

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION

This chapter, the researcher presents the finding of the research. It presents some discussions dealing with the collected data of students' pre-test and post-test score from experimental and control group. This chapter covers the description of data, hypothesis testing, and discussion

A. Data Description

Data description has a purpose to show the result of research. The subjects of the research were the eleventh grade students at SMKN 1 Bandung Tulungagung which 35 students of 11 AKL 4 as experimental group and 32 students of 11AKL 3 as control group. In this chapter, the researcher showed the students score in pre-test and post-test in both of classes. This research was conducted in four meetings. The first meeting was conducted pretest which included administered test. This action had conducted to know the students' ability in writing ability before the researcher conducted the treatment using RAFT strategy. In the second until fourth meetings, the researcher conducted a treatment (teaching material) using RAFT strategy, but used different topic in each meeting. In the fifth meeting, the researcher conducted the posttest through RAFT strategy in the experimental group. The final result of students' writing after doing all of the steps in process of writing in pretest and posttest then were analyzed by using writing scoring rubric. The analyses of pre-test and post-test are shown below.

- a. Data from the scores of experimental group have been obtained as in the following:

Table 4.1 The sores of pre-test and post-test in the experimental group

NO.	NAME	PRETEST	POSTTEST
1	REA	64	68
2	RNS	68	72
3	RHK	68	70
4	RSK	68	76
5	SN	80	84
6	SNP	72	76
7	SPS	68	72
8	SA	68	70
9	SRM	76	84
10	SPI	76	80
11	SD	60	72
12	SAW	80	88
13	SKK	76	80
14	SNA	76	80
15	SF	76	84
16	SPA	60	72
17	SDR	80	88
18	TNH	60	72
19	TW	80	84
20	UF	60	76
21	UFU	80	80
22	UKN	60	72
23	VDA	60	76
24	VAS	80	84
25	WNI	60	70
26	WT	80	84
27	WAA	64	72

28	YNU	80	88
29	YEYA	64	70
30	YV	80	84
31	YRP	64	72
32	YPD	60	68
33	ZH	80	88
34	SNS	64	72
35	SVNP	76	80
SUM		2468	2708

- b. Data from the scores of experimental group have been obtained as in the following:

Table 4.2 the sores of pre-test and post-test in the control group

No.	NAME	PRETEST	POSTTEST
1	KSD	76	76
2	KLS	64	60
3	LW	80	84
4	LR	64	64
5	MDS	68	72
6	MSR	64	60
7	NR	68	64
8	NAR	80	76
9	NN	60	64
10	PAD	64	60
11	PE	60	64
12	QA	80	76
13	RIM	60	64
14	RF	80	76
15	ICIW	80	76
16	IR	80	80
17	IN	60	60
18	KA	60	60
19	KDP	80	74
20	LKN	60	64
21	LN	76	72
22	LAT	80	76
23	LM	60	64
24	LP	68	60

25	MDL	60	64
26	MP	60	60
27	NN	64	64
28	NRN	68	64
29	NPA	64	60
30	NPDW	68	68
31	NHN	64	60
32	RPA	72	68
SUM		2192	2154

1. Pre-test

The pretest was done by asking students to write a paragraph of recount text with the topic which has been selected by the researcher. In the pre-test there were 35 students in experimental group and 32 students in the control group. Pre-test was administered to experimental and control group to know their writing skill and their achievement before receiving the treatment.

And then, the researcher collected the score used SPSS 16.00 program which the result of the descriptive of statistic pre-test between experimental group and control group as below;

Table 4.3 statistic pretest experimental group

N Valid	35
Missing	0
Mean	70.51
Std. Error of Mean	1.363
Median	68.00
Mode	80
Std. Deviation	8.064
Variance	65.022
Range	20
Minimum	60
Maximum	80
Sum	2468

Based on table 4.3 above it can be seen that the mean score is 70, 51. It means that the average score of 27 students in the experimental group was 70. Where, most of the students can write the ideas based on the topic although there were some aspects that they wrote still less such as content and organization which most of them still not correlate or lack detail. Meanwhile in the pre-test, the low score was 60 and high score 80.

Table 4.4 frequency pretest of experimental group

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 60	8	22.9	22.9	22.9
64	5	14.3	14.3	37.1
68	5	14.3	14.3	51.4
72	1	2.9	2.9	54.3
76	6	17.1	17.1	71.4
80	10	28.6	28.6	100.0
Total	35	100.0	100.0	

Then based on table 4.3 the median score was 68, which if seen in the table above that 13 students who got score less than 68 and 17 students who got score more than 68. Then the mode score also 80 It means that the most frequent score was 80. Therefore, many students got score 80.

Table 4.5 statistic pretest control group

N Valid	32
Missing	0
Mean	68.50
Std. Error of Mean	1.411
Median	66.00
Mode	60
Std. Deviation	7.984
Variance	63.742
Range	20
Minimum	60
Maximum	80
Sum	2192

Based on table 4.5 above it can be seen that the mean score was 68.50. It showed that mean in control group was lower than experimental group. It means that the summarize score of 32 students in the control group was 68. Where, if in the control group most of the students can wrote the ideas based on the topic, but there were some aspects that they wrote still less such as content, organization and the grammar which has a lot of errors. Meanwhile in the pre-test of control group the low score was 60 and high score 80.

Table 4.6 frequency pretest of control group

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 60	9	28.1	28.1	28.1
64	7	21.9	21.9	50.0
68	5	15.6	15.6	65.6
72	1	3.1	3.1	68.8
76	2	6.2	6.2	75.0
80	8	25.0	25.0	100.0
Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Based on table 4.5 the median score was 66, there were based on table 4.6 which 16 students who got score less than 66 and 16 students who got score more than 66. And then the mode score was 60. It means that the most frequent score was 60. Therefore, many students got score 60.

So, it can be concluded that between experimental group and control group there was different mean and median in which the mean and median in experimental group was higher than control group, but both of that classes have same minimum and maximum score in the pre-test.

2. Post-test

The post-test was administered by asking the students to write a recount text with their own topic. Similar with pre-test there were 35 students in experimental group and 32 students in the control group. In it was done after treatments. This test was intended to know the students writing achievements in recount text using RAFT strategy in experimental group.

About the process of post-test, there was a difference between experimental group and control group, in which in experimental group the students were taught about RAFT writing strategy before they made a recount text. Whereas in control group they did not go through anything method.

After gaining the score, the researcher calculated the score using SPSS 16.00 program. The result of post-test between experimental group and control group as below:

Table 4.7 statistic posttest experimental group

N Valid	35
Missing	0
Mean	77.37
Std. Error of Mean	1.105
Median	76.00
Mode	72
Std. Deviation	6.540
Variance	42.770
Range	20
Minimum	68
Maximum	88
Sum	2708

As explanation before that post-test given after did some treatments. The mean score of post-test in experimental group was 77. It means there was an increase between mean in pre-test and mean in post-test, which mean in the pre-test was 70, in the post-test was 77. It showed that there was improvement in students' writing achievement before and after being taught by using RAFT strategy. Not only there was improvement in mean but also in median in the post-test. The median in pre-test was 68. But, in post-test median was 76. Meanwhile in the post-test, the low score was 68 and high score was 88.

Table 4.8 frequency posttest of experimental group

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 68	2	5.7	5.7	5.7
70	4	11.4	11.4	17.1
72	9	25.7	25.7	42.9
76	4	11.4	11.4	54.3
80	5	14.3	14.3	68.6
84	7	20.0	20.0	88.6
88	4	11.4	11.4	100.0
Total	35	100.0	100.0	

From the table above it showed that median of post-test was 76 and the mode was 72. It means that the most frequent score was 72. In other word many students got score 72. And based on the frequency distribution it showed that there were 15 students who got score less than 76 and there were 16 students who got score more than 76.

Table 4.9 statistic posttest control group

N	Valid	32
	Missing	0
Mean		67.31
Std. Error of Mean		1.259
Median		64.00
Mode		64
Std. Deviation		7.123
Variance		50.738
Range		24
Minimum		60
Maximum		84
Sum		2154

In the control group, the researcher also administered post-test, but did not go through discussion using any strategy like experimental group. The mean of post-test in the control group was 67, it means there was decreasing between in pre-test and post-test, but only little decreasing, in which the pre-test was 68 in the post-test was 67. Not only in mean, but also there was a little reduction in median which in the pre-test 66 to be 64. But, there was an improvement in mode, in the pre-test 60 to be 64 in the post-test. Meanwhile in the post-test, the low score was 60 and high score was 84.

Table 4.10 frequency posttest control group

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 60	9	28.1	28.1	28.1
64	10	31.2	31.2	59.4
68	2	6.2	6.2	65.6
72	2	6.2	6.2	71.9
74	1	3.1	3.1	75.0
76	6	18.8	18.8	93.8
80	1	3.1	3.1	96.9
84	1	3.1	3.1	100.0
Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Based on table 4.9 showed that median was 64 and mode was 64, It means that the most frequent score was 64, if about frequency distribution (see in table 4.10) it showed that there were 9 students who got less than 64 and there were 13 students who got more than 64.

From the result of calculation of post-test between experimental and control group, it can be concluded that there was improvement scores in experimental groups, it seen in the explanation before. Although in the experimental groups there were improvement, but there was a little improvement.

Table 4.11 descriptive Group Statistics

KELAS	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
EKSPERIMEN	35	77.37	6.540	1.105
CONTROL	32	67.31	7.123	1.259

As table 4.11 showed that mean in post-test of experimental group was higher than mean of control group. It indicated that in the average, the use of RAFT strategy has caused the improvement of students' writing achievement, but it was important to know that such a conclusion was only a descriptive conclusion.

B. Hypothesis Testing

The hypothesis testing of this study as follows:

1. When the significant level is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected and alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted. It means that there is significant effect of using RAFT strategy on students' achievement in writing recount text
2. When the significant level is more than 0.05, the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is rejected and null hypothesis (Ho) is accepted. It means that there is no significant effect of using RAFT strategy on students' achievement in writing recount text

After organizing the frequency and the percentage of score from pre-test and post-test, the means, the medians, the standard deviations, the variances, the minimum and the maximum of the writing pre-test and posttest scores of the sample. Therefore, to investigate whether talking chips gave effect on students' achievement in writing analytical exposition text. The researcher tested the result of post-test by using Independent Samples T-Test in SPSS 16.00 program.

Table 4.12 Independent Samples T-Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	.219	.641	6.027	65	.000	10.059	1.669	6.726	13.392
Equal variances not assumed			6.003	63.051	.000	10.059	1.676	6.711	13.407

Referring to Table 4.5, shows that in Levene's Test for Equality of Variances, it seen that $F= 0.289$ ($p=0,641$) because of p higher than 0.05, it indicated that there is no difference in variance data or in the other words data was equal/homogenous. If the data was homogeneous, see on the result of equal variances assumed. As can be seen in table above showed that Df (Degree of freedom) was 65. Therefore, the way to test whether the null hypothesis can be rejected was by comparing p -value with the standard level of significance, 0.05. The convention to reject the null hypothesis was when the p -value of the obtained statistics was less than 0.05 (Balnaves & Calputi, 2001). As table 4.11 showed, the p -value was less than 0.05 ($0.000 < 0.05$). Thus, there was enough evidence indicating that the null hypothesis could be rejected, and it could be concluded that there was significant effect of using RAFT strategy on students' achievement in writing recount text.

C. Discussion

The use of RAFT strategy is helpful for student. It helps students to plan and design what they will write. So that, the text not only good but also meaningful. RAFT strategy is a system to help students understand their role as a writer, the audience they will address, the varied formats for writing, and the expected content. The RAFT strategy helps student in organizing the text and stated the main idea clearly. In the pre-test there lot of student have lack main idea, the main idea is not strong and ambiguity. Then they set the paragraph uncoordinated. So there is no coherence. After get the treatment the students show their progress on post-test result. By applying RAFT strategy, writing became easier. The quality of writing is good enough, they can state the main idea of text (thesis) and each paragraph clearly. Then, students are able to organize the text well. They allow the generic structure of recount text. And they have main idea in each paragraph. The impact the text is more meaningful and understandable for the reader.

Based on the post-test result, the students can defend their role in the text, it can be seen from the point of view in each paragraph. They are able to use significance pronoun. The audience they choose is good. The purpose of the text and the message is delivered. At last, the student more enjoy with their own format. In the pre-test all student make an essay, some student have lack on it. In contrary, at the treatment the students have many formats for their own text. Student can be more creative in make a text. The finding of research result above agrees with the basic concept of RAFT strategy. Brozo (2008:14) stated RAFT strategy gives students the freedom project themselves into unique roles and look at content from unique perspective. It helps students to be more creative in develop their text. The finding result of the research also agrees with the purpose of RAFT strategy that is to make the writing in good quality. According to Sons (2008:30), RAFT strategy is used to increase the quality of students' writing. By personalizing the task and transforming student idea of both the writing topic and writing event. Based in the research finding, the student has increased their writing product be a good writing rather than their post-test.

Based on the theory, RAFT strategy will help the students to know and understand their writing. It's agree with the function of RAFT strategy that is to comprehend student about their written. The last is agree with the advantages of RAFT strategy as stated on Saskatoon Public School article (2008), RAFT strategy helps student understanding the main ideas of text, how to organize text, elaboration, and cohesive and coherence of the text. Then RAFT strategy help students know their position in making text or passage to state something strongest and it help student write text or passage effective for the reader.

Beside the researcher, RAFT strategy also has been successfully implemented by Fransisca, Rismaya and Luwandi in their project entitled "Improving Students'

Ability in Writing Hortatory Exposition Text by Using RAFT Strategy”. Second, by Endriani conducted a study entitled “The effect of using RAFT strategy toward student’s ability in writing narrative text at the second year students of SMAN 12 Pekanbaru”. Third, by Azhari, Arina entitled “The effectiveness of using role audience format topic strategy toward the students’ achievement in writing hortatory exposition text at madrasah Aliyah As-Salam Jambewangi”. Those research shows that RAFT strategy is very useful in writing teaching and learning process. It does not only helpful for student but also for the teacher. It has been proven increase students achievements in writing.

Based on explanation above, it can be said that RAFT give a significant effect on the student’s achievement in writing recount text. It could be seen from the description of research finding above, which this research support the previous study that RAFT appropriate to improvement on student’s descriptive writing, but not only support findings on previous study, this research also find that RAFT give improvement to students’ achievement on writing recount text. Although, RAFT strategy can improve student’s achievement on writing, but this method still there was a weakness in application which the time allocation most used in discussion, especially if apply on the class that has many students because to write a good quality in writing takes a longer time. Beside on finding above the teacher can apply RAFT strategy in teaching English especially in writing recount text which can consider the weakness.