# CHAPTER IV

# FINDING AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the research finding and discussion. The focuses the data in order to answer the research questions.

## A. Findings

In data analysis, the writer shows the students result in pre-test and post-test. It was intended to know the general description of the students' achievement in writing descriptive text before and after giving treatment. In other words, the writer wants to found out whether the students' skill in writing descriptive text was low or high. In this case, the writer classified the students' score.

There were two kinds of groups, the first was the experimental class and the second was the control class. The different treatment was applied to the two classes, the experimental class was taught through using picture strip story in teaching writing descriptive text, and the control class was taught through the teacher's usual method (inquiry strategy) in teaching writing descriptive text. Both of them were taught the same materials in the same month. At the end of treatment, the experimental class and the control class received a post-test, and the result of the two tests compared to find the significant differences between the experimental class and the control class.

In collecting data, the writer has given the students pre-test and post-test in both of the group, which consist of 4 sequence pictures. The test was done two times, the pre-test was given before the treatment and post-test were given after the treatment. The pre-test was given to know how far the students' skill in writing descriptive test up to know and the post-test was given to the students after treatment

to check the students' improvement. The writer wanted to know whether the students' skill in writing descriptive text constructed after given treatment.

1. The learning result on Pre-test.

**Table 4.1 Writing test result in Pre-test**

| No | Pre-test | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Content | Organization | Vocabulary | Language use | Mechanic | |
| 1. | 13 | 7 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 35 |
| 2. | 14 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 2 | 35 |
| 3. | 13 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 3 | 39 |
| 4. | 14 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 2 | 38 |
| 5. | 13 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 2 | 37 |
| 6. | 13 | 7 | 8 | 6 | 2 | 36 |
| 7. | 14 | 9 | 7 | 6 | 2 | 38 |
| 8. | 13 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 2 | 37 |
| 9. | 13 | 8 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 35 |
| 10. | 15 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 3 | 41 |
| 11. | 14 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 2 | 38 |
| 12. | 13 | 8 | 9 | 7 | 3 | 40 |
| 13. | 14 | 7 | 9 | 6 | 3 | 39 |
| 14. | 13 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 36 |
| 15. | 14 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 3 | 39 |
| 16. | 13 | 7 | 8 | 6 | 3 | 36 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 17. | 14 | 7 | 8 | 6 | 2 | 37 |
| 18. | 13 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 2 | 35 |
| 19. | 13 | 7 | 8 | 6 | 2 | 36 |
| 20. | 13 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 2 | 38 |
| **Total** | | | | | | **745** |

**Table 4.2 Students score classification of Pre-test**

| NUMBER OF STUDENTS | SCORES | | CLASIFICATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| | X1 | $X1^2$ | |
| Students 1 | 35 | 1225 | Very poor |
| Students 2 | 35 | 1225 | Very poor |
| Students 3 | 39 | 1521 | Very poor |
| Students 4 | 38 | 1444 | Very poor |
| Students 5 | 37 | 1369 | Very poor |
| Students 6 | 36 | 1296 | Very poor |
| Students 7 | 38 | 1444 | Very poor |
| Students 8 | 37 | 1369 | Very poor |
| Students 9 | 35 | 1225 | Very poor |
| Students 10 | 41 | 1681 | Poor |
| Students 11 | 38 | 1444 | Very poor |
| Students 12 | 40 | 1600 | Poor |
| Students 13 | 39 | 1521 | Very poor |
| Students 14 | 36 | 1296 | Very poor |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Students 15 | 39 | 1521 | Very poor |
| Students 16 | 36 | 1296 | Very poor |
| Students 17 | 37 | 1369 | Very poor |
| Students 18 | 35 | 1225 | Very poor |
| Students 19 | 36 | 1296 | Very poor |
| Students 20 | 38 | 1444 | Very poor |
| **Total** | **745** | **27811** | |

As illustrated 4.2, the result of student writing showed that no one student classified into very good score and also no one student classified into good score classification. Most of students were classified into very poor classification, there were eighteen students that classified into very poor classification. For fair classification there no one student classified into the classification. Another two students into poor classification from twenty students. Total scores in pre-test was 745. The following are the process of calculation to find out the mean score and the standard deviation based on the calculation of students score in pre-test.

2. The percentages and mean Score of pre-test

1. Percentage of student score:

$$\% = \frac{F}{N} \times 100$$

$$\% = \frac{37}{20} \times 100 = 31.85$$

2. Mean of students score:

$$\bar{X} = \frac{\sum x}{N}$$

$$\bar{X} = \frac{27811}{20} = 1.4$$

Based on result of pre-test the data showed that the mean score of pre-test was 1.4. It means that the students writing skill still low because most of the students gained poor score.

3. Standard deviation of pre-test

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{\sum x^2 - (\frac{\sum X}{N})^2}{N-1}}$$

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{27811 - (\frac{745}{20})}{20-1}}$$

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{27811 - (\frac{555025}{20})}{19}}$$

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{27811 - 27751}{19}}$$

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{60}{19}}$$

$$SD = \sqrt{315}$$

SD = 1.77

Students writing skill was classified into low category as showed of students writing test result in pre-test which the mean score of students in pre-test was 1.4 and standard deviation of students was 1.77.

1. The learning result on Post-test.

**Table 4.3 Writing test result in post-test**

| No | Post-test | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Content | Organization | Vocabulary | Language use | Mechanic | |
| 1. | 20 | 13 | 14 | 16 | 3 | 66 |
| 2. | 21 | 12 | 13 | 15 | 4 | 65 |
| 3. | 22 | 12 | 13 | 15 | 3 | 65 |
| 4. | 20 | 12 | 14 | 16 | 4 | 66 |
| 5. | 21 | 12 | 13 | 15 | 3 | 64 |
| 6. | 21 | 12 | 13 | 15 | 3 | 64 |
| 7. | 21 | 13 | 13 | 15 | 4 | 66 |
| 8. | 20 | 12 | 13 | 16 | 3 | 64 |
| 9. | 21 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 4 | 67 |
| 10. | 22 | 12 | 15 | 16 | 4 | 69 |
| 11. | 21 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 3 | 66 |
| 12. | 21 | 16 | 15 | 17 | 4 | 73 |
| 13. | 20 | 15 | 15 | 16 | 3 | 69 |
| 14. | 21 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 4 | 67 |
| 15. | 20 | 12 | 14 | 13 | 3 | 62 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 16. | 21 | 13 | 13 | 15 | 4 | 66 |
| 17. | 21 | 14 | 13 | 15 | 4 | 67 |
| 18. | 22 | 15 | 15 | 14 | 3 | 69 |
| 19. | 22 | 13 | 16 | 14 | 4 | 69 |
| 20. | 21 | 15 | 16 | 16 | 4 | 72 |
| **Total** | | | | | | **1336** |

**Table 4.4 Students score classification of Post-test**

| NUMBER OF STUDENTS | SCORES | | CLASIFICATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| | X2 | $X2^2$ | |
| Students 1 | 66 | 4356 | Good |
| Students 2 | 65 | 4225 | Fair |
| Students 3 | 65 | 4225 | Fair |
| Students 4 | 66 | 4356 | Good |
| Students 5 | 64 | 4096 | Fair |
| Students 6 | 64 | 4096 | fair |
| Students 7 | 66 | 4356 | Good |
| Students 8 | 64 | 4096 | Fair |
| Students 9 | 67 | 4489 | Good |
| Students 10 | 69 | 4761 | Good |
| Students 11 | 66 | 4356 | Good |
| Students 12 | 73 | 5329 | Good |
| Students 13 | 69 | 4761 | Good |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Students 14 | 67 | 4489 | Good |
| Students 15 | 62 | 3844 | Fair |
| Students 16 | 66 | 4356 | Good |
| Students 17 | 67 | 4489 | Good |
| Students 18 | 69 | 4761 | Good |
| Students 19 | 69 | 4761 | Good |
| Students 20 | 72 | 5184 | Good |
| **Total** | **1336** | **89386** | |

As illustrated 4.4, the result of student writing showed that there were student classified into good score and also there were fourteen students classified into good score classification. Most of students were classified into good classification. No one students that classified into very poor classification. For fair classification there six student classified into the classification and also no one students classified into poor classification from twenty students. Total scores in post-test was 1336. The following are the process of calculation to find out the mean score and the standard deviation based on the calculation of students score in Post-test.

2. The percentages and mean Score of post-test

a) Percentage of student score:

$$\% = \frac{F}{N} \times 100$$

$$\% = \frac{1336}{20} \times 100 = 66.8$$

b) Mean of students score:

$$\bar{X} = \frac{\sum x}{N}$$

$$\bar{X} = \frac{89386}{20} = 45.3$$

Based on result of Post-test the data showed that the mean score of Post-test was 45.3. It means that the students writing skill improved because most of the students gained good score.

3. Standard deviation of Post-test

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{\sum x^2 - (\frac{\sum X}{N})\,2}{N-1}}$$

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{89386 - (\frac{1336}{20})}{20-1}}$$

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{89386 - (\frac{1784896}{20})}{19}}$$

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{89386 - 89244.8}{19}}$$

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{141.2}{19}}$$

$$SD = \sqrt{7.43}$$

SD = 2.72

Students writing skill was improve after implementation of Genre approach. As showed of students writing test result in post-test most of students classified into good score classification which the mean score of students in post-test was 45.3 and standard deviation of students was 2.72

1. **The result of Pre-test and Post-test**

**Table 4.5 The mean score and standard deviation of pre-test and post-test**

| Test | Mean Score | Standard Deviation (SD) |
|---|---|---|
| Pre-test | 1.4 | 1.77 |
| Post-test | 45.3 | 2.72 |

The data in table 4.5 indicates that there was improvement while doing pre-test and post-test. Mean score of pre-test as 1.4 and mean score of post-test was increased become 45.3. Moreover for standard deviation which pre-test was 1.77 while post-test standard deviation was increases become 2.72. As illustrated in table 4.5 the mean score of post-test was greater than mean score of pre-test. It means that students writing skill was improve by Genre approach.

2. **The result of data analysis**

**Table 4.6 T-test value of pre-test and post-test**

| NO | X1 | X2 | $(X1)^2$ | $(X2)^2$ | D(X2-X1) | $(X2-X1)^2$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 35 | 66 | 1225 | 4356 | 31 | 961 |
| 2 | 35 | 65 | 1225 | 4225 | 30 | 900 |
| 3 | 39 | 65 | 1521 | 4225 | 26 | 676 |
| 4 | 38 | 66 | 1444 | 4356 | 28 | 784 |
| 5 | 37 | 64 | 1369 | 4096 | 27 | 729 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6 | 36 | 64 | 1296 | 4096 | 28 | 784 |
| 7 | 38 | 66 | 1444 | 4356 | 28 | 784 |
| 8 | 37 | 64 | 1369 | 4096 | 27 | 729 |
| 9 | 35 | 67 | 1225 | 4489 | 32 | 1024 |
| 10 | 41 | 69 | 1681 | 4761 | 28 | 784 |
| 11 | 38 | 66 | 1444 | 4356 | 28 | 784 |
| 12 | 40 | 73 | 1600 | 5329 | 33 | 1089 |
| 13 | 39 | 69 | 1521 | 4761 | 30 | 900 |
| 14 | 36 | 67 | 1296 | 4489 | 31 | 961 |
| 15 | 39 | 62 | 1521 | 3844 | 23 | 529 |
| 16 | 36 | 66 | 1296 | 4356 | 30 | 900 |
| 17 | 37 | 67 | 1369 | 4489 | 30 | 900 |
| 18 | 35 | 69 | 1225 | 4761 | 34 | 1156 |
| 19 | 36 | 69 | 1296 | 4761 | 33 | 1089 |
| 20 | 38 | 72 | 1444 | 5184 | 34 | 1156 |
| TOTAL | **745** | **1336** | **27811** | **89386** | **591** | **17619** |

$D = \frac{\sum D}{N} = \frac{591}{20} = 29.55$

The calculation of t-test value

$$t = \frac{D}{\sqrt{\frac{\sum D^2 - \frac{(\sum D)^2}{N}}{N(N-1)}}}$$

$$t = \frac{29.55}{\sqrt{\frac{17619 - \frac{591^2}{20}}{20(20-1)}}}$$

$$t = \frac{29.55}{}$$

$$t = \frac{\frac{\sum 17619 - \frac{349281}{20}}{20(19)}}{\frac{29.55}{\frac{\sum 17619 - 17464.05}{380}}}$$

$$t = \frac{29.55}{\frac{154.95}{380}}$$

$$t = \frac{29.55}{\sqrt{0.40}}$$

$$t = \frac{29.55}{0.63} = 46.9$$

**Table 4.7 The test of significant**

| Variable | T-test | T-table value |
|---|---|---|
| Pre-test and Post-test | 46.9 | 1.725 |

The table 4.7 showed that the value of t-test was greater than t-table. It indicated that there was difference between the result of students pre-test and post-test but not too significance. There were some reason that influence this case like the lack of meeting time during the research. In addition, because this approach is used by students at the school so that it affects the results of this study. In addition to these two things, the level of understanding of each student also influences because this research was carried out not through face-to-face cause of this Covid-19 pandemic the making this research approach genre less optimal.

### 4.1.5 Hypothesis Testing

To find out a degree of freedom (df) the researcher used the following formula:

Df = N-1

= 20-1

= 19

For the level, significant (α) 5% and df = 20 and the value of t-table was 1.725 while the value of t-test was 46.9. It means that t-test was greater than t-table (46.9 ≥ 1.725). It can be concluded that the use of Genre approach not able to improved writing skill of the student after given the treatment. As stated in hypothesis, the alternative hypothesis (Ho) as rejected and the null hypothesis (Ha) was accepted.

### A. Discussion

After seeing the test finding, from the data provided in classification table based on the aspects of writing, clearly to see that in the pre-test no one student who got very good score, two (10%) students got poor score, no one students got fair score, no one students got good score, and eighteen (90%) students got very poor score. Whereas in the post-test, no one student got poor score, six (30%) students got fair score, fourteen (70%) students got good score, no one student who got very good and very poor score. From the result, the researcher concluded that the students' writing process genre increased from poor to fair, as well as good classification. And to increase writing students I give some test. For examples I tell them to write descriptive text after they choose the topic that I have prepared before. In addition, the mean score of pre-test was and the mean score of post-test was. As conclusion, the mean score of post-test (45.3) was greater than pre-test (1.4). Even, for the level

significant (p) 0.25 and df = 19, and the value of table was 1,725 while the value of the t-test is 4.96. It means that t-test was greater than t-table (46.9 ≥ 1.725). It can be concluded that the use of Genre approach not able to improved writing skill of the student after given the treatment. As stated in hypothesis, the alternative hypothesis (Ho) as rejected and the null hypothesis (Ha) was accepted. Based on the findings above, the researcher concluded that there was an increasing of students' writing descriptive text by using process genre approach at the first year students of SMAN 4 Parepare.

The researcher used process genre approach as a media in giving treatment in the class. Before giving treatment, the researcher gave the pre-test to know the students initial in writing descriptive text. After doing the pre-test, the treatment was given. The treatment gave in four times. During the treatment, the researcher gave support and it was adapted with the students' performance at the first year students of SMAN 4 Parepare. After the treatment, the researcher gave the post-test to measure the increasing of the students' writing descriptive text after doing the teaching and learning process. The result of this research had been describe above. Based on the result, the researcher could concluded that process genre approach as media had a good impact and could increase students' writing in Descriptive Text. It could be seen from the result of the pre-test and post-test that after using students' personal experience in giving treatment, the students could be more independent in writing a narrative text. It proved by the students' score in post-test which higher than students score in post-test.