CHAPTER IV
FINDING AND DISCUSSION

A. Description of Research

This research was conducted by using experimental research. It described the effectiveness of using Mistake Buster Technique in teaching writing on recount text between class which was taught by Mistake Buster Technique (experimental class) and class which was taught without Mistake Buster Technique (control class). The implementation of this research is the classes was divided into two classes, they were VIII A as experimental class and VIII C as control class. The steps of both of classes consist of pre test and post test. For pre-test was given to experimental and control class before the students follow the learning process, after follow the learning process post-test was given to experimental and control class to obtain the data to be analyzed.

In this research, the pre test was given to experimental and control class to measure students' ability in writing recount text before giving the material. For experimental class was conducted on October 10th 2016 and for control class was conducted on October 11th 2016. From this Pre test was taken to both classes to know that two classes were normal and homogeneous.

After took pre test the students follow learning process that that given by the writer (treatment). The treatment was conducted to both of classes. It was conducted on October 12th and 17th 2016 for experimental class which was taught writing recount text by using Mistake Buster Technique. At this class the students were active and enjoy follow the learning process, because it was challenging for them. Meanwhile in control class was conducted on October 12th and 18th 2016 which was taught writing recount text without using Mistake Buster Technique (conventional method). In this class the students follow the learning process that usually used by their teacher.

The last step, students were given post test to measure students' ability after giving treatment. For experimental and control class it was conducted on October 19th 2016. From all of the steps the data analysis was analyzed based on the value of pre test which was done before giving material and post test was given after process of learning material.

B. Data Analysis

1. Analysis of Pre-test

Analysis of pretest was conducted to know the normality and homogeneity of data. Pre test was given to Experimental and control class. Each class consists of 29 and 30 students. They were asked to make a recount text with the same theme about unforgettable experience.

a. **Normality test**

Normally test is used to find out whether data of experimental and control class which had been collected from the research come from normal distribution or not. The researcher used liliefors to find out the distribution data in normality test. The initial data was used to normality test in pre test. Criteria of the test which used to significant level amount α = 5%, with approach 0,886 and df = 29 and 30. If $L_{count} \leq L_{table}$ so data was normal distributed, if $L_{count} > L_{table}$ so data was not normal distributed.

Table 4

The initial result of normality test

Class	L_{count}	DF	L_{table}	Criteria
Experimental	0.095	29	0.165	Normal
Control	0.090	30	0.162	Normal

Based on the table above, the normality test of initial data in experimental class (VIII A) for significant level α = 5% with DF = 29, obtained $L_{count} = 0.095$ and $L_{table} = 0.165$. Because $L_{count} \leq L_{table}$. So the conclusion, the data was normal distributed.

Meanwhile, normality test in control class (VIII C) for significant level α = 5% with df = 30, obtained

$L_{count} = 0.090$ and $L_{table} = 0.162$. Because $L_{count} \leq L_{table}$. So the conclusion, the data was normal distributed.

b. Homogeneity Test

Homogeneity test was used to get the assumption that sample of research came from a same condition or homogenous. In this research, the homogeneity of the test was measured by comparing the obtained score (F_{count}) with (F_{table}). Thus, if the obtained score (F_{count}) was lower than the (F_{table}) or equal, it could be said that the Ho was accepted.

Ho: $\sigma_1{}^2 = \sigma_2{}^2$

Ha: $\sigma_1{}^2 \neq \sigma_2{}^2$

According to the formula above, obtained that:

$$F = \frac{Vb}{Vk}$$

$$F = \frac{110.04}{102,76}$$

$$= 1,07$$

Table 5
The Initial Result of Homogeneity Test

Class	Variance (S^2)	N	Df	F_{count}	F_{table}	Criteria
Experimental	8.46	29	28	1.63	1.87	Homogeneous
Control	13.79	30	29			

Based on the computation above, it was obtained that F_{count} was lower than F_{table} so Ho was accepted. It could be concluded that data of pre-test from experimental and control class was homogeneous.

c. **Testing the Similarity of Average of the Initial Data between Experimental Class and Control Class**

The researcher used t-test to test the difference of average.

Ho: $\mu_1 = \mu_2$

Ha: $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$

Where:

μ_1: average data of experimental class

μ_2: average data of control class

Table 6
The Similarity of Average Result Initial Data between
Experimental Class and Control Class

Class	N	Average (X)	Variance (S^2)	Standard of deviation (S)	t_{table}	t_{count}	Criteria
Experimental	29	54.034	8.462	2.909	2.00	0.99	Ho accepted
Control	30	53.167	13.801	3.715			

$$S^2 = \frac{(n_1 - 1)s_1^2 + (n_2 - 1)s_2^2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2}$$

$$= \frac{(29-1)\,8.462 + (30-1)13.801}{29+30-2}$$

$$= 11.569$$

$$S = \sqrt{11.569}$$

$$= 3.401$$

$$t_{count} = \frac{54.034-53.167}{3.401\sqrt{\frac{1}{29}+\frac{1}{30}}}$$

$$= 0.99$$

With a = 5% and df = 29+ 30 - 2 = 57, obtained t_{table} 2.00.

Because t_{count} was lower than t_{table} (0.99 < 2.00), so Ho was accepted. It meant that there was not significance difference of initial average score from experimental and control class.

2. **Analysis of Post-test**

The experimental and control class were given post-test on October 19th, 2016. Post-test was conducted after all treatments were done. It was aimed to measure students' ability after they got treatments.

Mistake Buster Technique is used to teach writing recount text in experimental class. Meanwhile, students in control class were given treatment without Mistake Buster Technique.

Analysis of phase end was done to answer hypothesis of this research. The end analysis presents the result of pre-test and post-test that was done both in experimental and control class. This analysis will answer the research question "Is Mistake Buster Technique effective in teaching writing on recount text?" We can conclude that Mistake Buster Technique is effective when the result of post-test of the experimental class (using Mistake Buster Technique) and control class (without Mistake Buster Technique) had significant differences or the assumption that those classes was equal.

a. **Normality Test**

The initial data used to normality test in post-test. Criteria of test which used to significant level α = 5 %, Liliefors value was 0,886 and df =29 and 30. If $L_{count} \leq L_{table}$ so data was normal distributed dan if $L_{count} > L_{table}$ so data was not normal distributed.

Table 7

The Final Result of Normality Test

Class	L_{count}	DF	L_{table}	Criteria
Experimental	0.134	29	0.165	Normal
Control	0.122	30	0.162	Normal

On the table above, the normality test of initial data in experimental class (VIII A) for significant level α = 5% with df = 30, obtained L_{count} = 0.134 dan L_{table} = 0.165. Because $L_{count} \leq L_{table}$, so the conclusion, the data was normal distributed.

Meanwhile normality test in control class (VIII C) for significant level α = 5% with df = 30, obtained L_{count} = 0.122 dan L_{table} = 0.162. Because $L_{count} \leq L_{table}$, so the conclusion, the data was normal distributed.

b. **Homogeneity Test**

Homogeneity test was used to get the assumption that sample of research came from a same condition or homogenous.

Ho: $\sigma_1{}^2 = \sigma_2{}^2$

Ha: $\sigma_1{}^2 \neq \sigma_2{}^2$

According to the formula above, obtained that:

$$F = \frac{Vb}{Vk}$$

$$F = \frac{7.24}{5.33}$$

$$= 1.36$$

Table 8

The Final Result of Homogeneity Test

Class	Variance (S^2)	N	Df	F_{count}	F_{table}	Criteria
Experimental	5.33	29	28	1.36	1.87	Homogeneous
Control	7.24	30	29			

Based on the computation above, it was obtained that F_{count} was lower than F_{table} so Ho accepted. It can be concluded that data of post-test from experimental class and control was homogeneous.

c. **Hypothesis Test**

Hypothesis test was used to know whether there was a difference on post-test of experimental class and control class. The data which used to test the hypothesis was post test score both of classes. To test the difference of average used t-test.

Ho: $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \rightarrow$ It meant there was no significant difference writing recount text achievement of students who were taught by using Mistake Buster Technique and

who were taught without Mistake Buster Technique.

Ha: $\mu_1 > \mu_2$ → It meant there was significant difference between writing recount text achievement of students who were taught by using Mistake Buster Technique and who were taught without using Mistake Buster Technique.

Formula:

$$S^2 = \frac{(n_1 - 1)s_1^2 + (n_2 - 1)s_2^2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2}$$

$$= \frac{(29-1)\ 5.327 + (30-1)\ 7.236}{29+30-2}$$

$$= 6298$$

$$S = \sqrt{6298}$$

$$= 2.510$$

$$t_{count} = \frac{72.483 - 66.733}{2.510\sqrt{\frac{1}{29} + \frac{1}{30}}}$$

$$= 8.797$$

With a = 5% and df = 29 + 30 - 2 = 57, obtained t_{table} 1.67

Table 9
The Final Result of Homogeneity Analysis

Class	N	Average (X)	Variance (S^2)	Standard of deviation (S)	t_{table}	t_{count}	Criteria
Experiment	29	72.483	5.327	2.308	1.67	8.797	Ha accepted
Control	30	66.733	7.236	2.690			

Based on the computation above, it was obtained that the average ($\bar{X}$) of post-test of the experimental class who were taught by using Mistake Buster Technique was 72.483 and standard deviation (S) was 2.308. While the average ($\bar{X}$) of post-test of the control class who were taught without using Mistake Buster Technique was 66.733 and standard deviation (S) was 2.690, with df = 29 + 30 -2 = 57 by α = 5%, so obtained t_{table} = 1.67. From the result of calculation t-test t_{count} = 8.797. If compared between t_{count} and t_{table}, $t_{count} > t_{table}$. It meant, Ho was rejected and Ha was accepted. So, it can be concluded that there was significance difference of average score from pre-test and post-test of control class. From the calculation of interaction VIII A and VIII C, there was significance different between students who were taught by using Mistake Buster Technique and students who were taught without using Mistake Buster Technique.

C. Discussion

1. Students Average Scores in Pre-test and Post-test

The data were obtained from the students' achievement scores of writing recount text. They were pre-test and post-test score from the experimental and control class. The average score for experimental class was 54.034 in pre-test and 72.483 in post-test. The average score for control class was 53.167 in pre-test and 66.733 in post-test. The following was the simple tables of students' average score of each writing components.

Table 10
The Pre-test and Post-test Students' Average Scores of Each Writing Component

No	Component of Writing	Class	The Average Score of Pre-test	The Average Score of Post-test
1	Content	Experimental	15.03	19.58
		Control	15.30	19.23
2	Organization	Experimental	11.10	16.13
		Control	11	14.5
3	Vocabulary	Experimental	12.06	15.79
		Control	11.43	14.56
4	Grammar	Experimental	12.68	17.03
		Control	12.06	14.96
5	Mechanic	Experimental	3.13	3.93
		Control	3.36	3.46

2. **Students' Condition in Control Class**

In the control class, there was not a new treatment in the teaching learning process. They were given a usual treatment by using conventional method. They were taught writing recount text with monotonous technique. This aid in teaching learning process that teacher used less improve students' understanding on writing recount text which made students less in understanding writing recount text correctly. It was proved by the control class' average in the post-test (66.733) which was lower than the experimental class (72.483).

3. **Students' Condition in Experimental Class**

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

Pre-test was conducted before the treatment. From the result of pre-test, it was known that students faced many difficulties in writing recount text. The students' ability was in low level when they had to arrange sentences to be a good paragraph with correct grammatical. It meant that the idea was not clearly stated and the sentences were not well-organized. Not only the sequence of sentences which made by students was not complete but also there were many mistake in vocabulary, grammar and mechanic. They still tend to write about a text from material before. So, when they were asked to write recount text they were confused what they had to

write. To minimize their problems, the writer gave a little explanation about recount text in order to know a text that they wrote in a paper.

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

Based on the analysis of experimental class in the post test, it was found that students' understanding on writing recount text after getting treatment had higher achievement than in control class. In the treatment, the students were taught by using Mistake Buster Technique in teaching recount text for examples were function of recount text, generic structure, types and linguistic features. In this class, they could arrange one by one sentence although they had weakness in vocabulary. The students arranged and organized the sentences in paragraph with grammatical correctly. This was the aim of using Mistake Buster Technique because students not only understood but also knew how to write recount text with grammatical, because from the result of pre test most of them still used present tense in writing recount text.

Based on the result of t-test analysis, it was found that $t_{count} = 8,797$, and $t_{table} = 1.67$ for $a = 5\%$ with $df = ($ $n_1 + n_2 - 2$), because $t_{count} > t_{table}$, so Ha was accepted and Ho was rejected. It meant that there was a significant difference between the students' achievement on writing recount text that was given a new treatment using Mistake

Buster Technique was higher than achievement of students' ability on writing recount text that was not given a treatment. So, the using Mistake Buster Technique is effective in teaching writing on recount text.

4. **The Advantages and Weakness of Using Mistake Buster Technique in Teaching Writing on Recount Text**

After conducting the research, there are some advantages of using Mistake Buster Technique in teaching writing on recount text:

a. In applying this technique the students have the opportunity to identify the possible mistake, so it becomes the point to exercise the performance when they can find mistake something.

b. Applying this technique make the condition not be bored and quite, even full of being active students and fun because students try to go in and win the challenge.

c. Mistake buster technique can check and help students in understanding grammar and listening.

Meanwhile there are some weaknesses of using Mistake Buster Technique in teaching writing on recount text.

a. Some of students still shy to answer; they are hesitate to raise their hand.

b. The students are still confused with sentence who has read by the writer, because there are some vocabularies that they did not master.

D. Limitation of the Research

   The writer realized that this research had not been optimally. There were constrains and obstacles faced during the research process. Some limitations of this research were:

1. The research was limited at SMP Islam Asy Syafi'iyah Batealit Jepara and just used class VIII A and VIII C as sample. So, when the same research will be conducted in another school it still possible that different result will be gained.

2. Relative lack of experience and knowledge from the writer, so the implementation process of this research was less smooth. But the writer tried as good as possible to do this study in accordance with guidance from advisor.

   Considering all those limitations, it is necessary to do more research about teaching writing on recount text using the same or different technique. So, the more optimal result will be gained.