

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION**

This chapter, the researcher presents the finding of the research. It presents some discussions deal 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 eight grade students at SMPN 2 Pakel Tulungagung which 40 students of VIII-C as experimental group and 40 students of VIII-D 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 EGRA strategy. In the second until fourth meetings, the researcher conducted a treatment (teaching material) using EGRA strategy, but used different topic in each meeting. In the fifth meeting, the researcher conducted the post-test through EGRA strategy in the experimental group. The final result of students' writing after doing all of the steps in process of writing in pre-test and post-test 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 the pre-test and post-test 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	Pre Test Score	Post Test Score
1	NYR	76	81
2	LRN	84	87
3	FND	78	83
4	OSM	87	93
5	VMS	84	89
6	DDP	81	87
7	RSA	76	84
8	KAR	84	94
9	APP	84	93
10	FDK	81	91
11	NID	84	91
12	DBAY	77	84
13	MHM	75	84
14	DAS	83	89
15	IRH	79	86
16	SLM	89	94
17	EPS	94	98
18	ASM	87	94
19	MAD	78	84
20	IQH	78	88
21	RND	89	96
22	DDMA	87	94
23	SASP	89	93
24	FNE	84	93
25	AMY	88	97
26	LAS	84	96
27	AFM	81	88
28	DJK	77	81
29	KSM	75	86
30	ASTR	74	81
31	GDH	79	87
32	AKJ	83	91
33	MKF	84	94
34	FIH	79	84
35	SKH	83	87

36	EMD	87	94
37	RFN	78	88
38	SAG	85	94
39	FSA	81	88
40	KOL	79	87
Sum		3285	3573

Based on the table 4.1, there were 40 student as sample of the research. The descriptive statistic of eksperiment is as follows:

### 1. Pre-test of Eksperiment Class

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 40 students in experimental group and 40 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.

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 4.2**  
**statistic pretest experimental group**

N Valid	40
Missing	0
Mean	84.13
Std. Error of Mean	1.363
Median	79.00
Mode	80
Std. Deviation	8.064
Variance	65.022
Range	20
Minimum	76
Maximum	94
Sum	3285

Based on Table 4.2 above it can be seen that the mean score was 82,13. It means that the average score of 40 students in the experimental group was 82. Where, most of the students could 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 76 and high score 94.

**Table 4.4**  
**frequency pretest of experimental group**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 76	8	22.9	22.9	22.9
77	5	14.3	14.3	37.1
81	5	14.3	14.3	51.4
84	15	2.9	2.9	54.3
89	6	17.1	17.1	71.4
94	1	28.6	28.6	100.0
Total	40	100.0	100.0	

Then based on Table 4.4 the median score was 79, which if seen in the table above that 13 students who got score less than 79 and 37 students who got score more than . Then the mode score also 84 It means that the most frequent score was 84. Therefore, many students got score 84.

## 2. Post-test of Eksperiment Class

The post-test was administered by asking the students to write a recount text with their own topic. Similar with pre-test there were 40 students in experimental group and 40 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 EGRA 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 EGRA 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:

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

**Table 4.5 statistic posttest experimental group**

Based on table 4.5, 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 EGRA 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 4.6 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	

Based on the table 4.6 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.

b. Data from the scores of pre-test and post-test of control group have been obtained as in the following:

**Table 4.7  
the sores of pre-test and post-test in the control group**

No	Nama	Nilai Pre Test	Nilai Post Test
----	------	----------------	-----------------

1	NSK	78	87
2	AML	87	99
3	DMD	84	98
4	NHR	81	90
5	FAN	76	88
6	RZA	77	83
7	HDN	81	93
8	URM	77	89
9	MZR	75	84
10	MHN	84	95
11	SLF	78	86
12	FZD	83	93
13	YSA	74	89
14	EVW	89	95
15	SFH	87	96
16	ADS	78	85
17	MHA	87	90
18	MLM	84	91
19	MHRF	75	88
20	AF	77	84
21	FN	83	96
22	MFF	69	78
23	FP	76	84
24	DR	81	98
25	DP	80	88
26	MIZ	79	85
27	BYP	81	87
28	IF	81	88
29	MHR	76	86
30	RH	74	85
31	MFI	78	85
32	MIR	82	91
33	IK	80	91
34	EK	71	85
35	AUM	80	89
36	LL	74	85
37	WKH	80	88
38	FL	71	78
39	JS	80	85
40	KJKF	72	83
Sum		3160	3538

Based on the table 4.7, there were 40 student as sample of this research. The descriptive statistic of control class is as follow:

**Table 4.8 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 4.8 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 4.9 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 4.9 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.

**Table 4.10**  
**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

Based on the table 4.10, 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 4.11 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 4.11 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 4.12**  
**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 4.12 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 EGRA 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:



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 EGRA strategy on students' achievement in writing recount text. There was a significant difference in teaching using EGRA strategy. this was indicated that thereby shows that  $H_0$  is accepted and  $H_a$  is rejected. Therefore, it could be concluded from these results which show that the EGRA strategy for the ability to write recount text has a positive and effective influence according to statistics.

### C. Discussion

The use of EGRA 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. EGRA 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 EGRA 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 EGRA 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 EGRA strategy. Brozo (2008:14) stated EGRA 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 EGRA strategy that is to make the writing in good quality. According to Sons (2008:30), EGRA 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, EGRA strategy will help the students to know and understand their writing. It's agree with the function of EGRA strategy that is to comprehend student about their written. The last is agree with the advantages of EGRA strategy as stated on Saskatoon Public School article (2008), EGRA strategy helps student understanding the main ideas of text, how to organize text, elaboration, and cohesive and coherence of the text. Then EGRA 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, EGRA 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 EGRA Strategy". Second, by Endriani conducted a study entitled "The effect of using EGRA strategy toward student's ability in writing narrative text at the second year students of SMAN 12 Pekan Baru". Third, by Azhari, Arina entitled "The effectives 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 EGRA 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 EGRA 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 EGRA appropriate to improvement on student's descriptive writing, but not only support findings on previous study, this research also find that EGRA give improvement to students' achievement on writing recount text. Although, EGRA 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 EGRA strategy in teaching English especially in writing recount text which can consider the weakness.