

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION**

In this chapter, the data of the research result will be presented and analyzed. The data are try-out, pre-test, and post-test result. The writer describes and analyses the data. First, is analyzing the result of try-out test. The second is analyzing the result of pre-test, treatment activities, post-test, t-test statistical, and discussion of the research findings. The writer also gave pre-test and post-test to know whether it is effective or not to use grammar translation method as a method in improving students' writing skill. The writer wanted to know whether any significant difference between the students writing skill taught with and without using grammar translation method.

#### **4.1 Finding**

##### **4.1.1 The Pre-test Analysis**

The pre-test was conducted on August 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2018 for the Control group class and on August 5<sup>th</sup>, 2018 for the Experimental group class. This pre-test was held in the first meeting and was conducted to know the initial condition of students' writing skill in English lesson. The students were asked to create a dialogue based on the situation given of written test in thirty (30) minutes.

Table 4.1 blow described the pre-test scores of the experimental group and the control group. There were 68 students in both the experimental group and control group.

**Table 4.1****Pre-Test Scores of the Experimental Group and the Control Group**

<b>Students VII B</b>	<b>Pre-test Scores of Experiment</b>	<b>Students VII A</b>	<b>Pre-test Scores of Control</b>
1	65	1	55
2	65	2	65
3	70	3	65
4	60	4	60
5	75	5	55
6	70	6	60
7	50	7	50
8	55	8	55
9	55	9	55
10	70	10	50
11	50	11	60
12	55	12	55
13	65	13	60
14	50	14	50
15	60	15	65
16	50	16	45
17	55	17	50
18	65	18	55

19	65	19	60
20	55	20	55
21	50	21	55
22	70	22	55
23	60	23	65
24	55	24	65
25	55	25	55
26	60	26	60
27	50	27	55
28	55	28	45
29	55	29	60
30	50	30	55
31	60	31	50
32	65	32	55
33	50		
34	50		
35	50	<b>SUM</b>	<b>1800</b>
36	65		
<b>SUM</b>	<b>2105</b>		
<b>Mean</b>	<b>58,47</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>56,25</b>

The above data showed the students' pre-test scores of the experimental group and the control group. The test was given to the

students in the preliminary meeting before the researcher giving any treatment. In this part, the experimental group and control group had difference of the lowest score, the medium and the highest scores. In experimental had lowest score was 50, the medium was 55, and the higher score 75. Whereas in the control group the lowest score was 45, the medium was 55, and the higher score was 65. Then, the mean score of the experimental group was 58,47; and in the control group was 56,25.

**Table 4.2**  
**The *T-test* of Pre-test Scores in the Experimental Group and the Control Group**  
**Group Statistics**

	kelompok	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
nilai	experimental	36	58,47	7,447	1,241
	control	32	56,28	5,589	,988

### 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
Equal variances assumed	5,814	,019	1,358	66	,179	2,191	1,613	-1,030	5,412
Equal variances not assumed			1,381	64,274	,172	2,191	1,586	-,978	5,360

In the calculation pre-test score using SPSS above, the  $t_{count}$  was 1,358. The df was 66, in the table statistic 66 was 1,668. If to find out the difference significance from this score between control group and experimental group, the result  $t_{count} > t_{table}$ , if the result  $t_{count} < t_{table}$  the result is there is no significance between experimental group and control group. If there is no significance, this is a good result because if there is no significance between this classes, it means that the classes are same, the classes have the same quality.

The  $t_{table}$  66 in the table t-test showed that 1,668. It means that the result from this calculation  $1,358 < 1,668$ . It means there is no significance difference between experimental group and control group. Both of them have same quality and it is good result.

#### 4.1.2 Treatment Activities

Treatment activities were conducted, after the pre-test was given to the experimental and control group class. Each group has given twice meetings. For the experimental group, the treatment was given by using puzzle in teaching and learning. For the control group, the treatment was given by using book media. The schedule of the research can be seen in the following table:

**Table 4.3**  
**The Schedule of the Research**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Experimental Group (VIIB)</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Control Group (VIA)</b>
August 27 <sup>th</sup> , 2018	Pre-test for experimental group	August 28 <sup>th</sup> , 2018	Pre-test for control group
September 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 2018	First treatment by using GTM	September, 4 <sup>th</sup> , 2018	First treatment by using Text book
September 3 <sup>rd</sup> , 2018	Second treatment by using GTM	September, 11 <sup>th</sup> , 2018	Second treatment by using Text book
September,	Pos-test for	September,	Post-test for control

10 <sup>th</sup> , 2018	experimental group	13 <sup>th</sup> , 2018	group
-------------------------	--------------------	-------------------------	-------

During the twice meetings, each group was given the some topics. In the first meeting, the topics were greeting and introduction, in the second meeting were understanding about previous material. Here is the activity of the research.

**Table 4.4**  
**The activity of the research**

Activity	Experimental Group	Control Group
Pre-test	The writer gave the pre-test one question to create a dialogue based on the situation given.	The researcher gave the pre-test one question to create a dialogue based on the situation given.
First treatment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The writer engaged students relate to the material of greeting, and introduction.</li> <li>- The writer giving the example about the dialogue of greeting and introduction.</li> <li>- Students were divided</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The teacher gave little explanation about the topics ( greeting, and introduction).</li> <li>- The teacher giving the example about the dialogue of greeting and introduction.</li> <li>- The teacher asked the</li> </ul>

	<p>into 6 groups then each group arranged the puzzle into the correct sentences and translate it in bahasa.</p>	<p>students to analyzed the dialogue in group.</p>
Second treatment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The writer reviewed the previous material.</li> <li>- The writer asked each group presented the result of their discussion in front of class.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The researcher reviewed material in previous meeting.</li> <li>- Students were asked to presents their discussion in front of the class.</li> </ul>
Post-test	<p>The writer gave the test to the students one question to create a dialogue based on the situation given. The question of post-test is same with the pre-test's questions.</p>	<p>The researcher gave the test to the students one question to create a dialogue based on the situation given. The question of post-test is same with the pre-test's questions.</p>



### 4.1.3 The Post-test Analysis

The post-test was held after the treatment given. The post-test for experimental group class was conducted on August 23, 2018 and the post-test for control group class was held on August 25, 2018. The writer used the same questions as the pre-test.

Table 4.3 below described the students post-test scores of the experimental group and the control group. There were 68 students in experimental group and control group.

**Table 4.5**  
**Post-Test Scores of the Experimental Group and the Control Group**

<b>Students VII B</b>	<b>Post-test Scores of Experiment</b>	<b>Students VII A</b>	<b>Post-test Scores of Control</b>
1	85	1	70
2	80	2	60
3	80	3	50
4	85	4	60
5	85	5	70
6	85	6	80
7	75	7	60
8	70	8	70
9	75	9	65
10	80	10	60

11	75	11	55
12	70	12	60
13	85	13	75
14	60	14	60
15	80	15	60
16	75	16	60
17	70	17	55
18	80	18	60
19	80	19	50
20	65	20	55
21	60	21	55
22	80	22	60
23	70	23	60
24	75	24	65
25	70	25	70
26	70	26	60
27	75	27	70
28	75	28	75
29	70	29	70
30	70	30	65
31	80	31	60
32	80	32	65

33	70		
34	65		
35	75	<b>SUM</b>	<b>2010</b>
36	85		
<b>SUM</b>	<b>2710</b>		
<b>Mean</b>	<b>75,278</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>62,81</b>

The above data showed the post-test scores of experimental group and control group. The post-test was given in the last meeting after the researcher gave any treatment. The data showed the lowest score of the experimental group was 60, the medium score was 75, and the highest score was 85. And in control group the lowest score was 50, the medium score was 60, and the highest score was 80. The mean score in experimental group was 75,278 and in control group was 62,81. So, from this result that experimental group had higher than the control group.

**Table 4.6**

**The *T*-test of Post-test Scores in the Experimental Group and the Control Group**

**Group Statistics**

	kelompok	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
nilai	experimental	36	75,28	6,964	1,161
	control	32	62,81	7,177	1,269

### 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
Equal variances assumed	,059	,809	7,262	66	,000	12,465	1,716	9,038	15,892
Equal variances not assumed			7,249	64,552	,000	12,465	1,720	9,031	15,900

The table above shows the result of t-test analysis of post-test both the experimental dan controlled class. The significant difference is 0,000. This result means that the significant level of 0,000 is lower than 0,05. Thus, it can be concluded that there was significance of the treatment. The statistic table shows that mean score of post-test in experimental group was 75,28 and the controlled

group was 62,81. Meanwhile the interval of the difference is between 9,038 and 15,900.

#### 4.1.4 Hypotheses Testing

In this section, the researcher described the interpretation of the research finding and summarized the hypothesis. The research was held to answer the question whether the implementation of Grammar Translation Method is effective to improve students' writing skill achievement at the seventh grade of MTs Miftahul Huda Dongos or not. In order to answer the question, the researcher writes the Alternative Hypothesis (Ha) and the Null Hypothesis (Ho) as follows :

- a. The Null Hypothesis (Ho) : There was no a significance difference in writing achievement between students who were taught by using grammar translation method and those who were not.
- b. The Alternative Hypothesis (Ha) : There was a significance difference in writing achievement between students who were taught by using grammar translation method and those who were not.

To proved the hypothesis, the data obtained in experimental group and control group were calculated by using  $t_{test}$  formula with assumption as follows :

- a. If  $t_o > t_{table}$ , the Null Hypothesis (Ho) was rejected and Alternative Hypothesis (Ha) was accepted. It was proven that Grammar Translation Method implementation was effective to improve students' writing skill.

- b. If  $t_o < t_{table}$ , the Null Hypothesis ( $H_o$ ) was accepted and Alternative Hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) was rejected. It was proven that Grammar Translation Method implementation was not effective to improve students' writing skill.

According to the analysis of the results above, there was a significant difference between the gained score in experimental and control group. The result reports that the t-test was higher than t-table ( $5.556 > 1.668$ ). It can be defined that teaching writing skill by using Grammar Translation Method was effective than teaching writing skill without Grammar Translation Method since alternative hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) was accepted and the null hypothesis ( $H_o$ ) was rejected. In other words, teaching writing skill by using Grammar Translation Method gave positive influence toward students' achievement of the seventh grade in MTs Miftahul Huda Dongos.

#### **4.2 Discussion of the Research Findings**

The study was meant to answer the problem of the research. It was to find out the effectiveness of using grammar translation method in improving students' writing skill for the seventh grade students of MTs Miftahul Huda Dongos Jepara in the Academic Year of 2018/2019. In conducting this research, the writer took two classes that is VIIA and VIIB. The Experimental group class was VIIB, it consists of 36 students and the control group class was the VIIA, it consists of 32 students. The writer gave the treatments to the experimental group by using grammar translation method. Meanwhile, the control group taught

without using grammar translation method. The average score for experimental group was 58.47 (pre-test) and 75.28 (post-test). The average score of control group class was 56.25 (pre-test) and 62.81 (post-test). The following was the table of the pre-test and post-test students' average score.

**Table 4.7**

**The pre-test and post-test students' average score of the experimental group and control group**

No.	Group	The Average percentage of Pre-test	The Average percentage of Post-test
1.	Experimental	58.47	75.28
2.	Control	56.25	62.81

From the result above, the mean score of the students' of experimental group and control group in pre-test and post-test. The writer found that the mean of each group almost have the same average score. It could be seen that there is no significance difference in their writing skill.

After conducting the treatment, the mean score of the students' of experimental group was higher than control group. The mean score of the experimental group was 75.28 and the control group was 62.81. It can be conclude that students in experimental group after getting the treatments by using grammar translation method have higher score in improving writing skill than control group who taught without using grammar translation method.

This result related to the previous study that is by Made Juliarta (2014) about “Teaching Reading Comprehension Through Grammar Translation Method At The Seveth Grade Students of SMP Widya Suara Sukawati In Academic Year 2013/2014”. Based on the findings of this study, the researcher concluded that grammar translation method could improved reading comprehension of the seventh grade students of SMP Widya Suara Sukawati. It showed that the students avarege score in pre-test was 3.88 and then the mean figure improved to 5.72 in terms of level of mastery.

Another result of the computation shows that the result of t-test is the score of  $t_{count}$  was 5,556. By using degree of freedom 5%, the value 66 (the degree of significance) as stated in the t-table was 1,668. It means that the result from this calculation  $t_{test} > t_{table}$ . The conclusion is there is a significance difference between the students in improving students’ writing skill. Therefore, the hypothesis stating that “Grammar Translation Method is effective in improving students’ writing skill at the seventh grade students of MTs Miftahul Huda Dongos Jepara” is accepted.