CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

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

A. Research Findings

In this chapter, the researcher presented the data on students' writing descriptive before and after being taught by using Think-Pair-Share as technique in the process of teaching writing descriptive. The subject of the research consists of two classes. There are 7C as control group and 7F as experiment group. The researcher presented and analyzed the data which had been collected through two kinds of test, they are pre-test and post-test to both classes. The data were described into two tables. The table 4.1 showed the students' score and achievement in control class that include of The Students' Scores of Control Class, Descriptive Statistic of Pretest, Descriptive Statistic of Posttest, and the table 4.4 showed the students' score and achievement in experimental class that include The Students' Scores of Experimental Class(Using Technique), Descriptive Statistic prettest.

1. The Data of Control Class

Table 4.1

The Students' Scores of Control Class

No.	Student (x)	Pre-Test	Post-Test
1	ASP	58	76
2	AR	65	66
3	APM	66	68
4	DDN	70	70
5	DM	68	70
6	DAP	67	69
7	FK	65	76
8	GF	70	71
9	HRD	67	69
10	IP	66	70
11	JEL	59	63
12	MKZ	66	68
13	MWA	70	72
14	NNR	64	67
15	NDA	71	72
16	RWA	67	68
17	RB	61	65
18	RS	61	66
19	SY	57	63
20	TR	64	70
21	VZA	70	75
22	VS	67	76
	Σ Students (x)	**Σ X**= 1439	**Σ Y**=1530

According to the result of pre-test and post-test, it shows that the lowest score in pre-test was 57 and the highest score was 71. Beside, the lowest score of post-test was 63 , the highest score was 76. The result of post-test indicated that only 4 students who passed the standard of minimum score of English Subject and the rest got fewer than 75.

a) Pretest of Control Class

Table 4.2 Descriptive Statistic Pre-test

Statistics

pretest

N	Valid	22
	Missing	0
Mean		65.40
Median		66.00
Mode		67.00
Std. Deviation		4.043
Minimum		57.00
Maximum		71.00

Based on the table 4.2 above, shows *Mean* of pre-test score 65.40. It means the mean score is low.

b) Posttest of Control Class

Table 4.3 Descriptive Statistic Post-test

Statistics

Posttest

N	Valid	22
	Missing	0
Mean		69.54
Median		69.50
Mode		70.00
Std. Deviation		3.875
Minimum		63.00
Maximum		76.00

Based on the table 4.3 above, shows *Mean* of postest score 69.54. Then, can conclude the gain of mean score between pretest and posttest was 4.14.

2. The Data of Experimental Class

Table 4.4

The Students' Scores of Experiment Class

No.	Student (x)	Pre-Test	Post-Test
1	ADS	65	75
2	ANM	67	79
3	BBN	70	81
4	BAM	67	74
5	DHP	72	76
6	DAL	66	80
7	DTI	60	73
8	DMP	76	78
9	FTU	68	75
10	HA	65	82
11	IDW	61	76
12	KRS	67	81
13	MAS	70	75
14	NSI	64	72
15	PA	60	74
16	RV	65	74
17	SFA	73	81
18	STS	70	75
19	SCY	71	78
20	TDM	67	80
21	WDA	63	74
22	WAP	68	76
23	YP	71	84
24	YNA	60	75
	Σ X(Mean)	**Σ X** = 1606	**Σ Y**=1848

In the above table showed the result of pre-test and post-test from the experiment class, it shows that the lowest score of pre-test was 60 and the highest score was 76. And after the researcher gave the treatment by using Think-Pair-Share in teaching descriptive text, the researcher gave the sudents post test.The data showed in the post test th lowest score was 72 and the highest score was 84.

a) Pretest of Experimental Class

Table 4.5 Descriptive Statistic of Pre-test

Statistics

pretest

N	Valid	24
	Missing	0
Mean		66.91
Median		67.00
Mode		67.00
Std. Deviation		4.292
Minimum		60.00
Maximum		76.00

Table 4.5 above showed *Mean* of pre-test score 62.00.

b) Posttest of Experimental Class

Table 4.6 Descriptive Statistic of Posttest

Statistics

posttest

N	Valid	24
	Missing	0
Mean		77.00
Median		76.00
Mode		75.00
Std. Deviation		3.270
Minimum		72.00
Maximum		84.00

Based on the table 4.6 above, showed *Mean* of post-test score 77.00. Then, can conclude the gain of mean score between pretest and posttest was 15.00.

Table 4.7 Group Statistic

Group Statistics

	score	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Posttest	1	22	69.55	3.876	.826
	2	24	77.00	3.270	.668

Table 4.7 shows there were two classes; it was control class and experiment class. First control class, shows N cell there are 22, *Mean* of score control class (69.55),*Standard Deviation* for control class (3.876), and standard error mean for control class (826). Mean while, in the experiment class, shows cell there are 24, *Mean* of score experiment class (77.00), *Standard Deviation* for experiment class (3.270), and *Standard Error Mean* for experiment (668).

B. Hypothesis Testing

The hypotesis testing of this study as follow:

1. If the significant level is higher than 0.05, the null hypothesis (Ho) is accepted and alternative hypothesis (Ha) is rejected. It means there is no different of mean scores of the students who are taught and the students who are no taught by using Think-Pair-Share technique.
2. If the significant value is lower than significance level (0.05%), the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted and null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected. It means that there is difference students' mean scores of who were taught and the students who were not taught by using Think-Pair-Share technique. The difference is significant.

To know whether there is any significant difference of students writing ability between the students who are taught and the students who are no taught by using video, the researcher analyzed the data by using t-test formula with helped of SPSS 16.

Table 4.8 Independent Sample Test

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
posttest	Equal variances assumed	.082	.776	-7.070	44	.000	-7.455	1.054	-9.579	-5.330
	Equal variances not assumed			-7.017	41.296	.000	-7.455	1.062	-9.599	-5.310

From the result of t-test above can conclude, that P- value (sig) is 0.000, and it is lower than 0.05 (0.000<0.05). The null hypothesis that states there is no significant difference students writing ability between the students who were taught and the students who were no taught by using Think-Pair-Share was rejected. It was found that there is significant difference of students' score between those who are taught by using Think-Pair-Share and those who are not. It means that teaching writing how to write descriptive text by using Think-Pair-Share is effective.

C. Discussion

Based on the post test result was known that the students writing of descriptive text showed difference in both control class and experimental class. The average of pre test score in controll class was 65.40 and experimental class was 67.00. Meanwhile, in average score of post test, and control class had 69.54 and experimental class had 77.00 the post test in experimental class was higher than the controll class.

Based on the above explanation, the writer concludes that using Think-Pair-Share is effective in writing descriptive text. The final calculation was testing the hypothesis. This was the main calculation to answer the problem formulation of this research that whether there is significant different between students' writing ability in descriptive text at control class without using Think-Pair-Share and students' writing ability in descriptive text at experiment class which using Think-Pair-Share. The writer used SPSS 16,the result showed that the significant level less than 0.05(0.000<0.05) means that null hypothesis (Ho) was rejected, alternative hypothesis (Ha) was accepted. It can be concluded that there was any significant different score to the students writing ability between the students who are taught and the students who are no taught by using Think-Pair-Share. This research was confirmed the previous study by using Think-Pair-Share that says if Think-Pair-Share was effective. Fahlefi (2010) Think pair share method is profitable in term of the students to be actively involved in learning activities, encourage students to communicate in English, improve students' speaking skill ability in English. According to Fatimatuzzahro' (2011) said that Think-Pair-share

an increase student's writing narrative in SMAN 1 Durenan. Another preceding Pratiwi (2011) Think-Pair-Share technique can improve the students' quality in writing descriptive texts in terms of generic structures and language features. And the last one is Listiani (2014) Think-Pair-Share can improve students' reading comprehension. According to Richard (2007) think pair share is an effective way to change the discourse pattern in a classroom. It challenges the assumption that all recitations or discussions need to be held in whole group setting, and it has built in procedures for giving students more time to think and to respond and to help each other.

Based on the explanation about the analysis of the result on the table above the research at SMPN 2 Pakel Tulungagung, it can be inference that writing descriptive text by using Think-Pair-Share is better than without Think-Pair-Share. Moreover, the students who learned writing descriptive text through Think-Pair-Share and those who are not having such a significant difference that the students writing scores taught by using Think-Pair-Share are higher than those who are not given treatment. From the research finding, it can be concluded that using Think-Pair-Share can motivate students to engage in language learning. Discussion can increase student participation and activities in the lesson by giving students the chance to voice their opinions, help students in developing a better understanding by providing an opportunity to express their thoughts, and help students to improve their communication skills Suryosubroto (2009: 168). It can be concluded that there is a significant difference in result between students' ability of SMPN 2 Pakel grade VII in learning descriptive writing using Think

Pair Share Technique and using conventional method. This is concluded that the use of Think Pair Share Technique influences the students' writing ability.

Beside the advantages, there were so many disadvantages too on processed teaching learning using Think Pair Share. Using Think Pair Share made the students very noisy, but it can be prevented by give them a punishment. Also it is a hard job because the teacher will be busy preparing the material and classroom management. It can be prevented by prepared well everything night before.