

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents three topics related to research finding and discussion. Those are the description of data, hypothesis testing and discussion.

A. Research Finding

1. The Description of Data

This research was conducted at SMA Negeri 1 Tulungagung with population were all of the tenth grade students of SMA Negeri 1 Tulungagung. There were 7 classes at the tenth grade. The total of tenth grade students students were 245 students. The sample of this research was X MIPA 4 which consited of 36 students, 13 male and 23 female students as exprimental and control group because the researcher was conducted pre-experimental study. This research used indirect feedback to teach students' writing recount text. This research was conducted on March 29th, 2019 until April 30rd, 2019. The researcher used test to get data, those were pre-test and post-test.

In this research, the researcher presented the data of students' writing score, pre test and post test. Here, the researcher wanted to know the effectiveness of using indirect feedback toward students' ability in writing recount text of the tenth grade at SMA Negeri 1 Tulungagung. The effectiveness could be seen from the significant different of students' score in writing recount text before and after being taught by using indirect

feedback. Here the researcher conducted pre test, giving treatment about recount text. using indirect feedback and post test. Before and after treatments, the researcher did pre test and post test. Pre test and post test were done to obtain students' score in writing recount text.

Table 4.1 The score's criteria

No	Criteria	Range of Score
1	Excellent	81-100
2	Good	61-80
3	Average	41-60
4	Poor	21-40
5	Very Poor	1-20

The scores were divided into five criterion. They were excellent, good, average, poor, very poor. The students categorized into excellent score if they got 81-100 score which meant that they were able to do the test very well. The students categorized into good score if they got 61-80 score which meant that they had a little doubt. In this category, they were able to do the test well. The students categorized into average score if they got 41-60 score which meant that they were able to do test pretty well. The students categorized into poor score if they got 21-40 score which meant that they just did the test. The last criterion were the students categorized into very poor score if they got 1-20 score which meant that they could not do the test well.

a. The Data of Pre Test

After conducting pre test, the researcher obtained the data. The data were as follow:

Table 4.2 Students' score before being taught by using indirect feedback

No	Name	Score
1	A.D.P	64
2	A.R.A.P	76
3	A.D.P.P	68
4	A.P.L	52
5	A.G.S.W	64
6	B.F.A	56
7	C.A	56
8	E.A	56
9	E.F.I.S	44
10	E.T.N	56
11	F.K	40
12	F.S	60
13	F.N.S	56
14	H.C.F	72
15	H.G.F	72
16	H.M.A.P	60
17	H.R.A	56
18	H.Y.P	72
19	I.N.A.A	52
20	J.M.S.D	44
21	L.Z	48
22	M.D.F	52
23	M.S.A	48
24	M.W.A	72
25	N.A.S	64
26	N.C.T	60
27	N.A.K.K	56
28	P.A	76
29	R.P.C	76
30	R.S.S	52
31	R.N	72
32	S.K.E.P	60
33	S.A	44

34	T.L.S.R	44
35	W.C	56
36	Y.A.P	48

The researcher used SPSS 16.0 version to know the descriptive statistic and the percentage of students' score of pre test. The percentage was divided into five criterion: excellent, good, average, poor, and very poor (see table 4.1). The result of calculation as follow:

Table 4.3 Descriptive statistic of pre test

Statistics

PRE_TEST

N	Valid	36
	Missing	0
Mean		58.44
Median		56.00
Mode		56
Std. Deviation		10.355
Minimum		40
Maximum		76

Based on the table 4.3 above, it showed that the minimum score of pre test was 40, the maximum score was 76, standard deviation 10.355, and the mean was 58.44.

Table 4.4 The frequency of students' score in writing recount text before taught using indirect feedback

PRE_TEST					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	40	1	2.8	2.8	2.8
	44	4	11.1	11.1	13.9
	48	3	8.3	8.3	22.2
	52	4	11.1	11.1	33.3
	56	8	22.2	22.2	55.6
	60	4	11.1	11.1	66.7
	64	3	8.3	8.3	75.0
	68	1	2.8	2.8	77.8
	72	5	13.9	13.9	91.7
	76	3	8.3	8.3	100.0
Total		36	100.0	100.0	

From the table 4.4, frequency of pre test after being distributed there were no students who got score between 1-20 which meant that the students' score in wrting recount text were very poor. There was 1 student who got score between 21-40 which meant that the students' score in writing recount text was poor. There were 23 students who got score between 41-60 which meant that the students' score in writing recount text were average. There were 12 students who got score between 61-80 which meant that the students' score were good. There was no student who got score between 81-100.

b. The Data of Post Test

After conducting post test, the researcher obtained the data. The data were as follow.

Table 4.5 Students' score after being taught by using indirect feedback

No	Name	Score
1	A.D.P	68
2	A.R.A.P	80
3	A.D.P.P	60
4	A.P.L	68
5	A.G.S.W	80
6	B.F.A	56
7	C.A	60
8	E.A	72
9	E.F.I.S	48
10	E.T.N	64
11	F.K	48
12	F.S	60
13	F.N.S	68
14	H.C.F	80
15	H.G.F	76
16	H.M.A.P	60
17	H.R.A	68
18	H.Y.P	72
19	I.N.A.A	56
20	J.M.S.D	52
21	L.Z	52
22	M.D.F	60
23	M.S.A	56
24	M.W.A	80
25	N.A.S	72
26	N.C.T	64
27	N.A.K.K	72
28	P.A	84
29	R.P.C	80
30	R.S.S	60
31	R.N	72
32	S.K.E.P	56
33	S.A	52
34	T.L.S.R	52
35	W.C	60
36	Y.A.P	52

The researcher used SPSS 16.0 version to know the descriptive statistic and the percentage of students' score of pre test. The percentage was divided into five criterion: excellent, good, average, poor, and very poor (see table 4.1). The result of calculation as follow:

Table 4.6 Descriptive statistic of post test

Statistics		
POST_TEST		
N	Valid	36
	Missing	0
Mean		64.44
Median		62.00
Mode		60
Std. Deviation		10.421
Minimum		48
Maximum		84

Based on the table 4.6 above, it showed that the minimum score of post test was 48, the maximum score was 84, standard deviation 10.421, and the mean was 64.44.

Table 4.7 The frequency of students' score in writing recount text before taught using indirect feedback

POST_TEST					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	48	2	5.6	5.6	5.6
	52	5	13.9	13.9	19.4
	56	4	11.1	11.1	30.6

60	7	19.4	19.4	50.0
64	2	5.6	5.6	55.6
68	4	11.1	11.1	66.7
72	5	13.9	13.9	80.6
76	1	2.8	2.8	83.3
80	5	13.9	13.9	97.2
84	1	2.8	2.8	100.0
Total	36	100.0	100.0	

From the table 4.7, frequency of post test after being distributed showed that there were no students who got score between 1-20 which meant that the students' score in writing recount text were very poor. There were no students who got score between 21-40 which meant that the students' score in writing recount text was poor. There were 18 students who got score between 41-60 which meant that the students' score in writing recount text were average. There were 17 students who got score between 61-80 which meant that the students' score were good. There was 1 student who got score between 81-100 which meant that the student's score in writing recount text was excellent.

2. Hypothesis Testing

After the data were collected, the hypothesis testing was needed.

- a. $H_0 = \mu_1 \leq \mu_2$ or the mean of pre test was smaller than or equal to the mean of the post test. Null hypothesis of this research was the score of students in writing recount text after being taught by using indirect

feedback less than or equal to their scores before being taught by using indirect feedback to the tenth grade of SMA Negeri 1 Tulungagung.

- b. $H_1 = \mu_1 > \mu_2$ or the mean of post test was higher than the mean of pre test. Alternative hypothesis of this research was the score of students in writing recount text after being taught by using indirect feedback was higher than their score before being taught by using indirect feedback to the tenth grade of SMA Negeri 1 Tulungagung.

To know whether the post test' s score was higher than pre test score before and after using indirect feedback, the researcher computed *Paired-Sample T test* by using SPSS 16.0 Version. The output was as follow:

Table 4.8 The Result of paired sample t 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			
Pai POST_TEST r 1 - PRE_TEST	6.000	5.451	.909	4.156	7.844	6.604	35	.000

Based on the table 4.8, the t was 4.156, with the df =35, and the p-value (two tailed) was 0.000. Given that the present test was one-tailed test, so the p-value 0.000 was divided into $2 = 0.000$. The significance level was 0.05. For interpretation of decision based on the result of probability, it was:

1. If the probability value (sig) > 0.05 then the null hypothesis was not rejected
2. If the probability value (sig) < 0.05 then the null hypothesis was rejected.

Since 0.000 was smaller than significance level (α) 5% or 0.05, so the null hypothesis was rejected. In other words, the hypothesis said that the mean of the pre test was smaller than or equal to the mean of post test was rejected. It automatically accepted the alternative hypothesis saying that the mean of post test was higher than the mean of pre test. It meant that there was significance difference before and after being taught by using indirect feedback.

B. Discussion

As discussed of research method in teaching and learning process was divided into three steps. The first step was given pre test. The researcher wanted to know the students' score in writing recount text before being taught by using indirect feedback. The second step, the researcher gave treatment to the students divided in three meetings. The first meeting, the researcher explained about eight correction codes (WC, WF, ^ , ? , S/V A, Prep , Art) that used to indicate error in indirect feedback. The second meeting, the researcher continued to explain others correction codes (WO, SP, Capt, Punct, VT, DNS, More, Org). The third meeting, the researcher gave the correction

codes in their first draft in pre test and asked student to revise based on the feedback given. After all the treatments were done, the researcher conducted the third step that was pos test. It was to see the students' score whether any differences between pre test's score and post test's score.

Students' score in writing recount text was poor. It was proved when they were taught before using indirect feedback. From the research findings, the students' score before being taught by using indirect feedback was poorer than students' score of post test. It was proved by the calculation of the mean score on pre test 58.44 and the mean score on post test 64.44. From the research finding, the students' score of post test was higher than students' score of pre test. So, the researcher concluded that indirect feedback was very useful to make students more understand in writing recount text.

Based on the table 4.14, the t was 4.156, with the $df = 35$, and the p -value (two tailed) was 0.000. Given that the present test was one-tailed test, so the p -value 0.000 was divided into $2 = 0.000$. The significance level was 0.05. Since 0.000 was smaller than significance level (α) 5% or 0.05, so the null hypothesis was rejected. In other words, the hypothesis said that the mean of the pre test was smaller than or equal to the mean of post test was rejected. It automatically accepted the alternative hypothesis saying that the mean of post test was higher than the mean of pre test. It meant that there was significance difference before and after being taught by using indirect feedback.

The finding of this research stated that indirect feedback was considered effective to improve students' ability in writing recount text. It could be seen in

treatment process, the students were more interested when the teacher applied indirect feedback. The teacher could be as helpfull facilitator offering support and guidance for students. Teacher can offer self correction opportunity for their students by providing feedback on students grammatical errors (Chandler, 2003).

Regarding on the result of data analysis above, it was strongly with previous studies as stating that indirect feedback was considered as an effective techniqes toward students's writing ability in recount text. The first study conducted by Vivi Evayanti in 2013 entitled *"Increasing Students' Descriptive Text Writing Achievement through Feedback at the Second Year of SMP Taman Siswa II Bandar Lampung"* was conducted to investigate whether there is any increase of students' writing descriptive text achievement through feedback or not. The feedback which was used in this research was teacher indirect feedback in writing subject. As the result, there was an increase of students' descriptive text writing achievement through feedback and teacher feedback can be used to increase scores in five components of writing.

The second study conducted by conducted by Rendi Saputra in 2016 entitled *"The Effectiveness of Using Indirect Feedback on Students' Writing of Procedure text at the First Grade of SMP Ibadurahaman Cipondoh Tangerang"* was intended to know the effectiveness of using indirect feedback on students'. It found that there was a significant difference between students' achievement in writing of procedure text in experimental class which were given.

From the explanation above, it could be concluded that indirect feedback was effective in this research. The the strategy above was accepted by the researcher, especially in increasing writing ability to senior high school. It has been verified by the result of data analysis. The strategy of indirect feedback to the recount text can help students' writing ability at the tenth grade of SMA Negeri 1 Tulungagung.