdly, this strategy can make movement or re-energies tired students.

The Four Corners strategy can help student in organizing the text and stated the main idea clearly. In pre-test there lot of student have lack main idea, the main idea is not strong and ambiguity. Then they set program uncoordinated. So there is no coherence. After get treatment the students shows their progress on post-test result. By applying four corners strategy, writing became easier. The quality of writing is good enough; they can state the main iidea of text in each paragraph clearly. The students can make good thesis as main idea of text then strength by argument. The argument is clear annd supported the thesis, the students are able to add their opinion and fact to strength argument. The students are able to organize the text well. They allow the generic structure of hortatory expositiion text. The result the text is more meaningful and understandable for reader.