

CHAPTER IV

FINDING RESEARCH AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, discuss about research finding and discussion.

4.1 Finding

The writer has done the research and got the complete data from the research instrument test. To gain the objectives of the research the writer has analyze the data accurately. The data was analyzed in order to draw conclusion about the objective of the study.

4.1.1 The Validity of Tryout Test

Table 4.1

| | | | |
|------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Tabulation 2 x 2 | | Rater 1 | |
| | | Less relevant score 1-2 | Very relevant score 3-4 |
| Rater 2 | Less relevant score 1-2 | A | B |
| | Very relevant score 3-4 | C | D |

Formula :

$$Vi = \frac{D}{A+B+C+D}$$

Where,

Vi = Construct validity

A = Both rater disagree

B = Rater 1 agree, rater 2 disagree

C = Rater 1 disagree, rater 2 agree

D = Both rater agree

$$Vi = \frac{D}{A+B+C+D}$$

$$Vi = \frac{4}{0+0+3+3}$$

$$Vi = \frac{4}{6} = 0,6$$

Criteria of content validity :

0,8 – 1 = Very high validity

0,6 – 0,79 = High validity

0,40 – 0,59 = Medium validity

0,20 – 0,39 = Low validity

0,00 – 0,19 = Very low validity

Based on the description from the presented calculation above that the result of trying out test validity was 0,6. It means that the validity trying out test has a high validity.

4.1.2 Pre-test Score of Experiment and Control Group

Table 4.2

| Experimental Class | | | Control Class | | |
|--------------------|----------|-------|---------------|----------|-------|
| No | Students | Score | No | Students | Score |
| 1 | BC-1 | 40 | 1 | BC-1 | 50 |
| 2 | BC-2 | 38 | 2 | BC-2 | 50 |
| 3 | BC-3 | 48 | 3 | BC-3 | 40 |
| 4 | BC-4 | 60 | 4 | BC-4 | 40 |
| 5 | BC-5 | 38 | 5 | BC-5 | 47 |
| 6 | BC-6 | 58 | 6 | BC-6 | 25 |
| 7 | BC-7 | 42 | 7 | BC-7 | 50 |
| 8 | BC-8 | 38 | 8 | BC-8 | 40 |
| 9 | BC-9 | 60 | 9 | BC-9 | 25 |
| 10 | BC-10 | 42 | 10 | BC-10 | 30 |
| 11 | BC-11 | 45 | 11 | BC-11 | 38 |
| 12 | BC-12 | 42 | 12 | BC-12 | 55 |
| 13 | BC-13 | 60 | 13 | BC-13 | 40 |
| 14 | BC-14 | 30 | 14 | BC-14 | 33 |
| 15 | BC-15 | 38 | 15 | BC-15 | 50 |
| 16 | BC-16 | 42 | 16 | BC-16 | 30 |
| 17 | BC-17 | 36 | 17 | BC-17 | 30 |
| 18 | BC-18 | 42 | 18 | BC-18 | 25 |

| | | | | | |
|----|----------|-------|----|----------|-------|
| 19 | BC-19 | 48 | 19 | BC-19 | 30 |
| 20 | BC-20 | 38 | 20 | BC-20 | 25 |
| 21 | BC-21 | 48 | 21 | BC-21 | 30 |
| 22 | BC-22 | 38 | 22 | BC-22 | 38 |
| 23 | BC-23 | 34 | 23 | BC-23 | 30 |
| 24 | BC-24 | 38 | 24 | BC-24 | 40 |
| 25 | BC-25 | 30 | 25 | BC-25 | 30 |
| 26 | BC-26 | 38 | 26 | BC-26 | 25 |
| 27 | BC-27 | 45 | 27 | BC-27 | 25 |
| 28 | BC-28 | 48 | 28 | BC-28 | 30 |
| 29 | BC-29 | 52 | 29 | BC-29 | 50 |
| 30 | BC-30 | 32 | 30 | BC-30 | 50 |
| 31 | BC-31 | 32 | 31 | BC-31 | 55 |
| | Σ | 1320 | | Σ | 1101 |
| | Mean | 42,58 | | Mean | 36,70 |

The description from the table above presented the pre-test score of experimental and control group. In experimental class, the highest pre-test score is 60 while the lowest pre-test score is 30. On the other hand, in the control class, the highest score is 50 while the lowest pre-test score is 25. Moreover, in the experimental class, the average score or means is 43,19. On the other hand, in the control class, the average score or mean is 37,32.

Based on the result of pretest from the students' pre-test score mean it can be assumed that students from the experimental class performed better than students from the control class in the pre-test. This assumption was tested using t-test in the next section.

The T-test of Pre-test score of experiment and control group

Table 4.3

Group Statistics

| | Class | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|-------|---------|----|---------|----------------|-----------------|
| Score | 1,00 | 31 | 42,5806 | 8,56261 | 1,53789 |
| | Control | 31 | 37,2903 | 10,12980 | 1,81937 |

Table 4.4

Independent Samples Test

| | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
|---|---|------|------------------------------|------------|------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|---|--------------|
| | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2- tailed) | Mean Differ- ence | Std. Error Differ- ence | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| | | | | | | | | Lower | Upper |
| ex Equal pe variances rim assumed | 2,778 | ,101 | 2,22 1 | 60 | ,030 | 5,2903 2 | 2,3822 7 | ,52508 | 10,055 57 |
| ent Equal variances not assumed | | | 2,22 1 | 58,3 81 | ,030 | 5,2903 2 | 2,3822 7 | ,52236 | 10,058 29 |

In this calculation pre-test score using SPSS above, the t_{count} 2,221 and the df was 60. To find out the different significant from this score between control group and experimental group, $t_{count} < t_{table}$ the result is there is significance between experimental group and control group. The t test showed that 2,660. It means that the result from this calculation $2,221 < 2,660$ there is no significant between experimental group and control group because the t_{count} is lower between t_{table} .

4.1.3 Post-test Score of Experimental and Control group

Table 4.5

| Experimental Class | | | Control Class | | |
|--------------------|----------|-------|---------------|----------|-------|
| No | Students | Score | No | Students | Score |
| 1 | BC-1 | 88 | 1 | BC-1 | 60 |
| 2 | BC-2 | 85 | 2 | BC-2 | 60 |
| 3 | BC-3 | 92 | 3 | BC-3 | 50 |
| 4 | BC-4 | 95 | 4 | BC-4 | 50 |
| 5 | BC-5 | 92 | 5 | BC-5 | 55 |
| 6 | BC-6 | 92 | 6 | BC-6 | 50 |
| 7 | BC-7 | 92 | 7 | BC-7 | 60 |
| 8 | BC-8 | 92 | 8 | BC-8 | 55 |
| 9 | BC-9 | 88 | 9 | BC-9 | 40 |
| 10 | BC-10 | 88 | 10 | BC-10 | 58 |

| | | | | | |
|----------|-------|-------|----------|-------|-------|
| 11 | BC-11 | 92 | 11 | BC-11 | 53 |
| 12 | BC-12 | 92 | 12 | BC-12 | 60 |
| 13 | BC-13 | 95 | 13 | BC-13 | 50 |
| 14 | BC-14 | 88 | 14 | BC-14 | 50 |
| 15 | BC-15 | 92 | 15 | BC-15 | 60 |
| 16 | BC-16 | 92 | 16 | BC-16 | 48 |
| 17 | BC-17 | 88 | 17 | BC-17 | 48 |
| 18 | BC-18 | 88 | 18 | BC-18 | 55 |
| 19 | BC-19 | 88 | 19 | BC-19 | 50 |
| 20 | BC-20 | 92 | 20 | BC-20 | 50 |
| 21 | BC-21 | 88 | 21 | BC-21 | 60 |
| 22 | BC-22 | 90 | 22 | BC-22 | 50 |
| 23 | BC-23 | 90 | 23 | BC-23 | 52 |
| 24 | BC-24 | 88 | 24 | BC-24 | 57 |
| 25 | BC-25 | 85 | 25 | BC-25 | 55 |
| 26 | BC-26 | 88 | 26 | BC-26 | 50 |
| 27 | BC-27 | 92 | 27 | BC-27 | 45 |
| 28 | BC-28 | 88 | 28 | BC-28 | 52 |
| 29 | BC-29 | 92 | 29 | BC-29 | 60 |
| 30 | BC-30 | 95 | 30 | BC-30 | 60 |
| 31 | BC-31 | 85 | 31 | BC-31 | 60 |
| Σ | | 2792 | Σ | | 1603 |
| Mean | | 90,64 | Mean | | 53,64 |

The description from the table above presented the post-test score of experimental and control group. In experimental class, that taught by using treatment project-based learning method get the highest post-test score is 95 while the lowest post-test score is 85. On the other hand, in the control class that taught without project –based learning method get the highest score is 60 while the lowest pre-test score is 45. Moreover, in the experimental class, the average score or means is 90,64. On the other hand, in the control class, the average score or mean is 53,64. Based on the description above, it can be conclude that there was a good effect by using project-based learning method in writing descriptive text.

The T-test of Post-test score of experiment and control group

Table 4.6

Group Statistics

| | Control | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|------------|---------|----|---------|----------------|-----------------|
| Experiment | 1,00 | 31 | 89,8387 | 3,05611 | ,54889 |
| Control | 2,00 | 31 | 53,6452 | 5,32634 | ,95664 |

Table 4.7

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 | |
| Experiment Equal variances assumed | 12,889 | ,001 | 32,816 | 60 | ,000 | 36,19355 | 1,10292 | 33,98737 | 38,39972 | |
| Experiment Equal variances not assumed | | | 32,816 | 47,821 | ,000 | 36,19355 | 1,10292 | 33,97576 | 38,41134 | |

From the calculation, using SPSS above, T_{count} is 32816. The df was 60, in the table t test showed is 2660. To know the significance between experimental group and control group the t_{count} should > from t_{table} .

So, from this calculation showed that $32816 > 2660$, it means that the result there is significant difference between experimental group and control group in post test score. From this result that there is significance between students writing skills of descriptive text taught using project-based learning method and without project-based learning method.

4.2 Testing of the Hypothesis

The research was held to answer the question whether project-based learning method has any effect on students' ability in writing descriptive text on eighth grade students of MTsN 1 Jepara. In order to provide for the

question above, the Alternative Hypothesis (H_a) and Null Hypothesis (H_0) were proposed as follows:

- a. H_0 (Null Hypothesis): Project-based learning method has no significant effectiveness in learning writing of descriptive text.
- b. H_a (Alternative Hypothesis): Project-based learning method has significance effectiveness in learning writing of descriptive text.

To prove the hypothesis above, the obtained data from experimental class and control class were calculated by using t -test formula with assumption as follows:

- a. If $T_o \leq t_{table}$, in significance degree 1%, the Null Hypothesis (H_0) is accepted and the Hypothesis Alternative (H_a) is rejected. It mean that there is a significant effect of project-based learning method on the students writing of descriptive text ability.
- b. If $T_o \geq t_{table}$ in significance degree 1%, the Null Hypothesis (H_0) is rejected and the Hypothesis Alternative (H_a) is accepted. It mean that there is a significant effect of project-based learning method on the students writing of descriptive text ability.

According to the statistic calculation above, the value of T_o is 0.101 and the degree of freedom is 60 with 1% degree of significance is used by the writer. Based on the significance the value of t_{table} 2.390. by comparing the result of t_{table} and t_o , in the degree of significance of 1%, it can be seen that $t_o < t_{table}$ ($0.101 < 2.376$). According to those result, a conclusion can be drawn that the H_0 was accepted meanwhile the H_a was rejected.

4.2 Discussion

The result of this study generally means show that there is effectiveness of using project-based learning method in writing descriptive text. It can be proved from the result of experimental and control group score. Before the students of experimental and control group got the treatment the researcher were gave pre-test to know and assessing the students writing skills. The students' score from the experimental class were different from those who were in the control class. The result in pre test the lowest score is 45 in experimental group, and 25 in control group. The mean is 42,58 in experimental group, and 36,70 in control group. The lowest score pot-test in post-test experimental is 85, while in control class is 45. The mean score of the both classes are also different. The result of analysis shows that the mean score of the experimental class who were taught by using project-based learning method is 90,64 it is higher than control class who are taught without project-based learning method the mean is 53,43. Its mean that the students who are taught by using project-based learning method have better achievement than those who were taught without project-based learning method.

Based on the researcher method, the study is done in three steps, first steps is preliminary's day study where the researcher wants to know the students' ability in writing skill by administering a pre test. The second step is giving treatment to the students, this treatment given to the experimental group only. The treatment here is teaching writing by using project-based learning method. To apply this method, the researcher divides the class into group. One group consist 6 persons. And then the teacher explain about descriptive text material, including the purpose of the text, language features and generic structure. The teacher shows sample project as a media and the teacher give a guiding questions. In the order hand, in the control group get a conventional treatment or the teacher just give a simple explanation about the material. And the last is teacher gave a post test in experimental group the teacher gives a topic to each group that must be done as a project to

create descriptive text. After this the students designing project, planning observe and describe the project with their group and make individually text. In control group the teacher only gave a topic to students and write the topic into descriptive text.

As it was previously and stated that the T-test is used to check significant different score achievement. The data analysis shows that t_{count} bigger than t_{table} ($0,32816 > 0,2660$). It means that the alternative hypothesis (H_a) is accepted and null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected. It shows that significant different score of the students before and after being taught by using project-based learning class method and without using project-based learning method. Based on the result above, teaching writing descriptive text by using project-based learning method is effective and makes the students enjoyable, more active, and easy to understand the material especially in a text.

Based on the result of analysis shows that the mean score of class that taught by using project based learning method is 19,42 it is higher than class who are taught without project-based learning method the mean is 14,82. (Larasati,2015) state that project-based learning method is effective and can enhance students writing skills.