## CHAPTER IV

## FINDING AND DISCUSSION

This chapter provided the explanation of finding and discussion of the research. The finding and discussion of the research involves the description of the data, the result of normality and homogeneity, hypothesis testing and discussion.

## A. The Description of Data

This chapter presented the descriptive statistics of the research. The data were the students' writing score before and after instructed by using dictogloss technique. The outcome of students' writing in recount text was in the form of pre-test and post-test. The researcher measured the students' pre-test and post-test by using scoring rubric. The pre-test had delivered to the students before conducting the treatment while the post-test was delivered to the students after conducting the treatment. Both of tests were presented to the tenth grade of MA Darul Hikmah Tawangsari. The total of the students was 31 students. The students' writing score of pre-test and post-test could be seen in the table 4.1.

Table 4.1
The Result of Students' Writing Score in Pre-test and Post-test

| No | The Students' <br> name | Pre-test score | Post-test score | Gained score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | AMM | 65 | 70 | 5 |
| 2 | ADT | 70 | 90 | 20 |
| 3 | AZF | 65 | 70 | 5 |
| 4 | ASLF | 75 | 85 | 10 |
| 5 | DHK | 55 | 70 | 15 |


| 6 | DMNS | 65 | 80 | 15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7 | ER | 50 | 75 | 25 |
| 8 | IPI | 60 | 65 | 5 |
| 9 | IN | 50 | 75 | 25 |
| 10 | KFFU | 65 | 90 | 25 |
| 11 | KI | 55 | 75 | 20 |
| 12 | LN | 55 | 75 | 20 |
| 13 | MN | 50 | 70 | 20 |
| 14 | MNW | 55 | 75 | 20 |
| 15 | MFZ | 55 | 85 | 30 |
| 16 | MEPD | 75 | 90 | 15 |
| 17 | NEP | 75 | 80 | 5 |
| 18 | NBNS | 65 | 75 | 10 |
| 19 | NC | 55 | 65 | 10 |
| 20 | NS | 55 | 70 | 15 |
| 21 | NU | 55 | 75 | 20 |
| 22 | NF | 40 | 65 | 35 |
| 23 | RWP | 50 | 75 | 15 |
| 24 | RSU | 60 | 65 | 15 |
| 25 | SZ | 50 | 75 | 15 |
| 26 | SMS | 60 | 85 | 15 |
| 27 | SH | 65 | 85 | 20 |
| 28 | SRF | 65 | 80 | 20 |
| 29 | VNF | 75 | 90 | 5 |
| 30 | WEY | 85 | 80 | 5 |
| 31 | ZAEA | 65 |  | 15 |

Based on the table 4.1, the lowest score of the students in the pre-test was 40 while the highest score was 85 . After giving the treatment, the researcher provided the post-test to the students to find out whether there was difference score between pre-test and post-test. Based on the table, the lowest score was 65 and the highest score was 90 in the post-test. Then, it could be summed up that the students' score in the post-test higher than students' score in the pre-test

## 1. The Computation Result of the Students' Writing Score Before Being Taught by Using Dictogloss Technique (Pre-test)

The pre-test presented to the students in the form of writing-test and administered for 31 students. The pre-test had done before teaching writing by using Dictogloss Technique to know the students' writing before they were presented the treatment. The outcome of pre-test could be known by using IBM SPSS 23.0 version. The descriptive statistics of pre-test score involved of mean (table 4.2), the frequency distribution and percentage of pre-test (table 4.3) and histogram of pre-test (figure 4.1), those could be seen as follows:

Table 4.2 The Descriptive Statistics of Pre-test

## Statistics

Pre-test

| N | Valid | 31 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
|  | Missing | 0 |
| Mean |  | 60.81 |
| Median | 60.00 |  |
| Mode | $55^{a}$ |  |
| Std. Deviation | 9.840 |  |
| Minimum | 40 |  |
| Maximum |  | 85 |

a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown

Descriptive statistics aimed to describe the certain condition of the group. This research was intended to the tenth XB IPA students of MA Darul Hikmah

Tawangsari Kedungwaru. Based on the table 4.2, it showed that the mean score was 60.81 . From the median, the result was 60.00 . It meant that the middle students' score of pre-test was 60.00 from total of the students were 31 students. Meanwhile, the mode score meant that the most frequently appeared number. The mode score was 55. Moreover, the score of standard deviation was 9840 . The last, the minimum score was 40 while the maximum score was 85 .

Then, to find out the number of score which appeared in the pre-test score, the researcher presented the frequency distribution. It could be seen in the table 4.3 below:

Table 4.3 Frequency Distribution and Percentage of Pre-test

## Pre-test

|  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative <br> Percent |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid 40 | 1 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 3.2 |
| 50 | 5 | 16.1 | 16.1 | 19.4 |
| 55 | 8 | 25.8 | 25.8 | 45.2 |
| 60 | 3 | 9.7 | 9.7 | 54.8 |
| 65 | 8 | 25.8 | 25.8 | 80.6 |
| 70 | 1 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 83.9 |
| 75 | 4 | 12.9 | 12.9 | 96.8 |
| 85 | 1 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 100.0 |
| Total | 31 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

## Figure 4.1 The Percentage of Score in Pre-test



Based on the table 4.3, it showed the frequency of pre-test and figure 4.1 showed the percentage of score in pre-test. There were 14 students ( $45.1 \%$ ) got score $40-55$. There were 12 students ( $38.7 \%$ ) got score $60-70$. Then, there were 5 students (16.1\%) who got score 75-85.

After finding out the outcome of pre-test, the researcher supplied the treatment with the goal the students' writing ability could be developed. Then, the researcher presented post-test to assess the students' writing score after treatment organized.

## 2. The Computation Result of The Students' writing Score After Being Taught by Using Dictogloss Technique (Post-test)

The researcher presented the test by using writing test form. The students ordered to make the sentence based on the title that was determined. The post-test conducted to measure students' writing ability after the students were provided the treatment by the researcher.

The outcome of post-test could be known by using IBM SPSS 23.0 version. The descriptive statistics of post-test score involved of mean (table 4.4), while the frequency distribution and percentage of pre-test (table 4.5) and histogram of pre-test (figure 4.1), those are presented as follows:

Table 4.4 The Descriptive Statistics of Post-test

## Statistics

Post-test

| N | Valid | 31 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
|  | Missing | 0 |
| Mean | 76.77 |  |
| Median | 75.00 |  |
| Mode | 75 |  |
| Std. Deviation | 7.805 |  |
| Minimum | 65 |  |
| Maximum | 90 |  |

Descriptive statistics aimed to describe the certain condition of the group. This research was intended to the tenth XB IPA students of MA Darul Hikmah Tawangsari Kedungwaru. From the table 4.4, it indicated the mean score was 76.77 while the median was 75.00 . It meant that the middle students' score in pretest was 75.00 from total of the students were 31 students. Meanwhile, the mode score meant that the most often appeared number. The mode score was 75 . Moreover, the score of standard deviation was 7.805 . The last, the minimum score was 65 while the maximum score was 90 .

Thereafter, to find out the number of score which showed in the pre-test score, the researcher presented the frequency distribution. It presented in the table 4.5 below:

Table 4.5 Frequency Distribution and Percentage of Post-test Post-test

|  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative <br> Percent |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid 65 | 4 | 12.9 | 12.9 | 12.9 |
| 70 | 5 | 16.1 | 16.1 | 29.0 |
| 75 | 10 | 32.3 | 32.3 | 61.3 |
| 80 | 4 | 12.9 | 12.9 | 74.2 |
| 85 | 4 | 12.9 | 12.9 | 87.1 |
| 90 | 4 | 12.9 | 12.9 | 100.0 |
| Total | 31 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Figure 4.1 The Percentage of Score in Post-test


Based on the table 4.5, it showed the frequency of pre-test and figure 4.1 showed the percentage of score in pre-test. There were 19 students ( $61.3 \%$ ) got score 65-75. There were 12 students ( $38.7 \%$ ) who got score 80-90.

## B. The Result of Normality and Homogeneity Testing

The researcher presented the outcome of the normality and homogeneity testing by using IBM SPSS 23.0 version. The researcher calculated normality to find out whether the data had been normal distributed or not. Meanwhile, calculating the homogeneity was to know whether the sample of data is heterogenic or homogeny. The result of normality and homogeneity testing was presented as below:

## 1. The Result of Normality Testing

The normality both of pre-test and post-test was measured by IBM SPSS 23.0 version using the formula of One Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test. The result of normality test could be seen in the table 4.6 as follow:

Table 4.6 One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

|  |  | Pre-test | Post-test |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| N |  | 31 | 31 |
| Normal Parameters ${ }^{\mathrm{a}}$ | Mean | 60.81 | 76.77 |
|  | Std. Deviation | 9.840 | 7.805 |
| Most Extreme | Absolute | .174 | .203 |
| Differences | Positive | .174 | .203 |
|  | Negative | -.117 | -.120 |
|  | .969 | 1.129 |  |
| Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z | .305 | .156 |  |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) |  |  |  |

a. Test distribution is Normal.

Based on the table above, it could be seen the significance value of pretest was 0.305 , it was bigger than 0.05 . It meant that the data distribution of pre-
test was normal. Then, the significant value of post-test was 0.156 , it was bigger than 0.05. It meant that the data distribution of post-test was categorized normal. So, it could be summed up that both of the data pre-test and post-test were normal distributions.

## 2. The Result of Homogeneity Testing

Homogeneity testing was conducted after the researcher conducted normality testing. It meant homogeneity conducted after confirming the data had been normal distributed. Homogeneity testing aimed to know whether the data was homogeny or heterogenic data. The researcher used IBM SPSS 23.0 version to calculate homogeneity the data by using formula Homogeneity Levene Statistic. The result could be seen as below:

Table 4.7 Homogeneity Result Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Value

| Levene Statistic | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1.613 | 1 |  | 60 |

Significance value represented the descriptions of homogeneity data pretest and post-test. The significance value was 0.209 , it was bigger than 0.05 . From the result above, it could be summed up that the data pre-test and post-test were homogeny. After the data was normal distributed and homogeny. Next step, the
researcher tested the hypothesis. The researcher used parametric testing in term of Paired Sample T-Test by using IBM SPSS 23.0 version in testing hypothesis.

The result of hypothesis testing could be seen as below:

Table 4.8 Paired Sample T Test

|  | Paired Differences |  |  |  |  | T | df | Sig. (2tailed) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mean | Std. <br> Devia tion | Std. <br> Error <br> Mean | 95\% Confidence Interval of the Difference |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Lower | Upper |  |  |  |
| Pair pretest 1 posttest | -15.968 | 7.683 | 1.380 | -18.786 | -13.150 | -11.571 | 30 | . 000 |

Based on the table 4.8, it represented that the different mean score of pretest and post-test was -15.968 . The standard deviation was 7683. Meanwhile, the standard error mean was 1380 with the lower different was -18.786 and the upper different was -13.150 . The result of $t$-count was -11.571 (ignored the minus symbol) with the degree freedom (df) was 30 and the significant (2-tailed) was 0.000 .

## C. Hypothesis Testing

This research was conducted find out whether there was significant difference in students' writing in recount text of the tenth grade students in MA Darul Hikmah Tawangsari Kedungwaru in academic year 2019/2020 before and
after being taught by using Dictogloss Technique. To interpret the finding data, the researcher used Paired Sample Test by using IBM SPSS 23.0 version. The hypothesis of this research was stated as follow:

1. When the significant value < significant level, the alternative hypothesis $\left(\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{a}}\right)$ was accepted and the null hypothesis $\left(\mathrm{H}_{0}\right)$ was rejected. It means there was significant difference score on the students' writing before and after being taught by using Dictogloss Technique.
2. When the significant value > significant level, the null hypothesis $\left(\mathrm{H}_{0}\right)$ was accepted and the alternative hypothesis $\left(\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{a}}\right)$ was rejected. It meant there is no significant difference score on the students' writing before and after being taught by using Dictogloss Technique.

## D. Discussion

The researcher practiced one sample as subject for conducting the research. The researcher used class XB IPA of MA Darul Hikmah Tawangsari Kedungwaru in academic year 2019/2020. The students consisted of 31 students. This research had been choosing by using purposive sampling technique because of some recommendations some people in the school. This research aimed to find out whether there was any significant score in students' writing in recount text before and after being taught by using Dictogloss Technique.

The three steps were done in teaching and learning process. First, the researcher provided the pre-test before teaching writing by using Dictogloss Technique. The pre-test were provided to find out the students' writing score in recount text before treatment conducted by applying Dictogloss Technique. The
pre-test had done on March $4^{\text {th }}, 2020$. The pre-test was organized in the writing test form and the students ordered to arrange the sentence based on the title which determined by the researcher. There were 31 students as subject of this research and the time allocation was 45 minutes.

The second steps, the researcher presented the treatment to the students. Dictogloss technique was used by the researcher to conduct the treatment. The treatment was conducted for second times. The first treatment was conducted on March11 ${ }^{\text {th }}, 2020$. Meanwhile, the second treatment was conducted on March $18^{\text {th, }}$ 2020.

Last step, the researcher presented the post-test to the students after teaching writing by using Dictogloss Technique. The post-test aimed whether this technique was effective or not in teaching writing especially recount text. The researcher used student's score of pre-test and post-test and calculated both of them by using IBM SPSS 23.0 version.

Based on the outcome of calculation statistic, using Dictogloss Technique was effective to the students' writing in recount text. It was proved in hypothesis testing by gained significance value less than 0.05 . When the significance value less than 0.05 , then the alternative hypothesis $\left(H_{a}\right)$ was accepted and the null hypothesis $\left(\mathrm{H}_{0}\right)$ was rejected. It meant there was any significant difference score on students' writing in recount text before and after being taught by using Dictogloss Technique. The differences could be noticed in the result of mean in the pre-test and post-test score. The result of mean in the pre-
test was 60.81 become 76.77 in the post-test. So, the finding outcome by using Dictogloss Technique was increased in the students' writing of recount text.

The outcome of this research was supported by Makmun (2018) who examined Teaching Writing in Narrative Text through Dictogloss method at the eleventh grade students of MA Miftahul Ulum Pandanwangi Lumajang. This research was categorized into an experimental study. The data was gathered from post-test score in the experimental class which taught by using Dictogloss Technique and controlled class without using Dictogloss Technique. It meant that he mean score of post-test in the experimental class was 65.16 ; while, the mean score of post-test in the controlled class was 74.6. From the result of the study, it could be concluded that Dictogloss Technique was effective in teaching writing. In this case, the result of mean score of the experimental group from previous study above was 65 . 16 while this research was 76.77 . It meant the mean score of previous study is lower than this research.

This research was also supported by Shofuyah (2015) who investigated the effectiveness of Dictogloss Technique in teaching writing narrative text at the first grade students of SMA Manba'ul Ulum. According to the data collected from the pre-test and post-test gained from the experimental class was taught writing by using Dictogloss method, it shared the means score of pre-test was 52.5 while the mean score of post-test was 69.85 . It could be concluded that teaching by using Dictogloss Technique is effective than teaching without Dictogloss Technique. It meant that the means score of this research is higher than this previous study.

Then, this research also supported by Latif (2016) who examined Dictogloss Technique in developing the students' vocabulary. The result of mean score of post-test in experimental class was 82.25 while the mean score of pre-test was 71.5. It meant the score of post-test is higher than pre-test. From the result, it could be concluded that teaching vocabulary by using Dictogloss Technique is successful. Based on the analysis above, the mean score of this research is lower than this previous study.

From the outcome, it could be summed up that Dictogloss Technique to teach writing in recount text is effective. In addition, based on the result analysis data teaching writing by using Dictogloss Technique is effective to instruct the students' writing at tenth grade students of MA Darul Hikmah Tawangsari Kedungwaru.

