

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents research findings and discussion. Therefore this chapter covers description of data, normality and homogeneity, hypothesis testing, and discussion.

A. Description of Data

The researcher did quasi experimental research design with quantitative approach. The subjects of the research were the eleventh grade students of MAN 3 Blitar which consisted of 37 students of XI MIA 1 as experimental group and 34 students of XI IIS 1 as control group. The researcher selected those classes because both of them belong to normal classes. It is in line with the sampling technique used in this research, which is purposive sampling. Then, the researcher used test as the instrument of this research to collect the data. Thereby, pre-test and post-test had been developed by the researcher. Prior to be administered to experimental and control group, the researcher tried out the test to the same grade of MAN 3 Blitar at XI IIS 2.

This research was conducted in four meetings. The first meeting was administering pre-test. It was intended to measure the students writing ability before they were given treatments. In pre-test, students were asked to choose one of three topics served by the researchers. The second and the third meeting were conducted treatments. Meanwhile the fourth meeting, the researcher was administering post-test. As the same as pre-test, the students

could choose one topic from three topics provided by the researcher herself. The researcher gained students' score by considering scoring rubric that has been settled. Then, in calculating students score in pre-test and post-test, the researcher used SPSS 16.0. The analysis of pre-test and post-test can be seen as follows:

1. Data of Post-test Score in Experimental Group

Experimental group was a class taught by using Gallery Walk technique in hortatory exposition text. The subject of experimental group consisted of 37 students. Their score of post-test can be seen on the table below :

Table 4.1 Score of Post-test in Experimental Group

No.	Name	Post-test
1	ANH	96
2	ARU	96
3	ASS	88
4	ATS	86
5	DAN	96
6	DBN	88
7	DRD	86
8	DYA	95
9	DZH	84

10	FWF	95
11	HAD	96
12	HCJ	91
13	IFS	88
14	ISH	91
15	IZA	90
16	LAR	91
17	LHZ	83
18	LUH	90
19	MAT	91
20	MAR	88
21	MIB	83
22	MUR	86
23	MUS	91
24	MEO	96
25	MG	88
26	MRZ	83
27	NAS	91
28	NAZ	83

29	PAC	91
30	RLU	86
31	RKD	95
32	SEF	86
33	SFK	95
34	SNK	88
35	UAJ	86
36	VAN	84
37	WRA	95

Based on the table 4.1 there were 37 students of XI MIA 1 of MAN 3 Blitar as the sample in this research. All the students joined post-test, thus they got score from post-test. The lowest score of post-test was 83 which was gotten by four students and the highest test was 96 which was gained by five students. The descriptive statistic of experimental group was as follows:

Post-tets of Experimental Group

The post-test was given to the students after the treatments. The post-test was in the form of essay. There were 3 chosen topics as well as in pre-test, but the topic served both in pre-test and post-test was different. The descriptive statistic of post-test in experimental group can be seen below :

Table 4.2 Descriptive Statistic of Post-test in Experimental Group**Statistics**

POSTTEST

N	Valid	37
	Missing	0
Mean		89.62
Std. Error of Mean		.722
Median		90.00
Mode		91
Std. Deviation		4.393
Variance		19.297
Range		13
Minimum		83
Maximum		96
Sum		3316

Based on the table 4.2, it showed that the mean score was 89.62. It indicated the average of students score in post-test was 89.62. The median score was 90.00 and the mode score was 91. Then, the lowest score was 83 and the highest score was 96. The standard deviation was 4.393. In addition the total score of post-test in experimental group was 3316.

Table 4.3 Frequency Distribution of Post-test in Experimental Group

POSTTEST

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	83	4	10.8	10.8	10.8
	84	2	5.4	5.4	16.2
	86	6	16.2	16.2	32.4
	88	6	16.2	16.2	48.6
	90	2	5.4	5.4	54.1
	91	7	18.9	18.9	73.0
	95	5	13.5	13.5	86.5
	96	5	13.5	13.5	100.0
	Total	37	100.0	100.0	

Regarding on table 4.3, there were 18 students got score less than or equal to 88 and 13 students got score more than or equal to 90. The mode score showed 91. Therefore, many students got score 91.

2. Data of Post-test Score in Control Group

Control group was a class which taught by using conventional technique in hortatory exposition text. The subject of experimental group consisted of 34 students. Their score of post-test were as follows:

Table 4.4 Score of Post-test in Control Group

No.	Name	Post-test
1	AEB	83
2	ARD	83
3	ARM	80
4	AWK	79
5	DAY	75
6	DNI	88
7	DSA	83
8	FNR	83
9	FNU	88
10	HKU	80
11	ILN	80
12	KAF	82
13	KHI	83
14	KNH	79
15	LKA	80

16	MAF	79
17	MAU	86
18	MYA	83
19	NAR	79
20	NKN	83
21	NAM	80
22	NIV	79
23	NUZ	83
24	PNA	80
25	SAI	80
26	SAH	80
27	SRJ	74
28	SVF	83
29	SIY	83
30	TAG	84
31	TIH	80
32	URG	75

33	VFW	84
34	ZYN	83

Regarding on the table 4.4 there were 34 students of XI IIS 1 of MAN 3 Blitar as the sample in this research. All the students joined post-test. The lowest score of post-test was 74 which was gotten by four students and the highest test was 88 which was gained by five students. The descriptive statistic of control group was as follows:

Post-test of Control Group

The post-test was given to the students after the treatments. The post-test was in the form of essay. There were 3 chosen topics as well as in pre-test, but the topic served both in pre-test and post-test was different. The descriptive statistic of post-test in control group can be seen below :

Table 4.5 Descriptive Statistic of Post-test in Control Group

Statistics		
POSTTEST		
N	Valid	34
	Missing	3
Mean		81.29
Std. Error of Mean		.545
Median		81.00
Mode		83
Std. Deviation		3.177
Variance		10.093

Range	14
Minimum	74
Maximum	88
Sum	2764

From the table 4.5, it showed that there were 34 students as the sample of this research. The mean score was 81,29. It meant the average of students score in post-test was 81,29. The median score was 81.00 and the mode score was 83. Then, the lowest score was 74 and the highest score was 88. The standard deviation was 10.093. In addition the total score of post-test in experimental group was 2.764.

Table 4.6 Frequency Distribution of Post-test in Control Group

POSTTEST

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 74	1	2.7	2.9	2.9
75	2	5.4	5.9	8.8
79	5	13.5	14.7	23.5
80	9	24.3	26.5	50.0
82	1	2.7	2.9	52.9
83	11	29.7	32.4	85.3
84	2	5.4	5.9	91.2
86	1	2.7	2.9	94.1
88	2	5.4	5.9	100.0

Total	34	91.9	100.0
Missing System	3	8.1	
Total	37	100.0	

Referring to table 4.6, there were 17 students got score less than or equal to 81 and 17 students got score more than or equal to 82. The mode score showed 83. Therefore, many students got score 83.

B. Normality and Homegenity

1. Normality Testing

Normality test is one of the requirement in analyzing the data. Thus, before conducting further analysis, the data should normally distributed. In addition, normality test intended to know whether the data is normally distributed or not. Furthermore, it could become the consideration which statistical formula used. Then, if the significance value is more than 0.05, the data is normally distributed. Meanwhile if the significance value is less than 0.05, the data is not normally distributed. In this research, the researcher used One-Sample Kolmogorov – Smirnov Test on SPSS. The data were presented below:

Table 4.7 Normality Test of Experimental and Control Group

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test			POSTTEST EXPERIMENT	POSTTEST CONTROL
N			37	34
Normal Parameters ^a	Mean		89.62	81.29
	Std. Deviation		4.393	3.177
	n			
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute		.160	.175
	Positive		.130	.158
	Negative		-.160	-.175
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z			.972	1.020
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)			.301	.249
a. Test distribution is Normal.				

From the table above, it could be accomplished that the significance value post-test of experimental group was 0.301, the significance value post-test of control group was 0.249. So, it could be interpreted that all of them were more than 0.05. Therefore, all the data have been normal distributed.

2. Homogeneity

Homogeneity testing conducted to know whether the gotten data has a homogeneous variance or not. In this research, the researcher used SPSS Statistics 16.0 that is Levene Statistic test by the value of significance (α) = 0.05. The samples can be categorized as homogeneity if value of significance > 0.05 . Hence, the data of sample had same variance. The result can be seen below:

Table 4.8 Homogeneity Testing

ANOVA					
POSTTEST					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	90.259	8	11.282	.532	.821
Within Groups	530.359	25	21.214		
Total	620.618	33			

Based on table 4.8, it showed that the value of significance was 0.821. It meant that the value was lower than 0.05. Hence, the data was homogeneous.

Homogeneity and normality were fundamental in this research since the aim of homogeneity and normality testing were used to decide whether the formula for hypotheses testing belong to parametric or non-parametric one. Then, after doing calculation of normality and homogeneity testing by using SPSS 16.0 version, the research could determine that the formula for hypotheses testing in this research belong to Parametric test since it fulfill

the requirement of parametric test which were data normally distributed and belonged to interval scale or ratio.

C. Hypothesis Testing

The hypotheses testing of this research were as follows:

1. If the p-value (significance value) is less than or equal to 0.05 ($\alpha = 5\%$), the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis (H_a) is accepted. It means there is significant difference score in writing hortatory exposition text of the eleventh grade students taught by using Gallery Walk technique and those who are not taught by using Gallery Walk technique.
2. If the p-value (significance value) is greater than to 0.05 ($\alpha = 5\%$), the null hypothesis (H_0) is accepted and the alternative hypothesis (H_a) is rejected. It means there is no any significant difference score in writing hortatory exposition text of the eleventh grade students taught by using Gallery Walk technique and those who are not taught by using Gallery Walk technique.

After organizing the frequency and the percentage of score from 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 there was any significant difference score in writing hortatory exposition text of the eleventh grade students taught by using Gallery Walk technique and those

who are not taught by using Gallery Walk technique, the researcher analyzed the result of post-test by using Independent Samples T-Test in SPSS 16.0 version. The result could be seen below:

Table 4.9 Group Statistic

Group Statistics					
GROUP		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
POSTTEST	1	37	89.62	4.393	.722
	2	34	81.29	3.177	.545

Table 4.10 Independent Samples Test of Experimental and Control Groups

Independent Samples 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
Students score	Equal variances assumed	6.121	.016	9.082	69	.000	8.328	.917	6.498	10.157
	Equal variances not assumed			9.205	65.496	.000	8.328	.905	6.521	10.134

Based on table 4.9 the statistical analysis by using SPSS 16.0, the output of statistical calculation showed that there were 2 groups. Group 1 belonged to experimental group. It showed N cell there was 37, meant there were 37 students in experimental group. The mean of experimental group showed 89.62 and standard deviation was 4.393. Meanwhile Group 2 belonged to control group. It showed N cell there was 34, meant there were 34 students in control group. The mean of experimental group showed 81,29 and standard deviation was 3.177. From the result above, it can be inferred that there was significant difference score in writing hortatory exposition text of the eleventh grade students taught by using Gallery Walk technique and those who are not taught by using Gallery Walk Technique.

Referring to Table 4.10, showed that in Levene's Test for Equality of Variances, it seen that $F = 6.121$ ($p = 0.016$) 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 could be seen on the table above, it showed that Df (Degree of freedom) was 69. 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. As table 4.10 presented, the value of the Sig (2-tailed) was 0.000. It had to be divided into two since this study belonged to one-tailed test ($0.000 : 2 = 0.000$). Thereby, it indicated that the Sig value was less than 0.05 ($0.00 < 0.05$). Thus, there was

significant different score in writing hortatory exposition text of the eleventh grade students taught by using Gallery Walk technique and those who are not taught by using Gallery Walk technique. Then, it could be clearly concluded that null hypothesis (H_0) which stated that there is no any significant difference score in writing hortatory exposition text of the eleventh grade students taught by using Gallery Walk technique and those who are not taught by using Gallery Walk technique was rejected. In the contrary, the alternative hypothesis (H_a) which stated there is significant difference score in writing hortatory exposition text of the eleventh grade students taught by using Gallery Walk technique and those who are not taught by using Gallery Walk technique was accepted.

D. Discussion

The objective of this research was to know whether there is any significant different score in writing hortatory exposition text of the eleventh grade students taught by using Gallery Walk technique and those who are not taught by using Gallery Walk technique. The researcher used test as the instrument to get the data of this research.

There were three steps based on research method. The first step was administering pre-test. It was aimed to know the ability of students before being taught by using Gallery Walk technique and to know whether those classes are equal. The students could choose 1 topic for hortatory exposition text from three topics provided by the researcher. The second

step was conducting treatments. It needed two meetings to conduct treatments. The first meeting was planning and drafting. Therefore, the students together with their group constructed hortatory exposition based on the chosen topic. The second meeting was editing and final version of their product. In this case, Gallery Walk technique was applied to them. Then, the third meeting was administering post-test. Post-test was done as the same as pre-test with three different topics before. The purpose of post-test was to know the students' score after being taught by using Gallery Walk technique.

After conducting pre-test and post-test, the researcher got two scores for both experimental and control groups. Then, the researcher analyzed the data by using independent sample on SPSS 16.0 version software. Referring to research findings, the mean scores between pre-test and post-test in experimental and control groups were different. The gain of mean score post-test in control group and experimental was 81.29 and 89.62. It clearly stated that the gain of mean score in experimental was higher than control group.

Furthermore, based on statistical calculation of Independent Samples T-Test by using SPSS 16.0, the value of the Sig (2-tailed) was 0.000. It had to be divided into two since this study belongs to one-tailed test ($0.000 : 2 = 0.000$). Thereby, it indicated that the Sig value was less than 0.05 ($0.00 < 0.05$). Therefore, the alternative hypothesis (H_a) was accepted and the null hypothesis (H_0) was rejected. It was in line with (Balnaves & Calputi,

2001) that the convention to reject the null hypothesis was when the p-value of the obtained statistics was less than 0.05. Hence, there was significant different score in writing hortatory exposition text of the eleventh grade students taught by using Gallery Walk technique and those who are not taught by using Gallery Walk technique.

Regarding on the result of data analysis above, it correlated to the previous study from Fahmi Aulia Batubara as stating that the use of Gallery Walk Technique could improve learner' ability in writing announcement. This research belonged to quantitative and qualitative approach by using classroom action research as the methodology of this research to find out whether the use of Gallery Walk technique can improve learners' ability in writing announcement. The quantitative data were taken from the students' test. The qualitative data were taken from the students' score, interview sheet, observation sheet and documentation. After both groups were given the treatment, the result of this research showed the mean score of post-test of cycle I was 73.8 or 21 students and the mean of post-test of cycle II was 80 or 36 students. Based on the result of fahmi's research, it is line with this study in which after being given treatment by Gallery Walk technique, students were easier to understand the material well rather than those who are not taught by Gallery Walk technique.

Then, the research from Desi Lestari was conducted by using quasi experimental research with 40 students participated. Those students were

divided into experimental and control group. The experimental group was taught by using Gallery Walk strategy in writing descriptive paragraph, while the control group was taught by using lecturing method. The result indicated that the students' ability at writing descriptive paragraph taught by using lecturing method got mean 56.8 in pre-test with the maximum score 76 and the minimum score was 40. While in post-test the students got mean 60.4 with the maximum score 80 and the minimum score was 60. Desi's finding also proved that Gallery Walk Technique is effective on students' writing ability in descriptive paragraph.

Considering to the complexity of writing as stated by Hyland (2003), Writing is more than only putting ideas in the right. It also relates to several aspects such as grammar, spelling, punctuation, content, organization, and flow of the ideas. Thus, writing deals much with steps and stages. Probably, this is the reason that makes writing seems very difficult. Writing is difficult for English as Foreign Language learners (Thuy, 2009; Huy, 2015, Zhang&Guo, 2013). Writing in second language is different from writing in first language (Hinkel, 2004). Thus, the nature of teaching writing and instructions given for students in native language setting, second, and first language setting will be different. Regarding to these reasons, the teacher should implement an interesting way such as Gallery Walk to overcome those problems. Hammontree (2005) claims that gallery walk engages students with the opportunity of showing their project. In this case, gallery walk deals with showing students'

product. In line with Hammontree's claim, Kolodner (2002) argues that gallery walk deals with product publicly. Therefore, gallery walk relates to an activity that provides opportunity for students to show their product.

In addition, the implementation of Gallery Walk technique lead the students to pass the writing process properly. It was due to the existence of peer feedback in this technique. As Lundstrom and Baker, (2009) said that the practice of peer feedback allows students to receive more individual comments as well as giving reviewers the opportunity to practice and develop different language skills. This statement reflected the implementation of Gallery Walk technique itself in which students must rotate and left comment from one station to the other stations. Furthermore, students got many feedbacks left by their friends. Yang et al., (2006) also yielded that peer feedback is beneficial in developing critical thinking, learner autonomy and social interaction among students. Not only that but also the unique implementation of gallery walk in classroom promotes students' engagement and participation. In this study, the researcher put songs in applying Gallery Walk technique in order to create a good atmosphere since writing is quite and difficult thing that might lead the students felt bored and anxious in writing class. It is also supported by Adkins, (1997); Coufalikova, (2010) that the existence of song helped the students felt relax, reduce the anxiety, and create good atmosphere as well. Another benefit of song is that it reduces classroom

stress. Thereby by implementing this technique to the classroom, a good atmosphere arose in it and students could out of their chair, be active, and walk to the galleries. Last but not the least, the students are able to compose their individual writing after several treatments by using Gallery Walk technique. In short, finding verified that Gallery Walk technique was effective to be used for eleventh grade students in teaching writing at MAN 3 Blitar.