## CHAPTER IV <br> RESEARCH FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

## A. Research Findings

To find out the difference between the students who were taught using Indonesian pop song as a medium and the students who were not taught using songs in writing descriptive on students' imagination in class VIII D and VIII F of MTs Salafiyah Kajen Margoyoso Pati, the writer did an analysis of quantitative data. The data was obtained by giving test to the experimental class and control class after giving a different treatment of learning process in both classes. While during the experiment, the researcher conducts observation. In this study, observation only used to support the data about the students' imagination reflected on their engagement in writing class.

1. In the control class
a. Pre test

The pre test in control class was conducted on Thursday, January $5^{\text {th }}$ 2010 and followed by 34 students. The Activities in this pre test such as below:

1) Teacher gave explanation about descriptive text (the Social Function, Generic Structure, and grammar) and then the teacher showed an example about descriptive text.
2) In pairs, students are discussing and identifying the social function and grammar about the example given
3) Discussing the correct answer together.
4) Giving assignment for students to write their ideas about describing something or someone that they know on a piece of paper individually. The result score of students' assignment can be seen in table below:

Table 5

| No. | Pre-test |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Respondents | Criterion |  | Score |
|  |  | Content | Organization |  |
| 1 | F-1 | 35 | 25 | 60 |
| 2 | F-2 | 45 | 30 | 75 |
| 3 | F-3 | 40 | 25 | 65 |
| 4 | F-4 | 41 | 29 | 70 |
| 5 | F-5 | 40 | 25 | 65 |
| 6 | F-6 | 50 | 30 | 80 |
| 7 | F-7 | 30 | 20 | 50 |
| 8 | F-8 | 38 | 22 | 60 |
| 9 | F-9 | 35 | 25 | 60 |
| 10 | F-10 | 45 | 30 | 75 |
| 11 | F-11 | 42 | 28 | 70 |
| 12 | F-12 | 40 | 25 | 65 |
| 13 | F-13 | 45 | 25 | 70 |
| 14 | F-14 | 38 | 22 | 60 |
| 15 | F-15 | 45 | 30 | 75 |
| 16 | F-16 | 35 | 25 | 60 |
| 17 | F-17 | 42 | 28 | 70 |
| 18 | F-18 | 40 | 25 | 65 |
| 19 | F-19 | 40 | 25 | 65 |
| 20 | F-20 | 45 | 30 | 75 |
| 21 | F-21 | 30 | 20 | 50 |
| 22 | F-22 | 42 | 28 | 70 |
| 23 | F-23 | 40 | 20 | 60 |
| 24 | F-24 | 41 | 29 | 70 |
| 25 | F-25 | 40 | 25 | 65 |
| 26 | F-26 | 40 | 30 | 70 |
| 27 | F-27 | 45 | 35 | 80 |
| 28 | F-28 | 35 | 25 | 60 |
| 29 | F-29 | 45 | 35 | 80 |
| 30 | F-30 | 40 | 30 | 70 |
| 31 | F-31 | 30 | 25 | 55 |
| 32 | F-32 | 42 | 28 | 70 |
| 33 | F-33 | 35 | 25 | 60 |
| 34 | F-34 | 35 | 20 | 55 |

When the researcher taught descriptive text conventionally, some of the students paid attention to the researcher's explanation but some of them not. They did not ask any questions to the researcher but they did the test enthusiastic, and the percentage of observation result was fair (see appendix11). Thus are the activities in pre test process.
b. Post test

The researcher gave the students a post test which conducted on Thursday, January $12^{\text {th }} 2010$ and followed by 34 students. The Activities in this post test such as below:

1) The researcher did the explanation about descriptive text once again, and she asked them to make a group each group consists 6 persons. The researcher gave them for 10 minutes to arrange some sentences into a good paragraph that researcher gave them.
2) The researcher asked them to write their assignment on the whiteboard.
3) Then the researcher and students made a correction together about the paragraph. At the same time, the researcher also explained some grammatical rules and generic structure that have used in the paragraph.
4) Then the researcher gave the students a picture and she asked them to describe about the picture. Some of the students were answered. After that the researcher asked the students to make a simple free writing of descriptive text base on the picture. The result score of students' assignment can be seen in table below:

Table 6

| No. | Post-test |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Respondents | Criterion |  |  |
|  | Content | Organization | Score |  |
| 1 | F-1 | 35 | 20 | 55 |
| 2 | F-2 | 35 | 25 | 60 |
| 3 | F-3 | 41 | 29 | 70 |
| 4 | F-4 | 50 | 40 | 90 |
| 5 | F-5 | 42 | 28 | 70 |


| 6 | F-6 | 35 | 25 | 60 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7 | F-7 | 35 | 25 | 60 |
| 8 | F-8 | 45 | 35 | 80 |
| 9 | F-9 | 40 | 30 | 80 |
| 10 | F-10 | 30 | 20 | 50 |
| 11 | F-11 | 42 | 28 | 70 |
| 12 | F-12 | 50 | 30 | 80 |
| 13 | F-13 | 45 | 25 | 70 |
| 14 | F-14 | 50 | 35 | 85 |
| 15 | F-15 | 45 | 20 | 65 |
| 16 | F-16 | 42 | 28 | 70 |
| 17 | F-17 | 35 | 25 | 60 |
| 18 | F-18 | 40 | 25 | 65 |
| 19 | F-19 | 45 | 30 | 75 |
| 20 | F-20 | 50 | 30 | 80 |
| 21 | F-21 | 45 | 25 | 70 |
| 22 | F-22 | 50 | 35 | 85 |
| 23 | F-23 | 35 | 25 | 60 |
| 24 | F-24 | 40 | 25 | 65 |
| 25 | F-25 | 40 | 25 | 65 |
| 26 | F-26 | 40 | 30 | 70 |
| 27 | F-27 | 30 | 20 | 50 |
| 28 | F-28 | 40 | 20 | 60 |
| 29 | F-29 | 30 | 25 | 55 |
| 30 | F-30 | 30 | 25 | 55 |
| 31 | F-31 | 30 | 25 | 55 |
| 32 | F-32 | 45 | 30 | 75 |
| 33 | F-33 | 50 | 30 | 80 |
| 34 | F-34 | 35 | 20 | 55 |

At that time, some of students enthusiastic to ask about the grammar that they still did not understand yet, and the percentage of observation result was good (see appendix12).
2. In the experimental class
a. Pre test

The pre test in experimental class was conducted on Thursday, January $7^{\text {th }} 2010$ and followed by 32 students. The Activities in this pre test such as below:

1) Teacher gave explanation about descriptive text (the Social Function, Generic Structure, and grammar) and then the teacher showed an example about descriptive text.
2) In pairs, students are discussing and identifying the social function and grammar about the example given
3) Discussing the correct answer together.
4) Giving assignment for students to write their ideas about describing something or someone that they know on a piece of paper individually. The result score of students' assignment can be seen in table below:

Table 7

| No. | Pre-test |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Criterion |  |  |
|  | Respondents | Content | Organization | Score |
| 1 | D-1 | 30 | 25 | 55 |
| 2 | D-2 | 50 | 30 | 80 |
| 3 | D-3 | 40 | 25 | 65 |
| 4 | D-4 | 35 | 20 | 55 |
| 5 | D-5 | 40 | 25 | 65 |
| 6 | D-6 | 45 | 30 | 75 |
| 7 | D-7 | 40 | 25 | 65 |
| 8 | D-8 | 40 | 25 | 65 |
| 9 | D-9 | 50 | 30 | 80 |
| 10 | D-10 | 45 | 25 | 70 |
| 11 | D-11 | 50 | 35 | 85 |
| 12 | D-12 | 45 | 30 | 75 |
| 13 | D-13 | 45 | 25 | 70 |
| 14 | D-14 | 40 | 30 | 70 |
| 15 | D-15 | 35 | 20 | 55 |
| 16 | D-16 | 50 | 30 | 80 |
| 17 | D-17 | 55 | 30 | 85 |
| 18 | D-18 | 45 | 25 | 70 |
| 19 | D-19 | 45 | 25 | 70 |
| 20 | D-20 | 35 | 20 | 55 |
| 21 | D-21 | 45 | 30 | 75 |
| 22 | D-22 | 40 | 30 | 70 |


| 23 | D-23 | 45 | 30 | 75 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 24 | D-24 | 40 | 20 | 60 |
| 25 | D-25 | 45 | 30 | 75 |
| 26 | D-26 | 30 | 20 | 50 |
| 27 | D-27 | 38 | 22 | 60 |
| 28 | D-28 | 40 | 25 | 65 |
| 29 | D-29 | 40 | 25 | 65 |
| 30 | D-30 | 40 | 35 | 75 |
| 31 | D-31 | 30 | 20 | 50 |
| 32 | D-32 | 40 | 35 | 75 |

When the researcher taught descriptive text conventionally without any media, some of the students paid attention to the researcher's explanation but some of them not. Some of them looked unenthusiastic to learn written text. They did not ask any questions to the researcher, and the percentage of observation result was fair (see appendix 13). Thus are the activities in pre test process.
b. Treatment

The treatment in experimental class was conducted two days on Thursday (January $14^{\text {th }} 2010$ ) and Thursday (January $21^{\text {st }} 2010$ ), and followed by 32 students. The researcher did the treatment by using Indonesian pop songs as a medium to stimulate and motivate the students in learning written text. The Activities in this treatment such as below:

1) The researcher played the tape recorder to play the Indonesian pop song in the classroom, most of the students were listen to the song enthusiastic.
2) The researcher invited them to translate the Indonesian pop song's lyric (Sempurna by Andra and the backbone) to English, most of the students were very enthusiastic.
3) Then they discuss together what the song describes about. At the same time, the researcher also explained some grammatical rules that have used in the song lyric.
4) At that time, some of students enthusiastic to ask about the grammar that they still did not understand yet.
5) After they felt enough about the grammatical, the researcher asked to the students to make a group, and each group consist of 6 students to make 5 sentences by imagine someone base on the title of Indonesian pop song.
6) Then the researcher asked to the students to mention their sentences and write down on the whiteboard.
7) After that, the researcher with all of students makes a correction about grammatical rules of the sentences. At that time the students were paid attention of their mistakes, and some of them asked a question related their sentences to know how the correct one was.
8) Then from thus correct sentences, the researcher make a paragraph.
9) The paragraph showed a descriptive text with an appropriate generic structure.
b. Post test

After the treatment, the researcher gave the students a post test which conducted on Thursday (January $21{ }^{\text {st }} 2010$ ). The Activities in this post test such as below:

1) The researcher gave the students another Indonesian pop song (Kau Cantik Hari ini by Lobow).
2) Then the researcher and students do the same activities at previous steps (in pre test activities)
3) The researcher gave an assignment, she asked the students to make a simple free writing of descriptive text by imagine someone base on the Indonesian pop song that had discussed.
4) While they were writing, the researcher played the Indonesian pop song. Thus are the activities in treatment and post test. The result score of students' assignment can be seen in table below:

Table 8

| No. | Post-test |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Respondents | Criterion |  | Score |
|  |  | Content | Organization |  |
| 1 | D-1 | 45 | 30 | 75 |
| 2 | D-2 | 55 | 35 | 90 |
| 3 | D-3 | 50 | 35 | 85 |
| 4 | D-4 | 40 | 25 | 65 |
| 5 | D-5 | 55 | 35 | 90 |
| 6 | D-6 | 40 | 30 | 70 |
| 7 | D-7 | 40 | 30 | 70 |
| 8 | D-8 | 40 | 25 | 65 |
| 9 | D-9 | 50 | 35 | 85 |
| 10 | D-10 | 50 | 40 | 90 |
| 11 | D-11 | 50 | 40 | 90 |
| 12 | D-12 | 50 | 35 | 85 |
| 13 | D-13 | 50 | 35 | 85 |
| 14 | D-14 | 50 | 40 | 90 |
| 15 | D-15 | 42 | 28 | 70 |
| 16 | D-16 | 40 | 25 | 65 |
| 17 | D-17 | 55 | 35 | 90 |
| 18 | D-18 | 50 | 35 | 85 |
| 19 | D-19 | 50 | 30 | 80 |
| 20 | D-20 | 50 | 40 | 90 |
| 21 | D-21 | 55 | 35 | 90 |
| 22 | D-22 | 50 | 35 | 85 |
| 23 | D-23 | 45 | 40 | 85 |
| 24 | D-24 | 40 | 35 | 75 |
| 25 | D-25 | 50 | 40 | 90 |
| 26 | D-26 | 40 | 30 | 70 |
| 27 | D-27 | 50 | 35 | 85 |
| 28 | D-28 | 50 | 40 | 90 |
| 29 | D-29 | 40 | 35 | 75 |
| 30 | D-30 | 50 | 40 | 90 |
| 31 | D-31 | 45 | 40 | 85 |
| 32 | D-32 | 40 | 25 | 65 |

At the same time, the students were very enthusiastic in listen the explanation and they looked enjoyed to do the assignment. The percentage of observation result was excellent (see appendix 14).

## B. Hypothetical Analysis

Hypothetical analysis is intended to process the data collected from pretest and post-test. The goal of this analysis is to prove the hypothesis whether it is accepted or rejected.

Steps adopted in analyzing hypothetical test are:

1. The Data Analysis of Pre-test Value of the Experimental Class and Control Class
1) Pre Request-test
a. Searching for the normality of initial data in the control class and the experimental class.

The normality test is used to know whether the data obtained is normally distributed or not. Test data of this research uses the formula of chi-square.

Table 9
The List of Pre-test Value of Control and Experimental Classes

| $\mathbf{N}$ <br> $\mathbf{0}$ | Experimental class |  |  |  | Control class |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Code of <br> the <br> sudents | $x_{1}$ | $\left(x_{1}-\bar{x}\right)$ | $\left(x_{1}-\bar{x}\right)^{2}$ | Code of <br> the <br> students | $x_{2}$ | $\left(x_{2}-\bar{x}\right)$ | $\left(x_{2}-\bar{x}\right)^{2}$ |
|  | D-1 | 55 | -13.3 | 176.89 | F-1 | 60 | -6.2 | 38.44 |
| 2 | D-2 | 80 | 11.7 | 137.89 | F-2 | 75 | 8.8 | 77.44 |
| 3 | D-3 | 65 | -3.3 | 10.89 | F-3 | 65 | -1.2 | 1.44 |
| 4 | D-4 | 55 | -13.3 | 176.89 | F-4 | 70 | 3.8 | 14.44 |
| 5 | D-5 | 65 | -3.3 | 10.89 | F-5 | 65 | -1.2 | 1.44 |
| 6 | D-6 | 75 | 6.7 | 44.89 | F-6 | 80 | 13.8 | 190.44 |
| 7 | D-7 | 65 | -3.3 | 10.89 | F-7 | 50 | -16.2 | 262.44 |
| 8 | D-8 | 65 | -3.3 | 10.89 | F-8 | 60 | -6.2 | 38.44 |
| 9 | D-9 | 80 | 11.7 | 137.89 | F-9 | 60 | -6.2 | 38.44 |
| 10 | D-10 | 70 | 1.7 | 2.89 | F-10 | 75 | 8.8 | 77.44 |
| 11 | D-11 | 85 | 16.7 | 279.89 | F-11 | 70 | 3.8 | 14.44 |
| 12 | D-12 | 75 | 6.7 | 44.89 | F-12 | 65 | -1.2 | 1.44 |
| 13 | D-13 | 70 | 1.7 | 2.89 | F-13 | 70 | 3.8 | 14.44 |
| 14 | D-14 | 70 | 1.7 | 2.89 | F-14 | 60 | -6.2 | 38.44 |
| 15 | D-15 | 55 | -13.3 | 176.89 | F-15 | 75 | 8.8 | 77.44 |
| 16 | D-16 | 80 | 11.7 | 137.89 | F-16 | 60 | -6.2 | 38.44 |
| 17 | D-17 | 85 | 16.7 | 279.89 | F-17 | 70 | 3.8 | 14.44 |
| 18 | D-18 | 70 | 1.7 | 2.89 | F-18 | 65 | -1.2 | 1.44 |
| 19 | D-19 | 70 | 1.7 | 2.89 | F-19 | 65 | -1.2 | 1.44 |


| 20 | D-20 | 55 | -13.3 | 176.89 | F-20 | 75 | 8.8 | 77.44 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21 | D-21 | 75 | 6.7 | 44.89 | F-21 | 50 | -16.2 | 262.44 |
| 22 | D-22 | 70 | 1.7 | 2.89 | F-22 | 70 | 3.8 | 14.44 |
| 23 | D-23 | 75 | 6.7 | 44.89 | F-23 | 60 | -6.2 | 38.44 |
| 24 | D-24 | 60 | -8.3 | 68.89 | F-24 | 70 | 3.8 | 14.44 |
| 25 | D-25 | 75 | 6.7 | 44.89 | F-25 | 65 | -1.2 | 1.44 |
| 26 | D-26 | 50 | -18.3 | 334.89 | F-26 | 70 | 3.8 | 14.44 |
| 27 | D-27 | 60 | -8.3 | 68.89 | F-27 | 80 | 13.8 | 190.44 |
| 28 | D-28 | 65 | -3.3 | 10.89 | F-28 | 60 | -6.2 | 38.44 |
| 29 | D-29 | 65 | -3.3 | 10.89 | F-29 | 80 | 13.8 | 190.44 |
| 30 | D-30 | 75 | 6.7 | 44.89 | F-30 | 70 | 3.8 | 14.44 |
| 31 | D-31 | 50 | -18.3 | 334.89 | F-31 | 55 | 11.2 | 125.44 |
| 32 | D-32 | 75 | 6.7 | 44.89 | F-32 | 70 | 3.8 | 14.44 |
| 33 |  |  |  |  | F-33 | 60 | -6.2 | 38.44 |
| 34 |  |  |  |  | F-34 | 55 | 11.2 | 125.44 |
|  | $\sum$ | 2185 |  | 2885.48 | $\sum$ | 2250 |  | 2102.96 |
|  | $\bar{X}_{1}$ | 68.3 |  |  | $\bar{X}_{2}$ | 66.2 |  |  |

Based on the table above, the normality test:

## Hypothesis:

Ha: The distribution list is normal.
Ho: The distribution list is not normal

## Test of hypothesis:

The formula is used:

$$
X^{2}=\sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{\left(O_{i}-E_{i}\right)^{2}}{E_{i}}
$$

Table 10
Normality Test of Pre-test of Control Class

| Class <br> Interval | Limit <br> Class | Z for the <br> Limit Class | Opportunities <br> for Z | Size <br> Classes for <br> Z | $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{i}}$ | $\mathrm{O}_{\mathrm{i}}$ | $\frac{\left(O_{i}-E_{i}\right)^{2}}{E_{i}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 49.5 | -1.18 | 0.47 |  |  |  |  |
| $50-55$ |  |  |  | 0.08 | 2.72 | 4 | 0.60 |
|  | 55.5 | -1.21 | 0.39 |  |  |  |  |
| $56-61$ |  |  |  | 0.05 | 5.1 | 8 | 1.65 |
|  | 61.5 | -0.99 | 0.34 |  |  |  |  |
| $62-67$ |  |  |  | 0.29 | 9.86 | 6 | 1.51 |
|  | 67.5 | 0.13 | 0.05 |  |  |  |  |
| $68-73$ |  |  |  | 0.24 | 8.16 | 9 | 0.09 |


|  | 73.5 | 0.81 | 0.29 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $74-79$ |  |  |  | 0.14 | 4.76 | 4 | 0.12 |
|  | 79.5 | 1.48 | 0.43 |  |  |  |  |
| $80-85$ |  |  |  | 0.05 | 1.7 | 3 | 0.99 |
|  | 85.5 | 2.16 | 0.48 |  |  |  |  |
| $\sum$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

With $\alpha=1 \%$ and $\alpha=5 \%, \mathrm{dk}=6-3=3$, from the chi-square distribution table, obtained $X_{\text {table }}=11.3$ and $X_{\text {table }}=7.81$. Because $X^{2}{ }_{\text {count }}$ is lower than $X_{\text {table }}^{2}(11.3>4.96<7.81)$. So, the distribution list is Normal.

Table 11
Normality Test of Pre-test of Experimental Class

| Class <br> Interval | Limit <br> Class | Z for the <br> Limit Class | Opportunities <br> for Z | Size <br> Classes for <br> $Z$ | $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{i}}$ | $\mathrm{O}_{\mathrm{i}}$ | $\frac{\left(O_{i}-E_{i}\right)^{2}}{E_{i}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 49.5 | -1.83 | 0.47 |  |  |  |  |
| $50-55$ |  |  |  | 0.08 | 2.56 | 6 | 4.62 |
|  | 55.5 | -1.25 | 0.39 |  |  |  |  |
| $56-61$ |  |  |  | 0.14 | 4.48 | 2 | 1.37 |
|  | 61.5 | -0.67 | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |
| $62-67$ |  |  |  | 0.21 | 6.72 | 6 | 0.08 |
|  | 67.5 | -0.09 | 0.04 |  |  |  |  |
| $68-73$ |  |  |  | 0.15 | 4.8 | 6 | 0.3 |
|  | 73.5 | 0.50 | 0.19 |  |  |  |  |
| $74-79$ |  |  |  | 0.17 | 5.44 | 7 | 0.45 |
|  | 79.5 | 1.08 | 0.36 |  |  |  |  |
| $80-85$ |  |  |  | 0.09 | 2.88 | 5 | 1.56 |
|  | 85.5 | 1.66 | 0.45 |  |  |  |  |

With $\alpha=1 \%$ and $\mathrm{dk}=6-3=3$, from the chi-square distribution table, obtained $X_{\text {table }}=11.3$. Because $X^{2}{ }_{\text {count }}$ is lower than $X^{2}$ table $(8.38<11.3)$. So, the distribution list is Normal.
b. Searching for the homogeneity of the control class and the experimental class.

Homogeneity test is used to find out whether the group is homogenous or not.

## Hypothesis :

$$
\begin{aligned}
& H_{o}: \sigma_{1}^{2}=\sigma_{2}^{2} \\
& H_{A}: \sigma_{1}^{2} \neq \sigma_{2}^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Test of hypothesis:

The formula is used:
$F=\frac{\text { Biggest variant }}{\text { smallest variant }}$
The Data of the research:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sigma_{1}^{2}=93.08 \quad \mathrm{n}_{1}=32 \\
& \sigma_{2}^{2}=63.73 \quad \mathrm{n}_{2}=34 \\
& \sigma_{1}^{2}=S_{1}^{2}=\frac{\sum(x-\bar{x})^{2}}{n_{1}-1} \\
& S_{1}^{2}=\frac{2885.48}{32-1}=93.08 \\
& \sigma_{2}^{2}=S_{2}^{2}=\frac{\sum(x-\bar{x})^{2}}{n_{2}-1} \\
& S_{2}^{2}=\frac{2102.96}{34-1}=63.73
\end{aligned}
$$

Biggest variant $(\mathrm{Bv})=93.08$
Smallest variant $(\mathrm{Sv})=63.73$
Based on the formula, it is obtained:
$F=\frac{\text { Biggest var iant }}{\text { smallest var iant }}$
$F=\frac{93.08}{63.73}$
$F=1.46$

With $\alpha=5 \%$ and $\mathrm{dk}=(32-1=31):(34-1=33)$, obtained $F_{\text {table }}=1.71$. Because $F_{\text {count }}$ is lower than $F_{\text {table }}(1.46<1.81)$. So, Ho is accepted and the two groups have same variant/Homogeneous.
c. Searching for the average similarity of the initial data between the control and the experimental classes.

To test the average similarity, data is analyzed using t-test.

## Hypothesis :

$H_{0}: \mu_{1}=\mu_{2}$
$\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{a}}: \mu_{1} \neq \mu_{2}$

## Description:

$\mu_{1}$ : average of experimental class
$\mu_{2}$ : average of control class

Table 12
The Average Similarity Test of Pre-Test of the Experimental and the Control Classes

| Source variant | Experimental class | Control class |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bar{x}$ | 68.3 | 66.2 |
| Variant $\left(\mathrm{s}^{2}\right)$ | 93.08 | 63.73 |
| N | 32 | 34 |

So, the computation t-test:

$$
\begin{aligned}
t & =\frac{\bar{X}_{1}-\bar{X}_{2}}{\sqrt{\frac{\left(n_{1}-1\right) s_{1}^{2}+\left(n_{2}-1\right) s_{2}^{2}}{n_{1}+n_{2}-2}\left(\frac{1}{n_{1}}+\frac{1}{n_{2}}\right)}} \\
& =\frac{68.3-66.2}{\sqrt{\frac{(32-1) 93.08+(34-1) 63.73}{32+34-2}\left(\frac{1}{32}+\frac{1}{34}\right)}} \\
& =\frac{2.1}{\sqrt{\frac{(31) 93.08+(33) 63.73}{(32+34-2)}(0.06)}}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =\frac{2.1}{\sqrt{77.95(0.06)}} \\
& =\frac{2.1}{\sqrt{4.677}}=\frac{2.1}{2.16}=0.97
\end{aligned}
$$

With $\alpha=5 \%$ and $\mathrm{dk}=32+34-2=64$, obtained $t_{\text {table }}=2.00$. Because $t_{\text {count }}$ is lower than $t_{\text {table }}(0.97<2.00)$. So, Ho is accepted and there is no difference of the pre test average value from both groups.
2. The Data Analysis of Post-test Value in Experimental Class and Control Class

1) The End Phase Analysis
a. Searching for normality data of post-test of the control and the experimental classes

Table 13
The List of Post-test Value of Control and Experimental Classes

| N <br> $\mathbf{0}$ | Experimental class |  |  |  |  | Control class |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Code of <br> the <br> students | $x_{1}$ | $\left(x_{1}-\bar{x}\right)$ | $\left(x_{1}-\bar{x}\right)^{2}$ | Code of <br> the <br> students | $x_{2}$ | $\left(x_{2}-\bar{x}\right)$ | $\left(x_{2}-\bar{x}\right)^{2}$ |
|  | D-1 | 75 | -6.3 | 39.69 | F-1 | 55 | -12.5 | 156.25 |
| 2 | D-2 | 90 | 8.7 | 75.69 | F-2 | 60 | -7.5 | 56.25 |
| 3 | D-3 | 85 | 3.7 | 13.69 | F-3 | 70 | 2.5 | 6.25 |
| 4 | D-4 | 65 | -16.3 | 265.69 | F-4 | 90 | 22.5 | 506.25 |
| 5 | D-5 | 90 | 8.7 | 75.69 | F-5 | 70 | 2.5 | 6.25 |
| 6 | D-6 | 70 | -11.3 | 127.69 | F-6 | 60 | -7.5 | 56.25 |
| 7 | D-7 | 70 | -11.3 | 127.69 | F-7 | 60 | -7.5 | 56.25 |
| 8 | D-8 | 65 | -16.3 | 265.69 | F-8 | 80 | 12.5 | 156.25 |
| 9 | D-9 | 85 | 3.7 | 13.69 | F-9 | 80 | 12.5 | 156.25 |
| 10 | D-10 | 90 | 8.7 | 75.69 | F-10 | 50 | -17.5 | 306.25 |
| 11 | D-11 | 90 | 8.7 | 75.69 | F-11 | 70 | 2.5 | 6.25 |
| 12 | D-12 | 85 | 3.7 | 13.69 | F-12 | 80 | 12.5 | 156.25 |
| 13 | D-13 | 85 | 3.7 | 13.69 | F-13 | 70 | 2.5 | 6.25 |
| 14 | D-14 | 90 | 8.7 | 75.69 | F-14 | 85 | 17.5 | 306.25 |
| 15 | D-15 | 70 | -11.3 | 127.69 | F-15 | 65 | -2.5 | 6.25 |
| 16 | D-16 | 65 | -16.3 | 265.69 | F-16 | 70 | 2.5 | 6.25 |
| 17 | D-17 | 90 | 8.7 | 75.69 | F-17 | 60 | -7.5 | 56.25 |
| 18 | D-18 | 85 | 3.7 | 13.69 | F-18 | 65 | -2.5 | 6.25 |
| 19 | D-19 | 80 | -1.3 | 1.69 | F-19 | 75 | 7.5 | 56.25 |
| 20 | D-20 | 90 | 8.7 | 75.69 | F-20 | 80 | 12.5 | 156.25 |


| 21 | D-21 | 90 | 8.7 | 75.69 | F-21 | 70 | 2.5 | 6.25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 22 | D-22 | 85 | 3.7 | 13.69 | F-22 | 85 | 17.5 | 306.25 |
| 23 | D-23 | 85 | 3.7 | 13.69 | F-23 | 60 | -7.5 | 56.25 |
| 24 | D-24 | 75 | -6.3 | 39.69 | F-24 | 65 | -2.5 | 6.25 |
| 25 | D-25 | 90 | 8.7 | 75.69 | F-25 | 65 | -2.5 | 6.25 |
| 26 | D-26 | 70 | -11.3 | 127.69 | F-26 | 70 | 2.5 | 6.25 |
| 27 | D-27 | 85 | 3.7 | 13.69 | F-27 | 50 | -17.5 | 306.25 |
| 28 | D-28 | 90 | 8.7 | 75.69 | F-28 | 60 | -7.5 | 56.25 |
| 29 | D-29 | 75 | -6.3 | 39.69 | F-29 | 55 | -12.5 | 156.25 |
| 30 | D-30 | 90 | 8.7 | 75.69 | F-30 | 55 | -12.5 | 156.25 |
| 31 | D-31 | 85 | 3.7 | 13.69 | F-31 | 55 | -12.5 | 156.25 |
| 32 | D-32 | 65 | -16.3 | 265.69 | F-32 | 75 | 7.5 | 56.25 |
| 33 |  |  |  |  | F-33 | 80 | 12.5 | 156.25 |
| 34 |  |  |  |  | F-34 | 55 | -12.5 | 156.25 |
|  | $\Sigma$ | 2600 |  | 2650.08 | $\Sigma$ | 2295 |  | 3812.5 |
|  | $X_{1}$ | 81.3 |  |  | $\bar{X}_{2}$ | 67.5 |  |  |

Based on the table above, the normality test:

## Hypothesis:

Ha: The distribution list is normal.
Ho: The distribution list is not normal

## Test of hypothesis:

The formula is used:

$$
X^{2}=\sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{\left(O_{i}-E_{i}\right)^{2}}{E_{i}}
$$

Table 14
The Normality Test of Post-test of Control Class

| Class <br> Interval | Limit <br> Class | Z for the <br> limit class | Opportunities <br> for Z | Size classes <br> for Z | $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{i}}$ | $\mathrm{O}_{\mathrm{i}}$ | $\frac{\left(O_{i}-E_{i}\right)^{2}}{E_{i}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 49.5 | -1.59 | 0.44 |  |  |  |  |
| $50-56$ |  |  |  | 0.11 | 3.74 | 7 | 2.84 |
|  | 56.5 | -0.96 | 0.33 |  |  |  |  |
| $57-63$ |  |  |  | 0.2 | 6.8 | 6 | 0.09 |
|  | 63.5 | -0.33 | 0.13 |  |  |  |  |
| $64-70$ |  |  |  | 0.27 | 9.18 | 11 | 0.36 |
|  | 70.5 | 0.29 | 0.40 |  |  |  |  |
| $71-77$ |  |  |  | 0.21 | 7.14 | 2 | 3.70 |
|  | 77.5 | 0.93 | 0.32 |  |  |  |  |
| $78-84$ |  |  |  | 0.12 | 4.08 | 5 | 0.21 |
|  | 84.5 | 1.56 | 0.44 |  |  |  |  |


| $85-91$ |  |  |  | 0.04 | 1.36 | 3 | 1.97 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 91.5 | 2.19 | 0.48 |  |  |  |  |
| $\sum$ |  |  |  |  |  | 34 | 9.17 |

With $\alpha=1 \%$ and $\alpha=5 \%, \mathrm{dk}=7-3=4$, from the chi-square distribution table, obtained $X_{\text {table }}=13.3$ and $X_{\text {table }}=9.49$. Because $X^{2}{ }_{\text {count }}$ is lower than $X_{\text {table }}^{2}(13.3>9.17<9.49)$. So, the distribution list is Normal.

Table 15
The Normality Test of Post-Test of Experimental Class

| Class <br> Interval | Limit Class | Z for the Limit Class | Opportunities for Z | Size <br> Classes for Z | $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{i}}$ | $\mathrm{O}_{\mathrm{i}}$ | $\frac{\left(O_{i}-E_{i}\right)^{2}}{E_{i}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 64.5 | -2.04 | 0.47 |  |  |  |  |
| 65-69 |  |  |  | 0.05 | 1.6 | 4 | 3.6 |
|  | 69.5 | -1.5 | 0.43 |  |  |  |  |
| 70-74 |  |  |  | 0.1 | 3.2 | 4 | 0.2 |
|  | 74.5 | -0.96 | 0.33 |  |  |  |  |
| 75-79 |  |  |  | 0.17 | 5.44 | 3 | 1.09 |
|  | 79.5 | -0.41 | 0.16 |  |  |  |  |
| 80-84 |  |  |  | 0.11 | 3.52 | 1 | 1.80 |
|  | 84.5 | 0.13 | 0.05 |  |  |  |  |
| 85-89 |  |  |  | 0.2 | 6.4 | 9 | 1.05 |
|  | 89.5 | 0.67 | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |
| 90-94 |  |  |  | 0.33 | 10.56 | 11 | 0.02 |
|  | 94.5 | 1.21 | 0.58 |  |  |  |  |
| $\Sigma$ |  |  |  |  |  | 32 | 7.76 |

With $\alpha=1 \%$ and $\alpha=5 \%, \mathrm{dk}=6-3=3$, from the chi-square distribution table, obtained $X_{\text {table }}=11.3$ and $X_{\text {table }}=7.81$. Because $X^{2}{ }_{\text {count }}$ is lower than $X_{\text {table }}^{2}(11.3>7.76<7.82)$. So, the distribution list is Normal.
b. Searching for homogeneity of the experimental class and the control class

Homogeneity test is used to find out whether the group is homogenous or not.

## Hypothesis :

$H_{o}: \sigma_{1}^{2}=\sigma_{2}^{2}$
$H_{A}: \sigma_{1}^{2} \neq \sigma_{2}^{2}$

## Test of hypothesis:

The formula is used:
$F=\frac{\text { Biggest var iant }}{\text { smallest var iant }}$

## The Data of the research:

$$
\begin{gathered}
\sigma_{1}^{2}=85.49 \quad \mathrm{n}_{1}=32 \\
\sigma_{2}^{2}=115.53 \quad \mathrm{n}_{2}=34 \\
\sigma_{1}^{2}=S_{1}^{2}=\frac{\sum(x-\bar{x})^{2}}{n_{1}-1} \\
S_{1}^{2}=\frac{2650.08}{32-1} \\
S_{1}^{2}=85.49 \\
\sigma_{2}^{2}=S_{2}^{2}=\frac{\sum(x-\bar{x})^{2}}{n_{2}-1} \\
S_{2}^{2}=\frac{3812.5}{34-1} \\
S_{2}^{2}=115.53
\end{gathered}
$$

Biggest variant $(\mathrm{Bv})=115.53$
Smallest variant $(\mathrm{Sv})=85.49$
Based on the formula, it is obtained:
$F=\frac{\text { Biggest var iant }}{\text { smallest var iant }}$
$F=\frac{115.53}{85.49}$
$F=1.35$
With $\alpha=5 \%$ and $\mathrm{dk}=(34-1=33):(32-1=31)$, obtained $F_{\text {table }}=1.35$. Because $F_{\text {count }}$ is lower than $F_{\text {table }}(1.35<1.83)$. So,

Ho is accepted and the two groups have same variant /

## Homogeneous.

c. Testing the similarity of average between experimental class and control class.

To test the average similarity, data is analyzed using t-test.

## Hypothesis :

Но: $\mu 1=\mu 2$
На: $\mu 1 \neq \mu 2$
Description:
$\mu 1$ : average of experimental class
$\mu 2$ : average of control class
Table 16
The Average Similarity of Post-Test of Experimental Class and Control Class

| Source variant | Experimental class | Control class |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bar{x}$ | 81.3 | 67.5 |
| Variant $\left(\mathrm{s}^{2}\right)$ | 85.49 | 115.53 |
| N | 32 | 34 |

So, the computation t-test:

$$
\begin{aligned}
t & =\frac{\bar{X}_{1}-\bar{X}_{2}}{\sqrt{\frac{\left(n_{1}-1\right) s_{1}^{2}+\left(n_{2}-1\right) s_{2}^{2}}{n_{1}+n_{2}-2}\left(\frac{1}{n_{1}}+\frac{1}{n_{2}}\right)}} \\
& =\frac{81.3-67.5}{\sqrt{\frac{(32-1) 85.49+(34-1) 115.53}{32+34-2}\left(\frac{1}{32}+\frac{1}{34}\right)}} \\
& =\frac{13.8}{\sqrt{100.97938(0.06)}} \\
& =\frac{13.8}{\sqrt{6.0587625}}=\frac{13.8}{2.46145536}=5.59 \\
& \text { With } \alpha=5 \% \text { and df }=32+34-2=64, \text { obtained } t_{\text {table }}=2.00
\end{aligned}
$$

Because $t_{\text {count }}$ is higher than $t_{\text {table }}(5.59>2.00)$.

From the result, it can be concluded that there is a difference in students' imagination score between students taught using song and those taught using non-song. The hypothesis is accepted.

## C. Discussion of Research Finding

The result of the research shows that the experimental class (the students who are taught using Indonesian pop song) has the mean mark 81.3. Meanwhile, the control class (the students who are taught using non-song) has the mean mark 67.5. It can be said that teaching descriptive writing using Indonesian pop song as a medium is more effective than conventional teaching.

Before giving the treatment, researcher checked the balance of the initial ability of the students of both classes. The data used to test the balance was the score of pre-test. Analysis of initial data was conducted through normality test that aimed at showing whether the data is normally distributed or not. This can be seen from the normality test with chi-square, where $X_{\text {count }}^{2}<X_{\text {table }}^{2}, \alpha=1 \%$ and $\alpha=5 \%, \mathrm{df}=3$. On the normality test of pre-test of the control class, it can be seen $X^{2}$ count $(4.96)<X^{2}{ }_{\text {table }}$ (11.3) and (7.81) and the experimental class $X_{\text {count }}$ (8.38) $<X_{\text {table }}^{2}$ (11.3) and (7.81). Since homogeneity test shows $F_{\text {count }}(1.46)<F_{\text {table }}$ (1.81), it can be concluded that the population is homogeneous. Based on the analysis of t -test at the pre-test, it is obtained $t_{\text {count }}=0.97$ with $t_{\text {table }}=2.00$ which proves that there is no difference of the average of pre-test between both classes. The normality test of post-test of control class results $X_{\text {count }}^{2}(9.17)<X^{2}$ table (13.3) and (9.49) and experimental class results $X^{2}{ }_{\text {count }}(7.76)<X_{\text {table }}$ (11.3) and (7.81). The posttest demonstrate that the hypotheses of those two classes are normal on the distribution. It is proved with $F_{\text {count }}(1.35)<F_{\text {table }}$ (1.83) from the homogeneity test that have the same variant.

From the last phase of the t -test, it is obtained $t_{\text {count }}=5.59$ with $t_{\text {table }}=$ 2.00 with the standard of significant $5 \%$. Because of $t_{\text {count }}>t_{\text {table }}$, so the zero
hypothesis $\left(\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{o}}\right)$ is rejected and alternative hypothesis $\left(\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{a}}\right)$ is accepted. It means that there are significant differences between the students' imagination who had been taught using Indonesian pop song as a medium and the students' imagination who had not given the same treatment.

There were many factors that influenced the result of study. One of the factors was teaching aids or media used in teaching. If a teacher employs an appropriate teaching aids or media that is suitable with the method, the students will enjoy the lesson. Based on the result of tests that had been done, it can be explained that using Indonesian pop song as a medium in the process of learning English at VIIID and VIIIF students of MTs Salafiyah Kajen Margoyoso Pati could facilitate students' imagination of how to write descriptive text. In addition, learning using song also provide new variation. So that, students can enrich their vocabulary by imagining the vocabularies that they heard from the song lyric, and hearing the song or music its self can stimulate the spirit of the students to be active in making a free writing of descriptive text.

In the process of learning, teacher should be resourceful in determining the classroom setting in order to make students focus on the lesson. For example, by the setting of the class tailored to the learning activities of students of experimental class, the students were more focus and the atmosphere of the class was not too rowdy. By using appropriate teaching aids, students find it easier to understand descriptive text material delivered by the teacher. A fun learning can stimulate the spirit of the students to be active. Connecting material with the experience or incident that occurred in surrounding environment and utilization of teaching aids such as song can stimulate and increase students' imagination. Students can clearly understand the process or steps in writing descriptive text.

Meanwhile, teaching learning process in the control class was implemented through lecturing using text. In this process, the teacher explained the material using text. At the beginning of the process, the students were given a pre-test to know the initial ability of the students. Then, the
students sat and paid attention to the teacher's explanation. However, students felt saturated with the material presented by the teacher because there were no interesting teaching aids or media used.

The ability of the students can be seen from the score of learning. Based on the research that had been done, it proved the average of students' imagination that found learning using song as a medium higher that is 81.3 compared to the average of the students who did not get learning using song as a medium that is 67.5 . The use of song as a medium in teaching descriptive writing has brought students to realize the minimum standard of score. T-test shows that $t_{\text {count }}$ has positive score. It means that the average score of students who had been taught using song as a medium is higher than the score of students who had been taught using conventional learning.

Thus, it can be concluded that learning English using Indonesian pop songs to arouse students' imagination in writing descriptive with the eight grade students of MTs Salafiyah Kajen Margoyoso Pati is effective to improve students' skill in writing descriptive text.

## D. Limitation of the Research

The writer realizes that this research had not been done optimally. There were constraints and obstacles faced during the research process. Some limitations of this research are:

1. Relative short time of research makes this research could not be done maximally.
2. The research is limited at MTs Salafiyah Kajen Margoyoso Pati.. So that when the same research will be gone in other schools, it is still possible to get different result.
3. The implementation of the research process was less perfect; this was more due to lake experience and knowledge of the researcher.

Considering all those limitations, there is a need to do more research about teaching descriptive writing using Indonesian pop songs as the medium. So that, the more optimal result will be gained.

