

CHAPTER IV

RESULT OF THE STUDY

In this chapter, the writer presented the data which had been collected from the research in the field of study. The data were the result of experiment and control class, the result of post-test experiment and control class, result of data analysis, and interpretation.

A. Description of the Data

1. The result of Pre-Test and Post- Test score of Experiment and Control Class

The Pre- test and Post- test at the control class had been conducted on August, 6th 2014 (Wednesday, at time 06.30-08.00) for Pre-test and August, 16th 2014 (Saturday, at time 12.30-13.30) for Post- test in class X-1 of SMA Muhammadiyah-1 Palangka Raya with the number of student was 22 students. Then the experiment class had been conducted on August, 6th 2014 (Wednesday, at time 10.00-11.30) for Pre-test and August, 18th 2014 (Monday, at time 08.00- 09.30) for Post- test in the class X-4 of SMA Muhammadiyah-1 Palangka Raya with the number of student was 22 students. The Pre- Test and Post- Test scores of both of class were presented in table 4.1 and 4.2:

Table 4.1 the Pre- Test and Post- Test Scores of Bright Students of Experiment and Control Class

No.	Control Class				Experiment Class			
	Student Code	Score		Improvement	Student Code	Score		Improvement
		Pre-Test	Post-Test			Pre-Test	Post-Test	
1	C1	70	74	4	E1	61	78	17
2	C2	63	74	11	E3	65	73	8
3	C3	74	79	5	E4	70	88	18
4	C5	73	78	5	E7	60	78	18
5	C7	65	78	13	E8	70	88	18
6	C8	65	65	0	E9	61	79	18
7	C9	70	74	4	E11	66	75	9
8	C10	74	79	5	E12	74	88	14
9	C11	60	66	6	E13	78	84	6
10	C12	65	71	6	E14	78	88	10
11	C13	64	75	11	E15	65	84	19
12	C14	73	70	-3	E16	70	71	1
13	C16	61	66	5	E17	65	71	6
14	C17	65	70	5	E18	70	75	5
15	C18	70	63	-7	E20	66	80	14
16	C20	66	74	8	E21	70	81	11
17	C21	60	70	10	E22	65	83	18
Sum		1138	1226	88		1154	1364	210
Lowest Score		60	63	3		60	71	11
Highest Score		74	79	5		78	88	10
Mean		66.94	72.12	5.18		67.88	80.24	12.36
Standard Deviation		4.83	5.06	0.23		5.37	5.70	0.47

The researcher got the result of the data by using manual calculation and SPSS 17. The data presentation of experiment and control class showed the table frequency distribution of pre- test score, the measurement of central tendency (mean, median, and mode).

Based on the result above, mean of control class who taught using conversional teaching was from 66.94 in pre-test to 72.52 in post-test. Then mean of experiment class was from 67. 88 in pre-test before the writer applied picture media in teaching writing descriptive text and after the writer applied picture media, mean of post- test in experiment class was 80.24. It can be concluded that, mean of bright level of students' achievement of class X-1 as control class and X-4 as experiment class increased from pre- test to post- test.

Table 4.2 the Pre- Test and Post- Test Scores of Low students of Experiment and Control Class

No.	Control Class				Experiment Class			
	Student Code	Score		improvement	Student Code	Score		Improvement
		Pre Test	Post Test			Pre Test	Post Test	
1	C4	58	70	12	E2	54	75	21
2	C6	58	70	12	E5	58	83	25
3	C15	56	61	5	E6	56	74	18
4	C19	56	70	14	E10	54	78	24
5	C22	56	61	5	E19	58	70	12
Sum		284	332	48		280	380	100
Lowest Score		56	61	5		54	70	16
Higher Score		58	70	12		58	83	25
Mean		56.8	66.4	9.6		56	76	20
Standard Deviation		1.09	4.93			2	4.85	

Based on the result above, mean of control class who taught using conversional teaching was from 56.8 in pre-test to 66.4 in post-test. Then mean of experiment class was from 56 in pre-test before the writer applied picture media in teaching writing descriptive text and after the writer applied picture media, mean of post- test in experiment class was 76. It can be concluded that,

mean of low level of students' achievement of class X-1 as control class and X-4 as experiment class increased from pre- test to post- test.

B. Result of Data Analysis

1. Testing of Normality and Homogeneity

The researcher was calculated the result of pre-test and post-test score of experiment and control class by using SPSS 17.0 program. It is used to know the normality of the data that is going to be analyzed whether both groups have normal distribution or not. Also homogeneity is used to know whether experiment group and control group, that are decided, come from population that has relatively same variant or not.

- a. Testing of Normality and Homogeneity of Pre- Test of Experiment and Control Class

Table 4.3 Testing of Normality One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Experiment	Control
N		22	22
Normal Parameters ^{a, b}	Mean	65.5455	64.6364
	Std. Deviation	7.14294	6.07529
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.111	.130
	Positive	.111	.112
	Negative	-.106	-.130
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.521	.608
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.949	.854

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

Based on the calculation used SPSS program, the asymptotic significant normality of experiment class 0.949 and control class was 0.854. Then the normality both of class was consulted with table of Kolmogorov-Smirnov with the level of significant 5% ($\alpha=0.05$). Since asymptotic significant of experiment=0.949 $\alpha=0.05$, and asymptotic significant of control= 0.854 $\geq \alpha= 0.05$. It could be concluded that the data was normal distribution.

Table 4.4 Testing of Homogeneity Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances^a

Dependent Variable: Achivement

F	df1	df2	Sig.
4.190	3	40	.112

Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups.

Based on the result of homogeneity test, the F_{value} was 4.190 and the significant value was 0.112. The data are homogeneous if the significant value is higher than significant level $\alpha= 0.05$. Since the significant value (0.112) was higher than significant level $\alpha= 0.05$, it could be concluded that the data are homogeneous. It meant that both of classes have same variants.

- b. Testing of normality and homogeneity for post-test of experiment and control class

Table 4.5 One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Experiment	Control
N		22	22
Normal Parameters ^{a, b}	Mean	79.2727	70.8182
	Std. Deviation	5.89739	5.49143
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.129	.168
	Positive	.129	.105
	Negative	-.112	-.168
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.606	.788
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.856	.563

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

Based on the calculation used SPSS program, the asymptotic significant normality of experiment class was 0.856 and control class was 0.536. Then the normality both of class was consulted with table of Kolmogorov- Smirnov with the level of significant 5% ($\alpha = 0.05$). Since asymptotic significant experiment = 0.856 $\geq \alpha = 0.05$, and asymptotic significant control = 0.563 $\geq \alpha =$

Table 4. 6 Testing Homogeneity Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances^a

Dependent Variable: Achievement			
F	df1	df2	Sig.
.312	3	40	.817

Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups.

0.05. It could be concluded that the data was normal distribution.

Based on the result of homogeneity test, the F_{value} was 0.312 and the significant value was 0.817. The data are homogeneous if the significant value is higher than significant level $\alpha = 0.05$. Since the significant value (0.817) was higher than significant level $\alpha = 0.05$, it could be concluded that the data are homogeneous. It meant that both of classes have same variants.

2. Testing Hypothesis

The researcher used Two- Ways ANOVA to test the hypothesis with significant level $\alpha = 0.05$. The researcher used manual calculation and SPSS 17.0 Program to test the hypothesis using Two-ways ANOVA. The criteria of H_a was accepted when $F_0 > F_{\text{table}}$, and H_0 was refused when $F_0 < F_{\text{table}}$. The result of testing hypothesis explained in table 4.11.

Source of variance	SS	df	MS	F observed (F0)	Level of significant 0.05
Between Columns	786.2728	1	786.2728	26.9266	4.08
Between Rows	191.3679	1	191.3679	6.5536	4.08
Columns by Rows (Interaction)	4.2449	1	4.2449	0.1454	4.08
Between Group	981.8856	3	327.2958		
Within Group	1168.0235	40	29.2006		
Total	2149.9091	43			

Table 4.7 Result of Testing Hypothesis

1. First, based on the calculation above used manual calculation and SPSS program, the F_{observed} between columns was 26.9266. Then it was consulted with F_{table} of with the level of significant 5% so $F_{\text{table}} = 4.08$. Since F_0

$=26.9266 > F_{table} = 4.08$, the difference between columns was significant. It could be concluded that using picture media toward bright level students' achievement in writing descriptive text was significant effect. Thus, H_a that stating using picture media gave significant effect for bright students in writing descriptive text at first year students at SMA Muhammadiyah-1 Palangka Raya was accepted and H_0 that stating using picture media did not give significant effect for bright students in writing descriptive text at first year students at SMA Muhammadiyah-1 Palangka Raya was rejected.

2. Second, the $F_{observed}$ between rows was 6.5536 which consulted with F_{table} with the level of significant 5%. Since the $F_{observed} = 6.5536 > F_{table} = 4.08$, the difference between rows was significant. It could be concluded that using picture media toward low level students' achievement in writing descriptive text was significant effect. Therefore, H_a stated that using picture media gave significant effect for low students in writing descriptive text at first year students at SMA Muhammadiyah-1 Palangka Raya was accepted and H_0 that stating using picture media did not give significant effect for low students in writing descriptive text at first year students at SMA Muhammadiyah-1 Palangka Raya was rejected.

3. Third, the $F_{observed}$ columns by rows (interaction) was 0.1454 that consulted with level of significant 5%. Since $F_{observed} = 0.1454 < F_{table} = 4.08$, it could be concluded that using picture media toward high and low level students' achievement in writing descriptive text was significant effect. It

could be concluded that using picture for bright and low students gave effect to both level and there was no difference.

C. Interpretation of The F-Ratios

The hypothesis testing used Two-ways ANOVA to measure the significant effect of using picture media toward bright of students' achievement in writing descriptive text. First, based on the manual calculation and SPSS 17 program of Two-ways ANOVA the $F_0 = 26.9266$ was consulted with F table with significant level 5% ($F_{table} = 4.08$). Therefore, $F_0 (26.9266) < F_{table} (4.08)$. It could be concluded that using picture media toward bright level students' achievement in writing descriptive text was significant. The result of using picture media toward bright level students' achievement in writing descriptive had better mean (79.27) than student's who taught without picture with mean (70.81).

Then second F- ratio, which $F_0 = 6.5536$ was more than F table on significant level 5% ($F_{table} = 4.08$) is significant at the level 5% ($F = 4.08$), based on comparison of achievement of the subject in bright of experiment class and bright level of control class with achievement of the subject in low level of experiment class and low level of control class. Therefore, it can summary that the difference achievement between the performance of those subject in bright level and the subject in low level of both classes in writing descriptive text is beyond expectation. It showed on table 4.7 that bright level of experiment class and control class have obtained a combined mean (76.27) as compared with mean (71,2) for low level of experiment and control group.

The third F-ratio showed the interaction effect between the two variable, bright and low level students' achievement in writing descriptive text that

taught by picture media, which testing hypothesis used Two-ways ANOVA. Based on the calculation of Two-ways ANOVA, $F_0 = 0.1454$. It was consulted with F table with level of significant 5% ($F_{table} = 4.08$) Since the $F_0 = 0.1454 < F_{table} = 4.08$. It could be concluded that no significant interaction using picture media toward bright and low level students' achievement in writing descriptive text. It meant that the effect of using picture media in teaching writing descriptive text did not depend on the students' level achievement. Since using picture gave effect toward bright and low level students' achievement in writing descriptive text and there was not difference on both.

