CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the data that were collected during the experimental research. The writer presents the result of pre-test and post-test which were done both in experimental and control group.

A. Pre-requisities Test

1. Analysis of Pre-test

The experimental group (class XI A) was given a pre-test on May 03rd, 2014 and control group (class XI C) was given a pre-test on May 17th, 2014. They were asked to make a report text based on their own concept.

a. Test of Normality

Test of normality was used to find out whether data of control and experimental group which had been collected from the research come from normal distribution or not. The result computation of Chiquadrate (X^2_{score}) then was compared with table of Chi-quadrate (X^2_{table}) by using 5% alpha of significance. If $X^2_{score} < X^2_{table}$ meant that the data spread of research result distributed normally.

Based on the research result of XI C students in the control group before they were taught report text without documentary film, they reached the maximum score 80 and minimum score 55. The range of score were 25. From the computation, the average score (X) was 67.8 and the standard deviation (S) was 8.18.

Table 1.
Table of the Frequency distribution of Control Group

Class Number	Class Interval	Frequency	Relative Score (%)
1	55.0 – 60.2	6	27.3
2	60.3 – 65.5	3	13.6
3	65.6 – 70.8	5	22.7
4	70.9 – 76.1	4	18.2
5	76.2 – 81.4	4	18.2
Sum		**22**	**100%**

Based on data processing with SPSS 17, writers' found that :

Tests of Normality

	rata_populasi	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.
skor_siswa	35.00	.073	69	.200*	.984	69	.524

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

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

Table 2

Data significance was 0.524. It means $P > \alpha$ = 0.524 > 0.05. Ho was accepted and Ha was rejected. So, data normally distributed.

Ha: The samples come from populations that are not normally distributed

Ho: The samples come from populations that are normally distributed

While from the result of XI A students in experimental group, before they were taught report text by using documentary film, was found that the maximum score was 85 and minimal score was 57. The range of score were 28. From the computation, the average score (X) was 71.4 and the standard deviation (S) was 8.96.

Table 3. Table of the Frequency distribution of Experimental Group

Class Number	**Class Interval**	**Frequency**	**Relative Score (%)**
1	57.0 – 62.8	5	22.7
2	62.9 – 68.7	4	18.2
3	68.8 – 74.6	3	13.6
4	74.7 – 80.5	6	27.3
5	80.6 – 86.4	4	18.2
Sum		**22**	**100%**

Based on data processing with SPSS 17 writers' found that :

Tests of Normality

	pre_con_group	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.
pre_ex_group	35	.106	69	.054	.977	69	.243

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Table 4

Data significance was 0.243. It means $P > \alpha$ = 0.243 > 0.05. The score was lower than t-table by using 5% alpha of significance (α=0.05). Ho

was accepted and Ha was rejected. So the initial data of experimental group distributed normally.

b. Test of homogeneity

Test of homogeneity was done to know whether sample in the research came from population that had same variance or not. In this study, the homogeneity of the test was measured by comparing the obtained sig. value with 5% alpha of significance (α=0.05). Thus, if the obtained score sig. value was higher than the 5% alpha of significance (α=0.05) or equal, it could be said that the Ho was accepted. It meant that the variance was homogeneous. The analysis of homogeneity test could be seen in table 5.

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

pre_test_con

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
478.288	16	3199	.212

Table 5. Test of Homogeneity

Because of sig. Value (P) ≥ α=0.05, 0.212 ≥ 0.05 so it could be concluded that both experimental and control group had no differences. The result showed both groups had similar variants (homogenous).

c. Test of difference two variants in pre-test between experiment and control group

After counting standard deviation and variance, it could be concluded that both group have no differences in the test of similarity between two variances in pre-test score. So, to differentiate whether the students' results of writing a news item text in experimental and control group were significant or not, the writer used t-test to test the hypothesis that had been mentioned in the chapter two.

Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	pre_con_group - pre_ex_group	.536	1.745	.210	.117	.956	2.552	68	.013

Table 6. T-test data processing with SPSS 17

After getting t-test result, then it would be consulted to the critical score of *ttable* to check whether the difference is significant or not. For a = 5% was found t_{table} = 0.13. Because of *t score* > *t table* , so it could be concluded that there was no significance of difference between the experimental and control group. It meant that both experimental and control group had same condition before getting treatments.

2. Analysis of Post-test

The experimental group was given post test on May 28th, 2014 and control group was given a post test on May 26th, 2014. Post-test was conducted after all treatments were done. Documentary film was used as aid in the teaching of report text to students in experimental group. Meanwhile, the students in control group were given treatment without documentary film. Post-test was aimed to measure students' ability after they got treatments. They were asked to make a report text after they read the text (for students in control group) and they watched documentary film (for students in experimental group).

a. Test of Normality

Test of normality was used to find out whether data of control and experimental group, which had been collected after they got treatments, came from normal distribution or not. The formula, that was used, was Chi-quadrate. The result computation of Chi-quadrate (X^2_{score}) then was compared with table of Chi-quadrate (X^2_{table}) by using 5% alpha of significance. If $X^2_{score} < X^2_{table}$ meant that the data spread of research result distributed normally.

Based on the research result of XI C students in the control group before they were taught report text without documentary film, they reached the maximum score 90 and minimum score 68. The range of score were 22. From the computation, the average score (X) was 75.3 and the standard deviation (S) was 78.4.

Table 7. Table of the Frequency distribution of Control Group

Class Number	**Class Interval**	**Frequency**	**Relative Score (%)**
1	68.0 – 72.6	5	22.7
2	72.7 – 77.3	6	27.3
3	77.4 – 82.0	3	13.6
4	82.1 – 87.2	6	27.3

5	87.3 – 91.9	2	9.1
Sum		**22**	**100%**

Based on data processing with SPSS 17, writers' found that :

Tests of Normality

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
post_con_group	.089	69	.200*	.977	69	.233

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

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

Table 8

Data significance was 0.233. It means $P > \alpha$ = 0.233 > 0.05. Ho was accepted and Ha was rejected. So, data normally distributed.

Ha: The samples come from populations that are not normally distributed

Ho: The samples come from populations that are normally distributed

While from the result of XI A students in experimental group, they were taught report text by using documentary film before, was found that the maximum score was 95 and minimal score was 70. The range of score were 25. From the computation, the average score (X) was 81.3 and the standard deviation (S) was 7.1.

Table 9. Table of the Frequency distribution of Experimental Group

Class Number	**Class Interval**	**Frequency**	**Relative Score (%)**
1	70.0 – 75.2	7	31.8
2	75.3 – 80.5	6	27.3
3	80.6 – 85.8	2	9.1
4	85.9 – 91.1	7	31.8
5	91.2 – 96.4	1	4.5
Jumlah		**22**	**100%**

Based on data processing with SPSS 17 writers' found that :

Tests of Normality

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
post_ex_group	.090	69	.200*	.982	69	.399

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

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

Table 10

Data significance was 0.399. It means $P > \alpha$ = 0.399 > 0.05. The score was lower than t-table by using 5% alpha of significance (α=0.05). Ho

was accepted and Ha was rejected. So the initial data of experimental group distributed normally.

b. Test of homogeneity

Test of homogeneity was done to know whether sample in the research came from population that had same variance or not. In this study, the homogeneity of the test was measured by comparing the obtained sig. value with 5% alpha of significance (α=0.05). Thus, if the obtained score sig. value was higher than the 5% alpha of significance (α=0.05) or equal, it could be said that the Ho was accepted. It meant that the variance was homogeneous. The analysis of homogeneity test could be seen in table 11.

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

pre_test_con

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
478.288	16	3199	.156

Table 11. Test of Homogeneity

Because of sig. Value (P) ≥ α=0.05, 0.156 ≥ 0.05 so it could be concluded that both experimental and control group had no differences. The result showed both groups had similar variants (homogenous).

c. Test of difference two variants in pre-test between experiment and control group

After counting standard deviation and variance, it could be concluded that both group have no differences in the test of similarity between two variances in pre-test score. So, to differentiate whether the students' results of writing a news item text in experimental and control group were significant or not, the writer used t-test to test the hypothesis that had been mentioned in the chapter two.

Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	post_con_group - post_ex_group	-6.304	2.421	.291	-6.886	-5.723	-21.629	68	.204

Table 12. t-test data processing with SPSS 17

After getting t-test result, then it would be consulted to the critical score of *ttable* to check whether the difference is significant or not. For a = 5% was found t_{table} = 2.204. Because of *t score* > *t table* , so it could be concluded that there was no significance of difference between the experimental and control group. It meant that both experimental and control group had same condition before getting treatments.

Based on the computation there was a significance difference between the teaching of report writing using documentary film and the teaching of report writing without documentary film for the eleven grade students of MA Roudlotut Tholibin. Teaching report with documentary film seemed to be more effective than teaching report without documentary film. It can be seen from the result of the test where the students taught writing by using documentary film got higher scores than the students taught writing without documentary film.

B. Discussions

The data were obtained from the students' achievement scores of the test of writing report texts. They were pre-test and post-test scores from the experimental and control group. The average score for experimental group was 71,4 (pre-test) and 81,3 (post-test). The average score for control group was 67,7 (pre-test) and 78,4 (post-test). The obtained t-test was 2.204, whereas the t-table was 1.67 for α = 5%. The t-test score was higher than the t-table (2.204 > 1.67). It was meant that Ha was accepted while Ho was rejected. Since t-test score was higher than the t-table, documentary film was effective media in improving students' report writing in MA Roudlotut Tholibin. Based on the finding, the writer assumes that documentary film may be used as one of alternative medium in the teaching writing of report text. There was a significance difference in the achievement between students in class XI A who were taught report text through the use of documentary film and students in class XI C who were taught report text without using documentary film (using text only). It was meant that the use of documentary film as media in the teaching of writing report text was very effective. The following was the simple tables of pre and post-test students' average score and students' average score of each writing components.

1. Students' Condition in Control Group

In this study, source of data as control group was class XI C. In the control group, there was not a new treatment in a teaching learning process. They were given a usual treatment. They were taught report writing using text as they had got. By using text as an aid in the teaching learning process, teacher had used a monotonous media that could not increase students' report writing. Students could not enjoy in writing and explore their ideas because they had to write what they had read from the text. It was proven with the control group's average in the post-test (78.4) which was lower than the experimental group (81.3).

2. Students' Condition in Experimental Group

   a. Analysis of Students' Writing Before Treatment (Pre-test)

      In the pre-test, students' ability in writing report text was low. Pre-test was conducted before the treatment. From the result of pre-test, it was known that students faced many difficulties in report writing. Sentences which were made by students, were influenced by Indonesian language. Students' ability was in low level when they had to arrange sentences to be a good paragraph by considering main idea. It meant that the idea was not clearly stated and the sentences were not well-organized to support the main idea. Students' word choice (fluency) was also far from being perfect. Not only the sequence of sentences which were made by students were not complete but also there were many difficulties in grammar and mechanic; therefore, students' ability of news item writing could not be understood. To minimize the number of students' mistakes in their writing, the researcher collected students' writing, gave correction, and returned the paper to them. From the correction of their mistakes, students' were supposed to learn more and improve their ability in news item writing.

   b. Analysis of Students' Writing After Treatment (Post-test)

      In the term of the product of the students' work, students'ability were collected and analyzed had been provided. Based on the analysis of students' ability, it was found that students' ability after getting treatment improved. In the treatment, students were given documentary film that was in line with the function of report text, its linguistic features, and its generic structure. The content was complete and relevance to the topic and the ideas were easy to understand. The sentences were well organized to support the main idea and in accordance with the sequence of event in the documentary film; however,

there were mistakes in grammar. Based on analyzed the students' ability in report writing, the finding showed that students' ability was in good level; although, there were still some mistakes that students had made like grammar. So, it could be concluded that the implementation of using documentary film as media in the teaching of report writing was very effective. It was proven with students' average score in experimental group was higher than control group. By considering the students' final score after getting treatment, the teaching of report writing using documentary film as media was better than without documentary film (text).

Based on t-test analysis that was done, it was found that the tscore (2,204) was higher than t-table by using 5% alpha of significance (1.67). Since *t score* > *t table* , it proved that there was a significant difference between the improvement of students achievement that was given a new treatment (using documentary film) and the improvement of students achievement that was given a usual treatment (using text).

C. The Disadvantages of Using Documentary film in the Teaching of Report Text

The disadvantages were described below:

1. It spent a lot of time to prepare the equipments like computer, LCD projector, and others.
2. It was not easy to find the appropriate documentary film that is related to the function of report text. In selecting documentary film, teacher has to consider documentary film duration and time for writing activity.

D. Limitation of Research

The writer realized that there were some hindrances and barriers in doing this research. The hindrances and barriers which occurred were not caused by inability of the researcher but caused by the limitation of the research like time, fund, and equipment of research.