

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **FINDING AND INTERPRETATION**

In this chapter, the writer discusses: (a) findings and (b) interpretation.

#### **A. Findings**

The findings of this research were to find out: (1) data descriptions, (2) prerequisite analysis, and (3) result of hypothesis testing.

##### **1. Data Descriptions**

In the data descriptions, distribution of frequency data and descriptive statistics were analyzed.

###### **a. Distribution of Frequency Data and Descriptive Statistics**

In distribution of frequency data, score, frequency, percentage, were analyzed and in descriptive statistics, total number of sample (N), minimum score, maximum score, mean score, and standard deviation were analyzed. The scores were got from: (1) pretest scores in control and experimental groups, (2) posttest scores in control and experimental groups.

### a.1. Students' Pretest Scores in Control and Experimental Groups

**Table 6**  
**Distribution of Frequency Data and Descriptive Statistics on**  
**Students' Pretest Scores in Control and Experimental Groups**

	N	Distribution of Frequency			Descriptive Statistics			
		Score Interval	Category	Frequency (%)	Min	Max	Mean	SD
<b>Control Group</b>	39	80-100	Excellent	0 (0%)	48.50	70.50	61.1795	5.41135
		70-79	Good	2 (5.1%)				
		60-69	Fair	26 (66.7%)				
		50-59	Poor	10 (25.6%)				
		Below 49	Very Poor	1 (2.6%)				
<b>Experimental Group</b>	39	80-100	Excellent	0 (0%)	50.00	67.00	60.1026	4.77132
		70-79	Good	0 (0%)				
		60-69	Fair	22 (56.4%)				
		50-59	Poor	17 (43.6%)				
		Below 49	Very Poor	0 (0%)				

*Source: SMP Muhammadiyah 7 Palembang Academic Year (2014/2015)*

Based on the Table 6 above, it was found that the total number of sample was 39 students. There were 2 students in good category, 26 students in fair category, 10 students in poor category, and 1 student in very poor category. Then, the minimum score was 48.50, the maximum score was 70.50, the mean score was 61.1795, and the score of standard deviation was 5.41135. It could be assumed that the result of students' pretest scores in control group were in average level. It means that the students in control group did not need the treatment.

Meanwhile, the total number of sample in experimental group was 39 students. There were 22 students in fair category, and 17 students in poor category. Then, the minimum score was 50.00, the maximum score was 67.00, the mean score was 60.1026, and

the score of standard deviation is 4.77132. It could be assumed that the result of students' pretest in experimental group are in poor level. Therefore, the students' in experimental group need to give treatment. It was because the mean score students in experimental group and it can be stated that the mean score of students' pretest in experimental group were lower than the mean score of students' pretest in control group.

#### a.2. Students' Posttest Scores in Control and Experimental Groups

**Table 7**  
**Distribution of Frequency Data and Descriptive Statistics on Students' Posttest Scores in Control and Experimental Groups**

	N	Distribution of Frequency			Descriptive Statistics			
		Score Interval	Category	Frequency (%)	Min	Max	Mean	SD
<b>Control Group</b>	39	80-100	Excellent	2 (5.1%)	49.50	83.00	67.4487	7.20087
		70-79	Good	12 (30.8%)				
		60-69	Fair	21 (53.8%)				
		50-59	Poor	4 (10.3%)				
		Below 49	Very Poor	0 (0%)				
<b>Experimental Group</b>	39	80-100	Excellent	14 (35.9%)	65.00	87.00	76.9487	5.73974
		70-79	Good	21 (53.8%)				
		60-69	Fair	4 (10.3%)				
		50-59	Poor	0 (0%)				
		Below 49	Very Poor	0 (0%)				

Based on the Table 7 above, it was found that the total number of sample was 39 students. There were 2 students in excellent category, 12 students in good category, 21 students in fair category, and 4 students in poor category. Then, the descriptive statistics from students' posttest scores in control group found that the

minimum score was 49.50, the maximum score was 83.00, the mean score was 67.4487, and the score of standard deviation was 7.20087. It could be assumed that the result of students' posttest in control group were in average level. There were many students in fair and poor category.

Meanwhile, the total number of sample in experimental group was 39 students. There were 14 students in excellent category, 21 students in good category, and 4 students in fair category. Then, the descriptive statistics from students' posttest scores in experimental group found that the minimum score was 65.00, the maximum score was 87.00, the mean score was 76.9487, and the score of standard deviation was 5.73974. It could be assumed that the result of students' posttest scores in experimental group were higher than students' posttest scores in control group and the students' scores increased after being given the treatment. It was proven that there were not students' posttest scores in poor and very poor categories and the mean score on students' posttest in experimental group were higher than the mean score on students' posttest in control group.

## 2. Pre-requisite Analysis

In the pre-requisite analysis, normality and homogeneity were analyzed.

### a. Normality Test

In the normality test, the scores were got from: (1) students' pretest scores in control and experimental groups, and (2) students' posttest scores in control and experimental groups.

#### a.1. Students' Pretest Scores in Control and Experimental Groups

From the table analysis, it was found the p-output from students' pretest in control group is 0.810 and experimental group is 0.545. From the score, it could be stated that the students' pretest score in control and experimental groups were considered normal since the result of the 1-sample kolmogorov-smirnov were higher than 0.025. The illustration of result analysis is described in the following Table 8.

**Table 8**  
**Normality Test of Students' Pretest Scores**  
**in Control and Experimental Groups**

No	Students' Pretest	N	Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z	Sig. (2-tailed)	Result
1	Control Group	39	0.638	0.810	Normal
2	Experimental Group	39	0.799	0.545	

### a.2. Students' Posttest Scores in Control and Experimental Groups

From the table analysis, it was found the p-output from students' posttest in control group is 0.957 and experimental group is 0.746. From the score, it could be stated that the students' posttest score in control and experimental groups were considered normal since the result of the 1-sample kolmogorov-smirnov were higher than 0.025. The illustration of result analysis is described in the following Table 9.

**Table 9**  
**Normality Test of Students' Posttest Scores in Control and Experimental Groups**

No	Students' Posttest	N	Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z	Sig. (2-tailed)	Result
1	Control Group	39	0.510	0.957	<b>Normal</b>
2	Experimental Group	39	0.679	0.746	

### b. Homogeneity Test

In the homogeneity, Levene analysis was used to analyze the students' pretest and posttest scores in control and experimental groups.

#### b.1. Students' Pretest Scores in Control and Experimental Groups

Based on measuring homogeneity test, it was found that the significance level is 0.780. From the result of the output, it can be stated that the students' pretest in control and experimental group was homogeny since it was higher than 0.05. The result of homogeneity test is figured out in Table 10.

**Table 10**  
**Homogeneity Test on Students' Pretest Scores**  
**in Control and Experimental Groups**

No	Students' Pretest	N	Levene Statistics	Sig.	Result
1	Control Group	39	0.078	0.780	Homogen
2	Experimental Group	39			

### **b.2. Students' Posttest Scores in Control and Experimental Groups**

Based on measuring homogeneity test, it was found that the significance level is 0.373. From the result of the output, it can be stated that the students' posttest in control and experimental group was homogeny since it was higher than 0.05. The result of homogeneity test is figured out in Table 11.

**Table 11**  
**Homogeneity Test on Students' Posttest Scores**  
**in Control and Experimental Groups**

No	Students' Posttest	N	Levene Statistics	Sig.	Result
1	Control Group	39	0.802	0.373	Homogen
2	Experimental Group	39			

## **3. Result of Hyphotesis Testing**

### **a. Measuring the significant difference on students' writing achievement**

In this study, independent sample t-test and paired sample t-test were conducted to measure the significant difference on students' writing narrative text achievement before and after being taught by

using POW + WWW W=2 H=2 strategy and strategy that used by teacher at SMP Muhammadiyah 7 Palembang.

### a.1 Independent Sample T-Test

**Table 12**  
**The Result of the Independent Sample T-Test**

POW + WWW W=2 H=2 Strategy and Teacher's Strategy	Independent Sample T-Test					
		T	Df	Sig. (2-Tailed)	Ho	Ha
	Before	0.932	76	0.354	Accepted	Rejected
After	6.443	76	0.000	Rejected	Accepted	

Based on the table above, it was found that p-output was 0.354 with  $df=76$  (2.000), and  $t\text{-value}= 0.932$ . It can be stated that there was no significant difference on students' writing narrative text achievement before being taught by using POW + WWW W=2 H=2 strategy and teacher's strategy since p-output was lower 0.05. It was concluded that the null hypothesis (Ho) was accepted, and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) was rejected.

Meanwhile, it was found that the p-output was 0.000 with  $df=76$  (2.000), and  $t\text{-value}= 6.443$ . It can be stated that there was significant difference on students' writing narrative text achievement after being taught by using POW + WWW W=2 H=2 strategy and strategy that used by teacher since p-output was lower 0.05. It was concluded that the null hypothesis (Ho) was rejected, and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) was accepted.

### a.2. Paired Sample T-Test

**Table 13**  
**The Result of Paired Sample T-Test**

Control Group (Teacher's Strategy)	Paired Sample T-Test			Ha
	T	Df	Sig. (2-Tailed)	
	5.483	38	0.000	Accepted
Experimental Group (POW + WWW W=2 H=2 Strategy)	16.132	38	0.000	Accepted

From the table analysis of pretest and posttest in control group, it was found that p-output was 0.000 with df= 38 (2.042), and t-value was 5.483. Meanwhile, pretest and posttest in experimental group, it was found that p-output was 0.000 with df= 38 (2.042), and t-value was 16.132. Since the p-output was lower than 0.05 and t-value was higher than value of t-table, it was concluded that the null hypothesis (Ho) was rejected and alternative hypothesis (Ha) was accepted. It is described in Table 13.

### b. Measuring Students' Responses on the Implementation of POW + WWW W=2 H=2 Strategy

In this study, questionnaire was used to find out students' response on the implementation of POW + WWW W=2 H=2 Strategy that they had learned in writing narrative text, questionnaire constructed by the

writer himself and it was presented by using closed statements. The questionnaire was given to the experimental group only and to ask the students' responses on the questionnaire the writer used Quipper School Indonesia as online learning media which is accessed from <http://www.quipperschool.com>. In general, most of students gave positive responses on the statements given.

**Table 14**  
**The Questionnaire Result**

Number of Questionnaire	Positive Response		Negative Response	
	Students	Percentage	Students	Percentage
1	39	100%	0	0%
2	35	89.7%	4	10.3%
3	34	87.2%	5	12.8%
4	38	97.4%	1	2.6%
5	37	94.9%	2	5.1%
6	33	84.6%	6	15.4%
7	39	100%	0	0%
8	35	89.7%	4	10.3%
9	39	100%	0	0%
10	38	97.4%	1	2.6%
11	35	89.7%	4	10.3%

Based on the table above, it could be assumed that most of students in experimental group gave positive responses in implementing POW+ WWW W=2 H=2 Strategy. It seems that, the students agreed POW+ WWW W=2 H=2 Strategy improved their writing narrative text achievement and writing ability in many aspects.

## **B. Interpretation**

Based on the findings, the researcher made some interpretations. They were the sampling obtained, the differences students' pretest scores of both classes, treatment, the differences students' posttest scores of both groups, and conclusion.

First, based on the percentage analysis the researcher had taken two conclusion. Firstly, the percentage of students' pretest to posttest in control group. The students' pretest scores were in average level. It was because there were two students in good category. On the other hand, the students' posttest scores were in average level. Although there were two students in excellent category. The researcher concluded that the students' posttest scores in control group were in average level. Because there was two students in excellent category and there were many students in fair and poor category. It was emphasized that the students' pretest to posttest score in control group in control group got slightly increased since the students got treatment.

Second, the different result of students' pretest to posttest in control and experimental group. The researcher had interpreted about students' scores in control and experimental groups. Students' pretest in control group were in average level and students' score in experimental were in poor level. It was caused by the researcher did not gave the treatment to the experimental group. The students' scores in control group were a bit better than the students' scores in experimental group.

Furthermore, the students' posttest in control group were in average level. The researcher assumed that it was because by the control group did not gave the treatment using POW + WWW W=2 H=2 Strategy. Although, students' posttest in control was in average level. There were two students in excellent category. Meanwhile, the students' posttest in experimental group was in good level. It was because by the treatment using POW + WWW W=2 H=2 Strategy. The Strategy made the students' in experimental group to be active and improved their writing in learning English. It was supported Westwood (2008, p.76) states that POW + WWW W=2 H=2 was helping students think productively before writing, and then to sequence their ideas logically, add relevant detail, impose structure on their text, and then review and improve their first draft.

Third, there was significant students achievement in experimental group through POW + WWW W=2 H=2 Strategy during treatment in 10 meetings. In the second to third meetings, the students were still confused to do the steps of POW + WWW W=2 H=2 Strategy. The researcher explained and discussed together with the students about the acronyms, purpose, and benefit of the strategy. Then, the second steps was organize their notes (the "O" in POW), and ask the students with WWW W=2 H=2 strategy then the researcher elicits the students to write their idea in graphic organizer. When all seven parts of a story have been included. The last step was writing stage (the "W" in POW). The students were encouraged to write more by adding exciting words to their stories. It is in

line with Lieneman and Reid (2012, p. 16) state that POW + WWW W=2 H=2 strategy is a strategy that helps students write better stories. The POW component of the strategy is designed to help students pick their idea, organize (plan), and write their story. The WWW What=2 How=2 component is intended to help students organize their notes (the “O” in POW). In the fourth to seventh meetings, the students had memorized the strategy and they applied the strategy in learning writing skill. In the eighth to eleventh meetings, the students felt the benefit of the strategy because it leads them to planning of the story, step by step to write better their stories. Those findings could be supported by the differences between students’ pretest and posttest scores in experimental group were in poor level to be in good level.

Fourth, based on the differences between students’ posttest scores in control and experimental groups. The score in experimental group were in good level. Whereas the scores in control group were in average level. It was because the students of experimental group looked enjoyable in answering the test than the students of control group did during the posttest. Masroja (2012) mentioned that POW + WWW W=2 H=2 is a strategy that started by picking idea until how does the story end, and it will help the students to remind some important things that should be involved in writing narrative text such as the characters, the time, place, etc. Meanwhile, the scores in control group had difficult to answer the test. The researcher assumed that it was because the students did not focus

when the posttest began. It could be supported by the mean score posttest between two groups that obtained. Although the two groups of students had progress, the progress of the students in control group was not high as the progress of the students in experimental group. It was agree with Lieneman and Reid (2009, p. 16) state that POW + WWW W=2 H=2 Strategy have been shown to improve students' narratives and story writing.

In addition, it was also supported by the result of the questionnaire that shown the most of students in experimental group gave positive responses in implementing POW + WWW W=2 H=2 Strategy. It means that, the students agreed that the strategy improved their narrative writing ability in many aspects.

Finally, it was inferred that the use of POW + WWW W=2 H=2 strategy was effective in teaching and learning process. In addition, there was a significant difference on the eighth grade students' writing narrative text achievement who were taught by using POW + WWW W=2 H=2 strategy and those who were taught by using Teacher's Strategy of SMP Muhammadiyah 7 Palembang.