

CHAPTER IV

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

This research was quasi experimental research which used nonequivalent control group design as the design. This study was aimed to examine the effectiveness of the round table technique to improve students' writing skill. In this research, the researcher used two classes, experimental class and control class. Experimental class who taught using round table technique and control class who taught without round table technique. The experimental class was XI MIA 1 with total students is 15. Meanwhile the control class was XI MIA with total students is 22 students. Both of experimental class and control class was given pre test and post test.

4.1 Finding

4.1.1 Try Out the Instrument

a. Content Validity

Validity is a degree of instrument accuracy, where the instrument used is absolutely right to measure what will be measured (Arifin, 2014). In this research the researcher was used content validity. Content validity is usually measured for test used to measure the cognitive, such as grammar, vocabulary, and for the other linguistic. In this research the content validity is analyzed by using Lawshe's CVR. The analysis is below.

Table 4.1 Data of Competent Panels for Content Validity

Item Number	Indicator	Basic Competence	Panel (essential, appropriate but not essential, or useless)
1	Determine the social functions and generic structures in narrative texts.	Analyze social functions, generic structure, and language features in simple narrative texts in the form of folk legends, according to the context.	Essential

$$I. \quad CVR_{item\ 1} = \left(n_e - \frac{N}{2}\right) : \left(\frac{N}{2}\right)$$

$$CVR_{item\ 1} = \left(1 - \frac{1}{2}\right) : \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)$$

$$CVR_{item\ 1} = \frac{1}{2} : \frac{1}{2}$$

$$CVR_{item\ 1} = 1$$

CVR is the content validity ratio, n_e is the number of panel members indicating an item “essential” and N is the number of

panel members. Lawshe (1975) suggested the transformation (from proportion to CVR) was of worth as it could readily be seen whether the level of agreement among panel members was greater than 50%. CVR values range between -1 (perfect disagreement) and $+1$ (perfect agreement) with CVR values above zero indicating that over half of panel members agree an item essential (Scully, 2013). It means that item number 1 have high content validity. It is because $-1 < 1$.

b. Construct Validity

Based on Widoyoko (2016) construct validity refers to the extent to which an instrument measures the concept of a theory, which is the basis for the preparation of the instrument. In the testing the construct validity can use expert judgment.

In this case after the instrument has been constructed about aspects that will be tested on the basis of certain theories, it is then consulted with the experts. In this research the researcher used expert judgments to measure the instrument.

4.1.2 Pre Test

Pre test was given to know students' ability before they are given treatment. In this study, the pre test was in the form of written test. The students were asked to write narrative text with the topic Indonesian legend. Pre test was done on 2nd march 2020

for both experimental class (XI MIA 1) and control class (XI MIA 2). Then, the result of the pre test is bellow:

a. Score of Pre Test

Table 4.2 Pre Test Score of Both Experimental Class and Control Class

Students' Code	Score	Students' Code	Score
EC01	43	CC01	44
EC02	46	CC02	49
EC03	47	CC03	59
EC04	48	CC04	47
EC05	33	CC05	44
EC06	47	CC06	46
EC07	52	CC07	45
EC08	49	CC08	44
EC09	49	CC09	30
EC10	53	CC10	40
EC11	50	CC11	41
EC12	48	CC12	59
EC13	47	CC13	42

EC14	32	CC14	43
EC15	48	CC15	42
		CC16	63
		CC17	52
		CC18	52
		CC19	54
		CC20	55
		CC21	55
		CC22	56
Total	692	Total	1062
Mean	46,13	Mean	48,27

In the table above, EC is students' code for Experimental Class while CC is students' code for Control Class. The mean of experimental class is 46,13, and the mean of control class is 48,27. The mean of control class is little bit higher from the mean of experimental group. The higher score of experimental class is 53. Meanwhile the higher score from control class is 59. The lowest score of experimental class is 43 while the lowest score of control class is 30

b. Analysis of Pre Test Data

Table 4.3 Comparison Pre Test Score between Experimental Class and Control Class

Students (X)	Students (Y)	X	Y	X-Mean1	Y-Mean2	(X-Mean1) ²	(Y-Mean2) ²
EC01	CC01	43	44	-3,13	-4,27	9,82	18,26
EC02	CC02	46	49	-0,13	0,73	0,02	0,53
EC03	CC03	47	59	0,87	10,73	0,75	115,07
EC04	CC04	48	47	1,87	-1,27	3,48	1,62
EC05	CC05	33	44	-13,13	-4,27	172,48	18,26
EC06	CC06	47	46	0,87	-2,27	0,75	5,17
EC07	CC07	52	45	5,87	-3,27	34,42	10,71
EC08	CC08	49	44	2,87	-4,27	8,22	18,26
EC09	CC09	49	30	2,87	-18,27	8,22	333,89
EC10	CC10	53	40	6,87	-8,27	47,15	68,44
EC11	CC11	50	41	3,87	-7,27	14,95	52,89
EC12	CC12	48	59	1,87	10,73	3,48	115,07
EC13	CC13	47	42	0,87	-6,27	0,75	39,35
EC14	CC14	32	43	-14,13	-5,27	199,75	27,80
EC15	CC15	48	42	1,87	-6,27	3,48	39,35
	CC16		63		14,73		216,89
	CC17		52		3,73		13,89
	CC18		52		3,73		13,89
	CC19		54		5,73		32,80
	CC20		55		6,73		45,26
	CC21		55		6,73		45,26
	CC22		56		7,73		59,71
Total		692	1062	0	0	507,73	1292,36
Mean		46,13	48,27	0	0	33,85	58,74

I. Mean of variable X

$$\bar{X}_1 = \frac{\sum X}{n_1}$$

$$\bar{X}_1 = \frac{692}{15}$$

$$\bar{X}_1 = 46,13$$

II. Mean of variable Y

$$\bar{X}_2 = \frac{\Sigma Y}{n_2}$$

$$\bar{X}_2 = \frac{1062}{22}$$

$$\bar{X}_2 = 48,27$$

III. Standard deviation of variable X

$$S_1^2 = \frac{\Sigma(X - \bar{X}_1)^2}{n_1 - 1}$$

$$S_1^2 = \frac{507,73}{15 - 1}$$

$$S_1^2 = \frac{507,73}{14}$$

$$S_1^2 = 36,266$$

$$S_1 = 6,022$$

IV. Standard deviation of variable Y

$$S_2^2 = \frac{\Sigma(Y - \bar{X}_2)^2}{n_2 - 1}$$

$$S_2^2 = \frac{1292,36}{22 - 1}$$

$$S_2^2 = \frac{1292,36}{21}$$

$$S_2^2 = 61,541$$

$$S_2 = 7,845$$

V. Standard deviation of both variable X and Y

$$S^2 = \frac{(n_1 - 1)S_1^2 + (n_2 - 1)S_2^2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2}$$

$$S^2 = \frac{(15 - 1)36,266 + (22 - 1)61,541}{15 + 22 - 2}$$

$$S^2 = \frac{14 \times 36,266 + 21 \times 61,541}{35}$$

$$S^2 = \frac{507,724 + 1292,361}{35}$$

$$S^2 = \frac{1800,085}{35}$$

$$S^2 = 51,431$$

$$S = 7,170$$

VI. T value

$$t_0 = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{s \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}}}$$

$$t_0 = \frac{46,13 - 48,27}{2,922 \sqrt{\frac{1}{15} + \frac{1}{22}}}$$

$$t_0 = \frac{-2,14}{1,906}$$

$$t_0 = -0,891$$

VII. Degree of freedom (df)

$$df = n_1 + n_2 - 2$$

$$df = 15 + 22 - 2$$

$$df = 35$$

From degree of freedom it can be concluded that the t_{table} is 2,030. H_0 will be accepted if $-t_{value} \leq t_{value} \leq t_{table}$ and H_0 will be

refused if $t_{\text{value}} > t_{\text{table}}$ (Sa'idah, 2017). The result of t test of from pre test t_{value} is lower than t_{table} ($-2,030 \leq -1,906 \leq 2,030$). It means that in pre test H_0 is accepted and H_a is refused.

The manual calculation above is proven with SPSS. It is know if the manual calculation is correct. Independent Sample T Test was used as the analysis method. The result of the analysis by using SPSS is below.

Figure 3 Group Statistics of pre test

Group Statistics					
	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Score	Experimental Class	15	46,13	6,022	1,555
	Control Class	22	48,27	7,845	1,673

The mean of experimental class is 46,13 with the total of students 15. Meanwhile the mean of control class is 48,27 with the total students 22. The standard deviation of the experimental class is 6,022 and the standard deviation of control class is 7,845. The result in the table above is same with the manual calculation

Figure 4 Independent Sample T Test of Pre Test

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	2,883	,098	- ,891	35	,379	-2,139	2,401	-7,014	2,736
Score Equal variances not assumed			- ,937	34,420	,355	-2,139	2,284	-6,778	2,499

The table above shows that t_{value} is -0,891 and the Sig. (2-tailed) is 0,379. H_0 will be accepted if the t_{value} is lower than t_{table} ($t_{\text{value}} < t_{\text{table}}$), t_{table} is 2,030. In this research, the t_{value} is lower than t_{table} (-0891<2,030). So, H_0 is accepted. The result in the table above is same with the manual calculation.

4.1.3 Post Test

a. Score of Post Test

Table 4.4 Post Test Score of Both Experimental Class and Control Class

students' code	score	students' code	score
EC01	85	CC01	70
EC02	87	CC02	76
EC03	91	CC03	85
EC04	88	CC04	80
EC05	88	CC05	70
EC06	89	CC06	80
EC07	97	CC07	79
EC08	91	CC08	81
EC09	92	CC09	80
EC10	96	CC10	69
EC11	92	CC11	71
EC12	89	CC12	90
EC13	91	CC13	70
EC14	98	CC14	67

EC15	92	CC15	69
		CC16	90
		CC17	81
		CC18	84
		CC19	82
		CC20	83
		CC21	80
		CC22	82
Total	1366	Total	1719
Mean	91,07	Mean	78,14

The table above shows the post test score of both experimental class and control class. The result shows that the mean score of experimental class is higher than control class. Mean score of experimental class is 91,07 while mean score of control class is 78,14. The highest score of experimental class is 97 and the highest score of control group is 90. Then, the lowest score of experimental class is 85. Meanwhile, the lowest score of control class is 67.

b. Analysis of Post Test Data

Table 4.5 Comparison Post Test Score between Experimental Class and Control Class

Students (X)	Students (Y)	X	Y	X-Mean1	Y-Mean2	(X-Mean1) ²	(Y-Mean2) ²
EC01	CC01	85	70	-6,07	-8,14	36,80	66,20
EC02	CC02	87	76	-4,07	-2,14	16,54	4,56
EC03	CC03	91	85	-0,07	6,86	0,00	47,11
EC04	CC04	88	80	-3,07	1,86	9,40	3,47
EC05	CC05	88	70	-3,07	-8,14	9,40	66,20
EC06	CC06	89	80	-2,07	1,86	4,27	3,47
EC07	CC07	97	79	5,93	0,86	35,20	0,75
EC08	CC08	91	81	-0,07	2,86	0,00	8,20
EC09	CC09	92	80	0,93	1,86	0,87	3,47

EC10	CC10	96	69	4,93	-9,14	24,34	83,47
EC11	CC11	92	71	0,93	-7,14	0,87	50,93
EC12	CC12	89	90	-2,07	11,86	4,27	140,75
EC13	CC13	91	70	-0,07	-8,14	0,00	66,20
EC14	CC14	98	67	6,93	-11,14	48,07	124,02
EC15	CC15	92	69	0,93	-9,14	0,87	83,47
	CC16		90		11,86		140,75
	CC17		81		2,86		8,20
	CC18		84		5,86		34,38
	CC19		82		3,86		14,93
	CC20		83		4,86		23,65
	CC21		80		1,86		3,47
	CC22		82		3,86		14,93
	Total	1366	1719	0	0	190,93	992,59
	Mean	91,07	78,14	0	0	12,73	45,12

I. Mean of variable X

$$\bar{X}_1 = \frac{\sum X}{n_1}$$

$$\bar{X}_1 = \frac{1366}{15}$$

$$\bar{X}_1 = 91,07$$

II. Mean of variable Y

$$\bar{X}_2 = \frac{\sum Y}{n_2}$$

$$\bar{X}_2 = \frac{1719}{22}$$

$$\bar{X}_2 = 78,14$$

III. Standard deviation of variable X

$$S_1^2 = \frac{\sum (X - \bar{X}_1)^2}{n_1 - 1}$$

$$S_1^2 = \frac{190,93}{15 - 1}$$

$$S_1^2 = \frac{190,93}{14}$$

$$S_1^2 = 13,637$$

$$S_1 = 3,692$$

IV. Standard deviation of variable Y

$$S_2^2 = \frac{\Sigma(Y - \bar{X}_2)^2}{n_2 - 1}$$

$$S_2^2 = \frac{992,59}{22 - 1}$$

$$S_2^2 = \frac{992,59}{21}$$

$$S_2^2 = 47,266$$

$$S_2 = 6,875$$

V. Standard deviation of both variable X and Y

$$S^2 = \frac{(n_1 - 1)S_1^2 + (n_2 - 1)S_2^2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2}$$

$$S^2 = \frac{(15 - 1)13,637 + (22 - 1)47,266}{15 + 22 - 2}$$

$$S^2 = \frac{14 \times 13,637 + 21 \times 47,266}{35}$$

$$S^2 = \frac{190,918 + 992,586}{35}$$

$$S^2 = \frac{1183,504}{35}$$

$$S^2 = 33,814$$

$$S = 5,814$$

VI. T value

$$t_0 = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{s \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}}}$$

$$t_0 = \frac{91,07 - 78,14}{2,922 \sqrt{\frac{1}{15} + \frac{1}{22}}}$$

$$t_0 = \frac{12,93}{1,946}$$

$$t_0 = 6,641$$

VII. Degree of freedom (df)

$$df = n_1 + n_2 - 2$$

$$df = 15 + 22 - 2$$

$$df = 35$$

From the degree of freedom (df) above, it can be known that the t_{table} is 2,030. Then, H_0 will be accepted if $-t_{table} \leq t_{value} \leq t_{table}$ and H_0 will be refused if $t_{value} > t_{table}$. In this study, t_{value} is higher than t_{table} ($2,391 > 2,030$). It means that H_0 is refused and H_a is accepted (Sa'idah 2017).

The manual calculation above then proven by using SPSS. It is to know whether the manual calculation is correct or not. Same as pre test, to analyze post test score writer also used independent sample t test. Then, the result is below.

Figure 5 Group Statistics of post test

Group Statistics				
Grup	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean

Score	Experimental Class	15	91,07	3,693	,954
	Control Class	22	78,14	6,875	1,466

The data above shows that the mean of post test score of experimental class is 91,07. Meanwhile the mean score of post test score of control class is 78,14. The standard deviation is 3,693 for experimental class and 6,875 for control class. It is same with the manual calculation.

Figure 6 Independent Sample T Test for Post Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	Score	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
	Equal variances assumed	8,045	,008	6,641	35	,000	12,930	1,947	8,977	16,883
	Equal variances not assumed			7,395	33,528	,000	12,930	1,749	9,375	16,486

The table above shows that the t_{value} is 6,641 and the Sig. (2-tailed) is 0,000. H_0 will be accepted if t_{value} is lower than t_{table} ($t_{\text{value}} < t_{\text{table}}$). In the degree of freedom in this study is 35 resulting t_{table} 2,030. The t_{value} is higher than t_{table} ($6,641 > 2,030$). So, H_0 is

refused and H_a is accepted. It means that round table technique is effective to improve students' writing skill on narrative text.

4.1 Discussion

In this part researcher discusses the research finding. The researcher explains the research finding of the data analysis in this part obtained from MA Walisongo Pecangaan. The researcher shows the result of this research that there are any effect of using the round table technique to improve students' writing skill especially on narrative text.

There are some techniques in teaching writing; one of the techniques is Round Table. The round table technique is one of the cooperative learning techniques that can be used for increasing students' writing skill. Roundtable is a technique that can be used for brainstorming. In roundtable, the student is designed to generate a large number of ideas about a topic in a group with the other students. It can be an excellent team building technique ensures that all members of a group are involved (Sepianita, 2010).

Subject of this study was tenth grade students of MA Walisongo Pecangaan in academic year of 2019/2020. XI MIA 1 was chosen as experimental class and XI MIA 2 was chosen as control class. Both of experimental and control class were given pre test, 3 meetings in treatments, and post test. The result of pre test and post test is below.

Table 4.6 The Different Score between Pre Test and Post Test

	Pre Test	Post Test
Mean Score	Experimental Class =	Experimental Class =

	46,13	91,07
	Control Class = 48,27	Control Class = 78,14
T_{Value}	-0,891	6,641
T_{Table}	2,030	2,030
T test result	<p>Ha is accepted</p> <p>$(-t_{table} \leq t_{value} \leq t_{table})$</p> <p>$(-2,030 \leq -0,891 \leq 2,030)$</p>	<p>Ha is accepted</p> <p>$(t_{value} > t_{table})$</p> <p>$(6,641 > 2,030)$</p>

From the table above showed that in pre test mean score of experimental class was lower than the mean score of control class. The mean score of experimental class was 46,13 while the mean score of control class was 48,27. Meanwhile in post test mean score of experimental class was higher than the mean score of control class. The result of the t test showed that t_{value} was lower than t_{table} ($6,641 < 2,030$). It meant that H_a was accepted.

In the treatment, experimental class was taught by using round table technique. The students in experimental class discuss in group by using round table rule, which they individually have to gather their ideas in paper then they write down the text based on their ideas. The students in control class were taught by using conventional teaching technique which they just discuss in group. The treatments for both experimental class and control class were done in 3 meetings for each.

In the table 4.6 showed that the score for both experimental class and control class increased. The mean score of experimental class was higher

than mean score of control class (91,07>78,14). The t test result was also positive. The t_{value} was higher than t_{table} (6,641>2,030). It meant that H_a is accepted and H_o is rejected. So, it can be concluded that round table technique is effective to improve students writing skill on narrative text.

