CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the researcher presents about research findings and discussion that include data of research findings, data analysis, the result of normality testing, hypothesis testing and discussion.

A. Research Findings

To investigate students' writing achievement in descriptive text before and after using public figure picture, the researcher conducted pretest and posttest. In pretest and posttest the reseacher was chosen different picture , but the characteristic was same. In pretest, the picture is Steven William. Then, in posttest the picture is Alghozali. The pretest was given before taught the class by using public figure picture and posttest was given after taught by using public figure picture.

The final result of students' writing after doing all of the steps in process writing in pretest and posttest then were analyzed by using writing scoring rubric.

Table 4.1 The students' writing scores before using public figure picture.

No	Subject	Number of Word	Vocabulary		Grammar	Paragraph Development	Average Score
			Spelling	Meaning			
1	AF	45	83	79	40	75	61
2	AA	36	94	89	60	70	68
3	ABP	46	85	74	11	65	48
4	AR	47	87	79	10	65	49
5	ARN	50	87	85	40	75	63
6	BAS	62	82	72	20	65	54
7	BS	36	89	80	14	70	51
8	DZ	49	98	94	60	75	72
9	DO	54	94	79	22	75	58
10	DOS	35	88	78	42	65	58
11	DR	50	98	86	20	75	58
12	ER	52	98	86	60	75	71
13	EAP	36	47	36	11	60	37
14	FNJ	79	100	88	90	80	86
15	FN	42	64	62	10	60	42
16	FAF	70	85	57	10	60	47
17	GW	45	100	95	40	75	65

18	HAK	40	96	92	60	75	70
19	IDP	74	94	79	60	75	72
20	JRT	70	97	93	50	75	71
21	KA	90	100	92	80	80	85
22	MWT	54	92	88	40	75	65
23	MD	47	93	91	60	75	71
24	MLH	34	91	88	62	65	66
25	MAG	51	98	88	80	80	80
26	MZW	46	100	93	70	75	75
27	NK	46	95	93	40	75	64
28	NJM	53	88	75	30	70	57
29	ND	40	97	97	44	75	66
30	RS	55	96	90	70	75	75
31	RHA	33	91	81	25	65	53
32	SR	42	93	80	33	70	58
33	ST	40	92	87	60	75	69
34	SIR	48	91	88	40	70	62
35	WNS	89	92	77	30	65	60

The pretest was given to the students by asking them to write a descriptive text. It was done before treatment process. This test was intended to know the basic competence of students before they got treatment.

Table 4.2 Descriptive Statistic of Pre-test

Statistics

Pre-test

N	Valid	35
	Missing	0
Mean		63.57
Median		65.00
Mode		58
Sum		2225

Table 4.3 Frequency of Pre-test

Pre-test

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	37	1	2.9	2.9	2.9
	42	1	2.9	2.9	5.7
	48	1	2.9	2.9	8.6
	49	1	2.9	2.9	11.4
	51	1	2.9	2.9	14.3
	53	1	2.9	2.9	17.1
	54	1	2.9	2.9	20.0
	57	1	2.9	2.9	22.9
	58	4	11.4	11.4	34.3
	60	1	2.9	2.9	37.1
	61	1	2.9	2.9	40.0
	62	1	2.9	2.9	42.9
	63	1	2.9	2.9	45.7
	64	1	2.9	2.9	48.6
	65	3	8.6	8.6	57.1
	66	2	5.7	5.7	62.9

68	1	2.9	2.9	65.7
69	1	2.9	2.9	68.6
70	1	2.9	2.9	71.4
71	3	8.6	8.6	80.0
72	2	5.7	5.7	85.7
75	2	5.7	5.7	91.4
80	1	2.9	2.9	94.3
85	1	2.9	2.9	97.1
86	1	2.9	2.9	100.0
Total	35	100.0	100.0	

Based on table of pretest above that consist of 35 students. It show that the mean score is 63.57, the median score is 65.00, the mode score is 58, and the total score is 2225. The frequency of pretest after distributed there are 42.9% got the score under the mean. While 48.6% students got score above the mean.

Table 4.4 The students' writing scores after using public figure picture.

No	Subject	Number of Word	Vocabulary		Grammar	Paragraph Development	Average Score
			Spelling	Meaning			
1	AF	63	97	89	80	75	79
2	AA	50	98	98	70	80	77
3	ABP	56	93	91	40	75	65
4	AR	56	95	89	60	75	71

5	ARN	72	93	90	60	75	73
6	BAS	54	87	83	60	75	70
7	BS	68	98	88	80	75	80
8	DZ	50	98	96	100	75	85
9	DO	75	97	95	70	75	78
10	DOS	50	98	90	90	80	83
11	DR	54	96	96	90	75	82
12	ER	53	96	96	70	95	82
13	EAP	58	79	79	40	75	62
14	FNJ	79	100	100	100	95	96
15	FN	57	96	94	60	80	74
16	FAF	40	97	75	50	65	62
17	GW	46	100	95	70	80	77
18	HAK	53	100	98	75	75	78
19	IDP	39	95	92	70	65	70
20	JRT	48	100	96	75	75	77
21	KA	93	100	93	100	75	90
22	MWT	58	98	95	70	75	76
23	MD	68	97	95	100	95	94
24	MLH	35	94	91	70	80	74
25	MAG	67	97	95	100	95	94
26	MZW	49	100	96	90	75	82

27	NK	69	100	97	100	95	95
28	NJM	55	98	91	40	75	65
29	ND	46	100	98	70	90	80
30	RS	65	100	98	100	75	88
31	RHA	48	98	94	50	75	68
32	SR	54	96	94	70	75	75
33	ST	49	98	96	80	75	79
34	SIR	69	93	85	50	70	67
35	WNS	79	95	88	60	75	74

The post test was given to the students by asking them to write a descriptive text. It was done after treatment process by teaching learning using public figure photo as a media. The test was intended to know the students writing achievement after students got treatment.

Table 4.5 Descriptive Statistic of Post-test

Statistics

postest

N	Valid	35
	Missing	0
Mean		77.77
Median		77.00
Mode		74[a]
Sum		2722

a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown

Table 4.6 Frequency of Post-test

Post-test

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	62	2	5.7	5.7	5.7
	65	2	5.7	5.7	11.4
	67	1	2.9	2.9	14.3
	68	1	2.9	2.9	17.1
	70	2	5.7	5.7	22.9
	71	1	2.9	2.9	25.7
	73	1	2.9	2.9	28.6
	74	3	8.6	8.6	37.1
	75	1	2.9	2.9	40.0
	76	1	2.9	2.9	42.9
	77	3	8.6	8.6	51.4
	78	2	5.7	5.7	57.1
	79	2	5.7	5.7	62.9
	80	2	5.7	5.7	68.6
	82	3	8.6	8.6	77.1
	83	1	2.9	2.9	80.0
	85	1	2.9	2.9	82.9
	88	1	2.9	2.9	85.7
	90	1	2.9	2.9	88.6
	94	2	5.7	5.7	94.3
	95	1	2.9	2.9	97.1
	96	1	2.9	2.9	100.0
	Total	35	100.0	100.0	

Based on table of pretest above that consist of 35 students. It show that the mean score is 77.77, the median score is 77.00, the mode score is 74,

and the total score is 2722. The frequency of pretest after distributed there are 42.9% got the score under the mean. While 57.1% students got score above the mean.

B. Data Analysis

Therefore, to investigate whether Public figure picture is effective on the students' achievement in writing descriptive text, the researcher tested the result of pre-test and post-test by using Paired Sample Test in IBM SPSS Statistics 16. As what previously mentioned that there are two hypotheses in this study; (1) Null hypothesis stating that there is no any significant difference on students' writing achievement in writing descriptive text before and after being taught by using Public figure picture, and (2) Alternative hypothesis stating that there is any significant difference on students' achievement in writing descriptive text before and after being taught by using public figure picture, the testing was done to investigate whether the null hypothesis could be rejected or not.

The result of data analysis is from student's score of pre-test and post-test as in the following table:

Table 4.7 : Correlation

Correlations

		pretest	postest
pretest	Pearson Correlation	1	.661**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000

	N	35	35
postest	Pearson Correlation	.661**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	35	35

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Relying on the table 4.7, the output of *Paired Samples Correlations* shows that there is a correlation between both samples. The numeral both correlation is 0.661 and the numeral of significance is 0.00. The interpretation of decision based on the result of probability achievement is:

a) If the probability >0.05 then the null hypothesis is accepted

b) If the probability <0.05 then the null hypothesis is rejected

The standard level of significance is 0.05. if the result of computation shows that the significance 2 tail on the table is lower than 0.05, there is a significant difference on students' writing score before and after being taught by using public figure picture. On the other hand, if the significance 2 tails in the table is higher than the significance level (0.05), there is no significant difference on the students' writing score before and after being taught by using public figure picure.

In table 4.7, the numeral significance level 0.02 is lower than 0.05 and therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. It means that there is a significant difference on students' writing score before and after being taught by using public figure picture. In other words, public figure picture is effective to improve the students' writing score in descriptive text.

Table 4.8 : Paired Sample Statistics

Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	pretest	63.5714	35	10.96327	1.85313
	postest	77.7714	35	9.13328	1.54381

The data presented above is the performance scores of the onegroup of students taken as the sample, before and after using public figure picture as the treatment. The mean score of pre-test is 63.57. While the mean score of post-test is 77.77. The number of students (N)both in pre-test and post-test is 35. The standard deviation of pre-test is10.963 and the error mean is 1.853. On the posttest, the standard deviationis 9.133 and the error mean is 1.543.

Based on the result of mean, it can be concluded that the meanscore of pre-test is different from the mean score of post-test. Thus it can be concluded that there is increase since the mean score of post-test is higher than pre-test.

Table 4.9 : Paired Samples Correlation

Paired Samples Correlations

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	pretest & postest	35	.661	.000

Based on the table 4.9 above, shows the correlations between two scores of pre-test and post-test where it seen that the correlation scores of pre-

test and post-test= 0.661 and sig= 0.000. For interpretation of decision based on the result of probability achievement, that is:

a) If the sig >0.05, means H_o is accepted

b) If the sig <0.05, means H_o is rejected

It shows that sig= 0.000 is lower than 0.05 means that H_0 is rejected and Ha is accepted. So, it can be concludes that there is significant correlation between pre-test and post-test score.

Table 4.10 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			
Pair 1	pretest - postest	-1.42000E1	8.44289	1.42711	-17.10023	-11.29977	-9.950	34	.000

The way to test whether the null hypothesis can be rejected is by comparing p-value with the standard level of significance, 0.05. The convention toreject the null hypothesis is when the p-value of the obtained statistics is less than0.05 (Balnaves & Calputi, 2001).

As Table 4.10 shows, the p-value is 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 using public figure picture was effective on the students' achievement in writing descriptive text.

C. Normality Testing

1. Normality Testing

Normality test is used to test whether a variable is normal or not. Normal here means if the data have a normal distribution. The main reason of conducting normality testing in a research is that it is necessary for the researcher to know that the population or data involved in the research is in normal distribution. To test the normality of the data can use the *One Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov* test with the provision that if Asymp. Sig > 0,05 the data were normally distributed (Asmarani, 2008:234). In this case the normality using *SPSS* (Statistical Product and Service Solutions) *16.0 for Windows*. The hypotheses for testing normality are:

a. H_0 : Data is in normal distribution
b. H_1: Data is not in normal distribution

In testing the hypotheses, the data is in normal distribution if Ho isaccepted. In this case, Ho is rejected if significance value is lower than0.05 ($\alpha = 5\%$) while Ho is accepted if the significance value is higher than0.05.

2. The Result of Normality Testing

Normality testing is conducted to determine whether the gotten data is normal distribution or not. The researcher used SPSS.16. *One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnove test* by the value of significance (α) = 0.050. The result can be seen below:

Table 4.11 : Normality Testing

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		pretest	posttest	Unstandardized Residual
N		35	35	35
Normal Parameters[a]	Mean	63.57	77.77	.0000000
	Std. Deviation	10.963	9.133	8.22884923
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.078	.093	.143
	Positive	.078	.093	.078
	Negative	-.077	-.076	-.143
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.462	.551	.844
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.983	.922	.475

a. Test distribution is Normal.

The sig/p value on pre-test is 0.983 and it is lower 0.05 (0.129> 0.05). It means that H_0 is accepted and H_a is rejected and the data is in normal distribution. Then, for post-test score the value of sig/p is 0.922 and that is bigger than 0.05 (0.743> 0.05). It also means that H_0 is accepted and H_a is rejected and the data is in normal distribution. So, it can be

interpreted that both of data (pre-test and post-test score) are in normal distribution.

D. Hypothesis Testing

From the data analysis it could be identify that:

1. When the value of $T_{count} > T_{table}$ in *df* =34 with the significant level 0.05. The alternative hypothesis (H_a) is accepted and the null hypothesis (H_o) is rejected. It means that there is significant different score of writing descriptive text achievement to eighth grade students at SMPN 3 Kedungwaru Tulungagung before and after being taught by using public figure picture.

2. When the value of $T_{count} < T_{table}$ in *df*=34 with the significant level 0.05. The null hypothesis (H_o) is accepted and the alternative hypothesis (H_a) is rejected. It means that there is no significant different score of writing descriptive text achievement to eighth grade students at SMPN 3 Kedungwaru Tulungagung before and after being taught by using public figure picture .

The mean of total writing descriptive text achievement test score of 35 students before being taught by using picture (63.57). After getting treatment, the means score of students' achievement is (77.77). It means that the students' score is improved.

Based on the statistical calculation using t-test, the researcher gives interpretation to t_{count}. First, he considered the *d.f.* with the *d.f.* (35-1=34). She

checked to the score of "t" at the significant level of 0,05. In fact, with the *d.f.* of (34) and the critical value 0,05 significant t_{table} was (2.032).

By comparing the "t" that he got in calculation t_{count} = (9.950) and the value of "t" on the t_{table}= $t_{0.05}$ = (2.032), it is known that $t_{count}$is bigger than t_{table}=9.950>2.032.

Because the t_{count} is bigger than $t_{table}$the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted. It means that there is significant different score of student's achievement in writing descriptive text of eighth grade students of SMPN 3 Kedungwaru Tulungagung before and after taught by using public figure picture.

E. Discussion

The objective of this study was to improve the eighth graders' students' achievement in writing descriptive text. Then, the result of this study indicated the result of post-test after using public figure picture was significant different than pre-test before using public figure picture. This result showed that the students more interested to write and share their idea by using public figure picture.

From the research finding in chapter IV, the output data of *Paired Samples Statistics* shows the the mean of pre-test and post-test was increased from 63.57 to be 77.77. The standard deviation is to measure how much the variance of the sample.The standard deviation of pre-test is 10.963 < 63.57and post-test is 9.133 < 77.77where if the standard deviation is getting higher than the mean it means that the mean is not homogeny and if the

standard deviation is getting smaller than the mean it means that the mean is homogeny. So, it can be concluded that standard deviation of pre-test and post-test was homogeny means that the sample of this research almost has the same mean.

Based on the output data of *Paired Samples Test* it was found that t_{count} = 9.950and t_{table} = 2.032 and if compared the differences both of value is 7.918. From this comparison, t_{count} = 7.918 is bigger than t_{table} = 2.032 which means the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted, while the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is significance different of the students' achievement in writing descriptive text of the eighth grade students of SMPN 3 Kedungwaru Tulungagung in academic year 2016/2017 before and after taught by using public figure picture.

The finding above is related with the previous study. Amik Rotul Chasanah (2013) has proven the implementation of picture seems more effective, enjoyable and useful for students. Moreover, Amik Rotul Chasanah (2013) has proven that the implementation of picture can be interest and good media in the learning process of the students to study writing. The last study was conducted by Aulya'ur Rosyidah (2013) has proven that using picture indicates the students' achievement was better and it was found that they have good motivation in teaching and learning process. Using picture is highly effective to develop the students' achievement. Those previous studies conducted support the belief that picture have a positif effect on descriptive text writing ability.

Based on the explanation above, teaching descriptive text on writing ability is good to increase students' descriptive text writing ability at the eight grader of junior high school. From the result of data analysis, there is significant difference scores of students in descriptive text writing ability before and after being taught by using picture. So, it can be concluded that using picture is effective to teach descriptive text on writing ability at the eight grade of SMPN 3 Kedungwaru.