

## CHAPTER IV

### FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presented the findings of the research and the discussion of the research. In the finding research, the researcher showed all of the data which were collected during the research. While in the discussion item, the researcher analyzed all of the data in finding item.

#### 4.1 Research Findings

In this chapter, the writer discussed about the result of the study, they were the result of pretest and posttest that were conducted in both experimental group and control group. The data collected from two classes of tenth grade students of SMA N 1 Kembang Jepara in the academic year of 2020/2021, which has 30 students, 15 students as the experimental group, and 15 students as the control group.

The writer analysed the data from the result of the tests, there were pretest and posttest. Pretest is given in the beginning of the lesson before the writer do the treatment. While the posttest is given after the writer do the treatment to know the students' improvement. Beside that, there were validity of Try-out Test, the significant differences between the score of pre-test and post-test and the hypothesis testing of the Independent sample T-test. The finding was described as follows:

#### 4.1.1 The Validity of Try-out Test

The writer used validity content to provide students with valid instrument evidence. According to Brink & Wood (2008:272), content validity is the judgment/qualification stage, which involves selecting experts to evaluate the content validity of each item and of the total scale. It means that the quality of the content is dependent on the material and that the information is consistent with the learning objectives. In other hand, the content validity is based on syllabus. The writer used the school English syllabus as the main achievement. The writer consult to the English teacher on the validity of the tool in which the students would be given the test. In this case, the writer conduct it to the expert. The experts here were the English Teachers of SMA N 1 KEMBANG.

**Tabel 4.1**

**Format validity content**

No	Aspect	Expert 1		Expert 2	
		Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree
1.	Material of question according to indicator. (required a written test for a description form)	√		√	
2.	The material in question according to competence	√		√	
3.	The contents of the material in question appropriate for the level of students or grade level	√		√	
4.	Use a question word or command that requires an answer to described	√		√	

5.	There are clear instructions on how to do the question	√		√	
6.	There are score guidelines	√		√	
7.	Use communicative sentences	√		√	
8.	The item of question using standard of English Language	√		√	
9.	Not using words/phrases that give multiple interpretations or misunderstandings.	√		√	

In this research used content validity. The test was tested to two experts ( English teacher of SMA N 1 Kembang) before being tested to the students. So, based on the table above, the result of the test validation showed that the experts agreed with all the aspects that had teated. So, it could be concluded that the instrument of this research was valid. So the instrument could use to pre-test and post-test.

#### 4.2 Pre Test Score

In this part, the researcher showed the data of pre-test score of experimental class and control class. There were 15 students in experimental class and 15 students in the control class.

**Table 4.2 Pretest Score of Experimental Class**

No	Name	Score
1	Jovita Janessa	53
2	Maya Widya	60

3	Risa Widiyanti	73
4	Selly Ananda	33
5	Laras Ayu	60
6	Muhamad Firnanda	60
7	Intan Berliana Putri	73
8	Bayu Aminur Rohman	40
9	Noval Adi Saputra	66
10	Isnanda Asa	73
11	Anggun T	80
12	Farid Abdur Rohman	53
13	Defi Kurniawati	60
14	Lia Tri A	46
15	Nestia Ayu	61

**Table 4.3 Pretest Score of Control Class**

No	Name	Score
1	Nelly Pransisca	60
2	Omega Putri	40
3	Adinda Rahmawati	33
4	Fathkis Aumil A	52
5	Herlina Puspita Sari	40
6	Mita Suci	70
7	Firliyan Agil Pamungkas	60
8	Rifkiyan Dimas Ardi Savana	55

9	Riski Anton	53
10	Khoirul Faizin Prayoga	48
11	Farhan	66
12	Silvy Adella Puspitasari	70
13	Dian Intan	55
14	Intan Famalin	40
15	Danita Amala	55

Based on the table of pre-test above, we can see that in experimental class, the highest score was 80 while the lowest score was 33. Besides, in the control class the highest pre-test score was 70 and the lowest pre-test score was 33. Moreover, the average score or means of experimental class was 59,4. Then, the means score of control class was 53,1.

From the students' pre-test mean score it can be assumed that students from the experimental class performed better than students' from control class in the pre-test, but the assumption is not sure significant yet before it is tested by using normality test, homogeneity test and t-test.

**Table 4.4 Normality Testing in Pre-Test**

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Hasil Pre test experimental group	.118	30	.200*	.963	30	.370
Hasil Pretest control group	.139	32	.122	.994	32	.097

\*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Based on the output from SPSS above is known that the significance value from two classes pre-test were 0,370 ( $0,370 > 0,05$ ) in experimental class and 0,097 ( $0,097 > 0,05$ ) in control class. The calculation showed that the both of significant score was bigger than 0,05. It assumed that the both of students' score in pretest was normal distribution. It meant that  $H_0$  is accepted and  $H_a$  is rejected and the data was in normal distribution.

**Table 4.5 Homogeneity Testing Pretest**

To know the homogeneity, the researcher used *One Way Anova* test with SPSS 23. The result can be seen below :

Test of Homogeneity of Variances			
Hasil Test			
Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
.085	1	28	.772

The variances of two classes will be told based on this decision.

If significant score (Sig.)  $> 0,05$  = homogeny

If significant score (Sig.)  $< 0,05$  = not homogeny

Based on the table above, it was known that the output from pretest of homogeneity of variance showed that the Sig  $0,772 > 0,05$  ( $\alpha = 5\% = 0,05$ ). It meant that  $H_0$  was accepted and the students' score in pretest was homogenous.

**Table 4.6 Independent Sample T-Test of Pretest**

Group Statistics					
	hasil	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
nilai	Experi mental	15	59.40	12.988	3.353
	control	15	53.13	11.307	2.919

## 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
nilai Equal variances assumed	.085	.772	1.409	28	.170	6.267	4.446	-2.841	15.374
Equal variances not assumed			1.409	27.479	.170	6.267	4.446	-2.849	15.382

The table above described the Independent t-test analysis using SPSS 23.0 of students' pre-test score in the experimental class and the control class. The table showed the mean score of experimental class was 59,4 and the mean score of control class was 53,13. The standar deviation of experimental class was 12,988 and the standard deviation of control class was 11,307. It was known from the mean score both of the class, the experimental class was higher than the control class. In this calculation of pre-test score in the experimental class and control class, the Sig. (2-tailed) was 0,170 was bigger than the level of significance 0,05 ( $0,170 > 0,05$ ). It was indicated that there was no significant difference between students' score pretest in experimental class which taught using Round Robin Technique through Realia and without using Round Robin Technique through Realia in control class. In other words, the result of the pretest of the students' score was weak. It concluded that  $H_0$  was accepted and  $H_a$  was rejected. So the Hypothesis of this research was rejected.

### 4.3 Post-Test Score

In this part, the researcher showed the data of post-test score of experimental class and control class after got treatment . There were 15 students in experimental class and 15 students in the control class.

**Table 4.7 Post test Score of Experimental Class**

No	Name	Score
1	Jovita Janessa	86
2	Maya Widya	80
3	Risa Widiyanti	73
4	Selly Ananda	80
5	Laras Ayu	93
6	Muhamad Firnanda	86
7	Intan Berliana Putri	84
8	Bayu Aminur Rohman	93
9	Noval Adi Saputra	66
10	Isnanda Asa	86
11	Anggun T	73
12	Farid Abdur Rohman	93
13	Defi Kurniawati	80
14	Lia Tri A	73
15	Nestia Ayu	73



**Table 4.8 Posttest Score of Control Class**

No	Name	Score
1	Nelly Pransisca	70
2	Omega Putri	66
3	Adinda Rahmawati	73
4	Fathkis Aumil A	60
5	Herlina Puspita Sari	60
6	Mita Suci	66
7	Firliyan Agil Pamungkas	61
8	Rifkiyan Dimas Ardi Savana	80
9	Riski Anton	70
10	Khoirul Faizin Prayoga	66
11	Farhan	64
12	Silvy Adella Puspitasari	80
13	Dian Intan	78
14	Intan Famalin	73
15	Danita Amala	60

Based on the table of post test above, we can see that in experimental class, the highest score was 93 while the lowest score was 66. But, in the control class the highest post-test score was 80 and the lowest post-test score was 60. Moreover, the average score or means of experimental class was 81. Then, the means score of control class was 68,4.

From the students' pre-test and post test mean score it can be assumed that students from the experimental class performed better than students from control class in the pre-test and post test. The result showed that there was an improvement in post test result than pre-test. In order to prove that the post test had significant different between experimental class and control class the writer used Independent Sample T-Test.

**Table 4.9 Normality Testing in Post-Test**

	Tests of Normality					
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.
Hasil Posttest Experimental	.140	30	.137	.944	30	.117
Hasil posttest Control	.142	32	.100	.951	32	.150

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

If significant score (Sig.) > 0,05 = normal distribution

If significant score (Sig.) < 0,05 = not normal distribution

Based on the output from SPSS above is known that the significance value from two classes pre-test were 0,117 ( $0,117 > 0,05$ ) in experimental class and 0,150 ( $0,150 > 0,05$ ) in control class. The calculation showed that the both of significant score was bigger than 0,05. It assumed that the both of students' score in posttest was normal distribution. It meant that  $H_0$  is accepted and  $H_a$  is rejected and the data is in normal distribution.



The table above described the Independent t-test analysis using SPSS 23.0 of students' posttest score in the experimental class and the control class. The table showed the mean score of experimental class was 81,27 and the mean score of control class was 68,47. The standar deviation of experimental class was 8,447 and the standard deviation of control class was 7,130. It was known from the mean score both of the class, the experimental class was higher than the control class. In this calculation of post-test score in the experimental class and control class, the Sig. (2-tailed) was 0,000 was lower than the level of significance 0,05 ( $0,000 < 0,05$ ). It was indicated that there was a significant difference between students' score posttest in experimental class which taught using Round Robin Technique through Realia and without using Round Robin Technique through Realia in control class. In other words, the result of the posttest of the students' score increased. It concluded that  $H_0$  was rejected and  $H_a$  was accepted. So the Hypothesis of this research was accepted. Moreover, it proved that teaching writing Descriptive Text using Round Robin Technique through Realia was more effective.

#### 4.4 Testing of the Hypothesis

In this part, the researcher described the interpretation of the research finding and summarized the hypothesis. The research was to answer the problem statement whether the use of Round Robin Technique through realia was effective to improve students' writing skills at the tenth grade students of SMA N 1 Kembang or not. In the previous part, the researcher stated two hypothesis to answer the problem statement there were Alternative Hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) and the Null Hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) as follow:

a. Alternative Hypothesis ( $H_a$ )

There was a significant difference of the students' writing skill between students who were taught by using Round Robin technique through realia and students who were not taught by using Round Robin technique through realia.

b. Null Hypothesis ( $H_0$ )

There was no a significant difference of the students' who were taught by using Round Robin technique through realia and students who were not taught by using Round Robin technique through realia. To know the hypothesis, the data obtained in the experimental class and control class were calculated by using t-test formula with assumption as follow:

1. If Sig. (2-tailed)  $> 0,05$ , the Null Hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) is accepted and the Alternative Hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) is rejected. It showed that Round Robin technique through realia was not effective to improve students' writing skill.
2. If Sig. (2-tailed)  $< 0,05$ , the Null Hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) is rejected and the Alternative Hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) is accepted. It showed that Round Robin technique through realia was effective to improve students' writing skill.

The researcher calculated and analyzed the t-test and got the result. The result showed that the post test score of experimental class was higher than posttest score of the control class ( $0,000 < 0,05$ ). Thus, the Null Hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) was rejected and the Alternative Hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) was accepted. In other words, teaching writing for Tenth grade of SMA N 1 Kembang by using Round Robin technique through realia effective.

#### **4.5 Discussion**

This research was aimed to know the use of round robin technique through realia to improve students writing skill in Descriptive Text at the tenth grade students of SMA Negeri 1 Kembang. It is to find out is there any significant difference between students who were taught by using Round Robin Technique through Realia and who were not taught by Round Robin Technique through Realia in Writing Descriptive Text.

The result of this research showed that the students' scores were higher after the treatment by using Round Robin Technique through Realia. The students showed their improvement in writing skills, most of them got good score. The use of Round Robin Technique through Realia was effective in improving students' writing skills it was according to (Barkley, 2019) said that Round Robin Technique is a technique supporting students to elaborate, explain, evaluate, and question the ideas in which the group members take turns in responding to the question with a word, phrase, or a short answer. According to (Newton, 2012) that Round robin generates ideas in a more structured way and giving everyone an equal voice and effective to teaching writing.

**Table 4.12**

Group	Pre-Test		Post-Test	
	Mean	Std. deviation	Mean	Std. deviation
Experimental	59.40	12.988	81.27	7.130
Control	53.13	11.307	68.47	7.130
T-Test				
	Pre-Test		Post-Test	
Sig (2-tailed)	0.170 > 0.05		0.000 < 0.05	
H <sub>0</sub>	Accepted		Rejected	
H <sub>a</sub>	Rejected		Accepted	

The analysis of the mean score and the standard deviation in the pre-test and post-test showed that the strategy was used was effective. The mean score in control class for pre test was 53,13 and 68,47 in post-test. The standar deviation was 11,307 for pretest, 7,130 for posttest in Control class. The mean score in experimental class for pret test was 59,40 and 81,27 in post-test. The standar deviation for pretest and posttest in Experimental class was 12,988 and 7,130. From pretest and posttest, it can be seen that there was significant difference between pretest and posttest. It meant that The use of Round Robin Technique through Realia was effective in improving students' writing skills in Descriptive Text.

From the T-Test analysis for post test showed that the Sig. (2-tailed) was 0,000 was lower than the level of significance 0,05 (0,000 < 0,05). From the explanation above, the null hypothesis (H<sub>0</sub>) was rejected and the alternative hypothesis (H<sub>a</sub>) was accepted. It can be concluded that there was significant difference between students' who were taught by using Round Robin Technique

through Realia and who were not taught by Round Robin Technique through Realia in Writing Descriptive Text. The result of the research at SMA Negeri 1 Kembang was Round Robin Technique can improve the students writing skills in Descriptive Text.

In the previous related study from Nur Laila (2016) defined that the use of round robin was effective to teach students' writing skill. But the differences with the previous related study, this researcher showed that the use of Round Robin technique through Realia was more effective to teach students' writing skills. As stated by Rega (2013) Round Robin technique was proven effective to be implemented in teaching writing Descriptive text. According to Sahardin (2019) the use of Round Robin Technique improved the students' writing skills. This technique offered the students' chances to share ideas and opinion with their peers, it could be seen after giving the treatment.

