

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 conducted Quasi-Experimental research design with quantitative approach. The subject of the research were the eleventh grade students of MAN Kota Blitar which consisted of 35 students of XI MIA 2 as experimental group and 35 students of XI MIA 3 as control group. The researcher selected those classes because both of the include into normal classes. It is in line with the sampling technique used in this research, which is purposive sampling. Then, the researcher used pre-test and post-test that had been developed as instruments in collecting the data. Before being administered to both experimental and control group, the instruments were tried out at the same grade students of MAN Kota Blitar that is XI MIA 4.

This reserach was carried out in four meetings. The first meeting was administering the first test that is pre-test. The pre-test was intended to measure students' writing ability before given treatments. In pre-test, students were asked to create explanation text based on the topic provided by the researcher. Then, the second and third meetings were treatments using Task Based Learning strategy to experimental group and conventional strategy to control goup. Finally, the post-

test was administered in the fourth meeting. The post-test was intended to measure students' writing ability after given treatments. In line with the pre-test, the students were also asked to create explanation text based on the topic opted by the researcher. The score of students' writing were gained by considering scoring rubric that had been settled. In calculating students' score in pre-test and post-test, the researcher used SPSS 16.0. The analysis of post-test can be seen as follows:

1. Data of Post-test Score in Experimental Group

Experimental group was class taught by using Task Based Learning strategy in creating explanation text. The subject of this group consisted of 35 students of XI MIA 2. The post-test score of the experimental group can be seen in the table below:

Table 4.1 Score of Post-test in Experimental Group

No	Name	Score
1	AR	80
2	AHC	84
3	AA	84
4	ASI	88
5	APS	88
6	APS	88

7	AWC	92
8	AIP	84
9	ABA	92
10	BVR	84
11	FAK	92
12	FAI	88
13	FF	92
14	HSR	88
15	IFN	80
16	IPD	88
17	IA	80
18	JRS	92
19	MAG	80
20	MRN	88

21	MDM	88
22	MIT	80
23	MIH	92
24	MN	88
25	OCN	88
26	PEA	80
27	PAW	92
28	RW	84
29	RAF	88
30	SSA	88
31	SNA	84
32	TMS	88
33	VI	96
34	WSN	88
35	YS	92

--	--	--

Based on the table 4.1, there were 35 students of XI MIA 2 of MAN Kota Blitar as sample in this research. All the students joined post-test and gained score as preented above. The highest score of post-test was 96 which was gotten by four students. Meanwhile the lowest score was 80 which was gained by six students.

Post-test of Experimental Group

The post-test was given by researcher after students getting treatments. It was in the form of written text created by students. Dealing with the topic, it was different with one used in pre-test. The descriptive statistic of post-test in Experimental group can be seen as follow:

Table 4.2 Descriptive Statistic of Post-Test in Experimental Group

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Range	Min	Max	Sum	Mean		Std. Deviation
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic
Experime ntal Group	35	16	80	96	3048	87.09	.735	4.348
Valid N (listwise)	35							

From the table 4.2, the mean score of post-test in experimental group was 87.09. It indicated that students' score were in the average of 87.09. Then, the

minimum score of experimental group was 80, meanwhile the highest score was 96. Furthermore, the standar deviation of the post-test was 4.348. In addition, the sum score or the total score of post-test in experimental group was 3048.

2. Data of Post-test Score in Control Group

Control group was a class taught by using a strategy commonly used in teaching and learning process. It consisted of 35 students of XI MIA 3. The score of post-test were as follows:

Table 4.3 Score of Post-test in Control Group

No	Name	Score
1	AJ	80
2	AA	84
3	ASN	76
4	AKV	80
5	AMI	84
6	AW	76
7	CAR	72
8	DIN	84
9	DFM	68

10	DLE	80
11	DNM	76
12	EAP	80
13	FMZ	80
14	HZP	72
15	HSW	76
16	IW	68
17	JIP	76
18	KQ	76
19	LS	80
20	LNU	84
21	LAR	84
22	ML	80
23	NAK	72
24	NIR	88
25	NAP	88
26	NZ	68

27	PYC	80
28	RAY	76
29	RR	76
30	RTS	72
31	SSS	76
32	SNA	84
33	SAA	76
34	SKA	64
35	VTS	80

According to the table 4.3, the sample of control group was 35 students of XI MIA 3. All of the students joined the post-test. From the list of scores above, the highest score was 88 which was gotten by two students. Meanwhile, the lowest score was 64 which was gotten by one students. The descriptive statistic of control group was presented below:

Post-test of Control Group

The post-test was given by researcher after students getting treatments. It was in the form of written text created by students. Dealing with the topic, it was different with one used in pre-test. The descriptive statistic of post-test in Experimental group can be seen as follow:

Table 4.4 Descriptive Statistic of Post-Test in Experimental Group

Descriptive Statistics								
	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	Mean		Std. Deviation
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic
Control Group	35	24	64	88	2716	77.60	.973	5.756
Valid N (listwise)	35							

From the table 4.4, the mean score of post-test in control group was 77.60. It indicated that students' score were in the average of 77.60. Then, the minimum score of control group was 64, meanwhile the highest score was 88. Furthermore, the standar deviation of the post-test was 5.756. In addition, the sum score or the total score of post-test in control group was 2716.

B. Normality and Homogeinity

1. Normality Testing

One of specifications to analyze the data is normality test. Normality test aims to know whether the data of research is normally distributed or not. Therefore, when the data is called normally distributed, the further analysis can be done. In addition, it can be a consideration to opt the statistical formula used in the research. The data is called normally distributed when the significance value is more than 0.05. Meanwhile, if the significance value is less than 0.05, the data is

not normally distributed. In this research, One-Sample Kolmogorov – Smirnov Test in SPSS is used to calculate normality test. The data was presented below:

Table 4.5 Normality Test of Experimental and Control Group

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		EXPERIMENT AL GROUP	CONTROL GROUP
N		35	35
Normal Parameters ^a	Mean	87.09	77.60
	Std. Deviation	4.348	5.756
	Most Extreme Differences		
	Absolute	.175	.162
	Positive	.139	.124
	Negative	-.175	-.162
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		1.037	.958
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.233	.318
a. Test distribution is Normal.			

From the table 4.5, it could be confirmed that the significance value of post-test in experimental group was 0.233 and the significance value of post-test in control group was 0.318. Then, it could be concluded that significance values of experimental group and control group were more than 0.05. Therefore, the data of post-test in experimental group and control group have distributed normally.

2. Homogeneity Testing

Homogeneity testing is conducted to find whether the gained 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 classified as homogeneous samples if the value of significance > 0.05. Accordingly, the variances of the data were the same.

Table 4.6 Homogeneity Testing

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

POST-TEST

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
2.543	1	68	.115

The data in table 4.6 presented that the value of significance was 0.115. It indicated that the value was higher than 0.05. Hence, the data was homogeneous.

Normality and homogeneity were essential in this research since the testing results were used in determining whether the formula for hypotheses testing is associated with parametric or non-parametric one. Thus, after calculating normality and homogeneity testing, the researcher could establish the formula for hypotheses testing which included into Parametric test since it fulfilled the requirements of parametric test which were the normally distributed data and included into interval scale or ratio.

C. Hypothesis Testing

The hypotheses testing in 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_1) is accepted. It means that there is significant different score in students' explanation text writing of eleventh grade between experimental group which was taught by using Task Based Learning (TBL) strategy and control group which was not taught by using Task Based Learning (TBL) strategy.
2. If the p-value (significant value) is higher than 0.05 ($\alpha = 5\%$), the null hypothesis (H_0) is accepted and the alternative hypothesis (H_1) is rejected. It means that there is no significant different score in students' explanation text writing of eleventh grade between experimental group which was taught by using Task Based Learning (TBL) strategy and control group which was not taught by using Task Based Learning (TBL) strategy.

In the pre-test, the result showed that the value of Sig. (2-tailed) was 0.460 and it was higher than 0.05. Thus, it indicated that there is no difference in variance data in both classes. In other words, XI MIA 2 and XI MIA 3 were equal. The computation result was presented in table 3.3 below:

Table 4.7 Group Statistics

Group Statistics

Group		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
PRE-TEST	Experimental	35	63.43	5.913	.999
	Control	35	62.40	5.673	.959

Table 4.8 Independent Sample T-Test of Pre-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
R E S U L T	Equal variances assumed	.052	.821	.743	68	.460	1.029	1.385	-1.735	3.792
	Equal variances not assumed			.743	67.884	.460	1.029	1.385	-1.735	3.793

To investigate whether there was any significant difference score in writing explanation text of the eleventh grade students taught by using Task Based Learning (TBL) strategy and those who taught by using conventional strategy, the researcher calculated the result of post-test by using Independent Sample T-Test in SPSS 16.0 version. The result was presented below:

Table 4.9 Group Statistics**Group Statistics**

GROUP		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
POST-TEST	Experimental	35	87.09	4.348	.735
	Control	35	77.60	5.756	.973

Table 4.10 Independent Sample Test of Post-Test**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	2.543	.115	7.780	68	.000	9.486	1.219	7.053	11.919
			7.780	63.271	.000	9.486	1.219	7.049	11.922

The statistical analysis in the table 4.7 above showed that there were two groups of sample namely experimental group and control group. In experimental group, the N cell was 35, means there were 35 students in it. The mean score

presented in experimental group was 87.09 with the standard deviation 4.348. Meanwhile in control group, the N cell was also 35, means there were 35 students in it. The mean score existed in control group was 77.60 with the standard deviation 5.756. From the previous statements, it can be summarized that there was significant different score in writing explanation text of the elevent grade students taught by using Task Based Learning (TBL) strategy and those who taught by using conventional strategy.

As aformentioned in table 4.8, the result of t-test can be concluded that significant value (Sig.-2 tailed) was 0.000 and it was smaller than 0.05 ($0.000 < 0.05$). It means that the null hypothesis (H_0) was rejected. Therefore, it can be concluded that was significant difference score in writing explanation text of the eleventh grade students taught by using Task Based Learning (TBL) strategy and those who taught by using conventional strategy. It could be defined that Task Based Learning (TBL) strategy is effective on students' writing ability.

D. Discussion

This research aimed to know whether there is any significant different score in explanation text writing of eleventh grade students who taught by using Task Based Learning (TBL) strategy and those who taught by using conventional strategy. The researcher used test as instruments in getting the data of this research.

According to the research method, three steps of research were implemented. The first step was administering pre-test, aiming to discover

students' writing ability before being taught by using Task Based Learning (TBL) strategy. In pre-test, the students wrote explanation text according to the topic given by the researcher. The next step was conducting treatments for both experimental and control group. Two meetings of treatment was implemented in experimental group by using Task Based Learning (TBL) strategy and control group by using conventional strategy. The last step was administering post-test, aiming to know students' writing ability after being taught by using Task Based Learning (TBL) strategy. It also needed students' writing on explanation text but with different topic with pre-test. After administering pre-test and post-test, the data in form of scores for experimental and control groups were collected. The researcher, then, analyzed the scores by using Independent Sample Test on SPSS 16.0. The result of analysis presented that the post-test mean of experimental group was 87.09, meanwhile the post-test mean of control group was 77.60. Thus, it stated clearly that the mean score of experimental group was higher than control group. The result also showed that the value of Sig (2-tailed) was 0.000 and smaller than 0.05 ($0.000 < 0.05$). It indicated that the effect of treatment given to the experimental group was the increasing score. Thus, it can be concluded that Task Based Learning (TBL) strategy was effective on students' writing ability.

The result of this study is in line with the study conducted by Simamora (2020), Sariannur (2017), and Siska (2017) on the implementation of Task Based Learning that discovered that TBL can improve students' writing ability. It was also found that by applying Task Based Learning, students' writing developed efficiently since it was proved that there were significant differences in students'

pre-test and post-test. In other words, implementing TBL in teaching can raise students' ability in writing. Besides enhancing students' writing, TBL also has effect in students' engagement during teaching and learning process. This result was also consistent with Desmayenni *et. al.* (2012) revealed that TBL increased students' participation in the process of teaching and learning writing. This also in line with research by Harmer (1998) declaring that TBL puts students' learning focus on the development of distinguishing tasks. Since the certain tasks are only students' centre of attention during the process of learning, students are more focus and it makes learning more effective. Task Based Learning (TBL) is not only a good strategy in enhancing students' writing, but also increasing their participation in teaching and learning process. Furthermore, this strategy can be applied in encouraging students' discussion and interaction as well.

According to the result, it can be concluded that using Task Based Learning (TBL) strategy is effective on students' writing ability at eleventh grade of MAN Kota Blitar. This activity also increased students' participation in learning process since the strategy is student-centered. Therefore, Task Based Learning (TBL) is a very useful strategy that can be implemented in teaching and learning process on students' writing.