# CHAPTER IV

**RESEARCH FINDING and DISCUSSION**

## Data

The data was applied to qualitative and quantitative data. The qualitative data were taken from observation, interviews, and a note from diary activities students' had done. While quantitative is taken from the mean of students in taking writing tests. The class was VIII-6 which consisted of 30 students. This research is divided into two-cycle. Each cycle consisted of four steps action research (planning, observing, action, and reflection). Before doing the first cycle the writer was done a pre-test. The first cycle was done with two meetings, the second cycle was done with two meetings. So totally there was five meetings in this research.

### Quantitative Data

The quantitative data were taken from the result during conducted research in five meetings. The test was given in three times. The first meeting was given to do a pre-test without any treatment to the students, while the test after each cycle was given after the students got some treatments. In the pre-test, the students generally got some bad scores. In the first cycle, the students get any improvement. It can see in 4.1 some students got under a standard of minimum completeness of mastery. In the second cycle, the writer can see any improvement from the students in writing descriptive text it can be seen in 4.2. In the cycle two there are also any students who got under a standard of minimum completeness but the students can show the improvement by the value and not many as the first cycle. The writer made a comparison table in pre-test and post-test cycles 1 and 2. In the pre-test, the student got scores total of 1935,3. In post-test cycle 1 2204,05. The last cycle 2 total scores students 2621,6. It can be seen in table 4.3.

Table 4. 1 The data of Post-Test 1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| No | Initial Name | Cycle 1 |
| Pretest | Post-test | Grade |
| 1 | MYD | 57,5 | 77,5 | Good |
| 2 | TNZ | 57,5 | 62,5 | Fair |
| 3 | DO | 52,5 | 70 | Fair |
| 4 | NH | 46,2 | 55 | Poor |
| 5 | MDS | 58,7 | 66,2 | Fair |
| 6 | VAP | 78,7 | 82,5 | Very Good |
| 7 | UA | 76,2 | 82,5 | Very Good |
| 8 | DTM | 70 | 78,7 | Good |
| 9 | EGP | 76,2 | 81,2 | Very Good |
| 10 | MPS | 53,7 | 66,2 | Fair |
| 11 | REM | 46,2 | 61,2 | Fair |
| 12 | TA | 58,7 | 70 | Fair |
| 13 | PH | 67,5 | 78,7 | Good |
| 14 | SAH | 62,5 | 78,7 | Good |
| 15 | ABP | 73,7 | 82,5 | Very Good |
| 16 | MT | 58,7 | 61,2 | Fair |
| 17 | MAG | 73,7 | 82,5 | Very Good |
| 18 | P | 62,5 | 71,2 | Good |
| 19 | GRS | 53,7 | 66,2 | Fair |
| 20 | MR | 68,7 | 73,7 | Good |
| 21 | GBIT | 71,2 | 83,7 | Very Good |
| 22 | MBG | 73,7 | 78,7 | Good |
| 23 | FM | 61,2 | 66,2 | Fair |
| 24 | SDN | 67,5 | 78,7 | Good |
| 25 | NS | 58,7 | 71,2 | Good |
| 26 | RP | 75 | 82,5 | Very Good |
| 27 | L | 78,7 | 83,7 | Very Good |
| 28 | YN | 73,7 | 81,25 | Very Good |
| 29 | CS | 70 | 73,7 | Good |
| 30 | AF | 52,5 | 56,2 | Poor |

**Table 4.2 The Data of Post-Test 2**

**Students Writing Score for the second cycle**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| No | Initial Name | Cycle 2 |
| Pretest | Post-test | Grade |
| 1 | MYD | 57,5 | 82,5 | Very Good |
| 2 | TNZ | 57,5 | 95 | Excellent |
| 3 | DO | 52,5 | 87,5 | Very Good |
| 4 | NH | 46,2 | 78,7 | Good |
| 5 | MDS | 58,7 | 88,7 | Very Good |
| 6 | VAP | 78,7 | 100 | Excellent |
| 7 | UA | 76,2 | 87,5 | Very Good |
| 8 | DTM | 70 | 86,2 | Very Good |
| 9 | EGP | 76,2 | 92,2 | Excellent |
| 10 | MPS | 53,7 | 83,7 | Very Good |
| 11 | REM | 46,2 | 77,5 | Good |
| 12 | TA | 58,7 | 83,7 | Very Good |
| 13 | PH | 67,5 | 80 | Good |
| 14 | SAH | 62,5 | 82,5 | Very Good |
| 15 | ABP | 73,7 | 100 | Excellent |
| 16 | MT | 58,7 | 75 | Good |
| 17 | MAG | 73,7 | 95 | Excellent |
| 18 | P | 62,5 | 76,2 | Good |
| 19 | GRS | 53,7 | 71,2 | Good |
| 20 | MR | 68,7 | 86,2 | Very Good |
| 21 | GBIT | 71,2 | 100 | Excellent |
| 22 | MBG | 73,7 | 100 | Excellent |
| 23 | FM | 61,2 | 88,7 | Very Good |
| 24 | SDN | 67,5 | 100 | Excellent |
| 25 | NS | 58,7 | 82,5 | Very Good |
| 26 | RP | 75 | 95 | Excellent |
| 27 | L | 78,7 | 91,2 | Excellent |
| 28 | YN | 73,7 | 96,2 | Excellent |
| 29 | CS | 70 | 78,7 | Good |
| 30 | AF | 52,5 | 80 | Good |

**Table 4. 3 The Data of Pre-test, Post-Test 1, and Post-Test 2**

The increasing of the students writing scores from

pre-test, post-test I, and post-test II

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | Students’ initial | Pre-test | Post-test 1 | Post-test 2 | Grade |
| 1 | MYD | 57,5 | 77,5 | 82,5 | Very Good |
| 2 | TNZ | 57,5 | 62,5 | 95 | Excellent |
| 3 | DO | 52,5 | 70 | 87,5 | Very Good |
| 4 | NH | 46,2 | 55 | 78,7 | Good |
| 5 | MDS | 58,7 | 66,2 | 88,7 | Very Good |
| 6 | VAP | 78,7 | 82,5 | 100 | Excellent |
| 7 | UA | 76,2 | 82,5 | 87,5 | Very Good |
| 8 | DTM | 70 | 78,7 | 86,2 | Very Good |
| 9 | EGP | 76,2 | 81,2 | 92,2 | Excellent |
| 10 | MPS | 53,7 | 66,2 | 83,7 | Very Good |
| 11 | REM | 46,2 | 61,2 | 77,5 | Good |
| 12 | TA | 58,7 | 70 | 83,7 | Very Good |
| 13 | PH | 67,5 | 78,7 | 80 | Good |
| 14 | SAH | 62,5 | 78,7 | 82,5 | Very Good |
| 15 | ABP | 73,7 | 82,5 | 100 | Excellent |
| 16 | MT | 58,7 | 61,2 | 75 | Good |
| 17 | MAG | 73,7 | 82,5 | 95 | Excellent |
| 18 | P | 62,5 | 71,2 | 76,2 | Good |
| 19 | GRS | 53,7 | 66,2 | 71,2 | Good |
| 20 | MR | 68,7 | 73,7 | 86,2 | Very Good |
| 21 | GBIT | 71,2 | 83,7 | 100 | Excellent |
| 22 | MBG | 73,7 | 78,7 | 100 | Excellent |
| 23 | FM | 61,2 | 66,2 | 88,7 | Very Good |
| 24 | SDN | 67,5 | 78,7 | 100 | Excellent |
| 25 | NS | 58,7 | 71,2 | 82,5 | Very Good |
| 26 | RP | 75 | 82,5 | 95 | Excellent |
| 27 | L | 78,7 | 83,7 | 91,2 | Excellent |
| 28 | YN | 73,7 | 81,25 | 96,2 | Excellent |
| 29 | CS | 70 | 73,7 | 78,7 | Good |
| 30 | AF | 52,5 | 56,2 | 80 | Good |
| Total |  | 195,3 | 2204,05 | 2621,6 |  |

### The Qualitative Data

The qualitative data was taken from observation sheets, interview sheets, and diary notes.

1. Observation Sheet

The observation was used to observe all the conditions that happened during the teaching and learning process. This method is one of the most effective methods to complement the format and observations as an instrument. From this researcher, making observations can also make considerations in providing an assessment into a multilevel scale. For example, it is stated in the observations made by researchers to determine the teaching and learning process in the classroom. (Arikunto, 2010) It was filled by the English teacher as the observer. It was focused on the situation of the teaching-learning process in which example non-example method was applied; students activities and behavior students’ achievement in writing descriptive text and the interaction between teacher and students.

1. Interview Sheet

The interview was done with students. The interview was done three times, first one to find out the students' difficulties in writing English, second to find out the students' opinion about example non-example method, the last to find out the students' opinion in online learning.

1. Diary Notes

From the diary notes, it was found students had difficulties in writing descriptive text at the beginning of the research. It was found that many students were not interested to write a descriptive text. But they become interested and enjoyed writing descriptive text after the writer applied the example non-example method. By applying this method they could know how to write a descriptive text.

## Data Analysis

The data analysis was taken from the results of quantitative and qualitative data.

## Analysis of Quantitative Data

The Quantitative data were taken from the average value students' scores while doing a test. From pre-test, post-test cycle 1, and cycle 2. The first test as a pre-test was given without treatment. In pre-test the lowest number of students is 46,2 points and the highest is 78,7 points, then the total score of a student is 1935,3 and the number of the students who took the test was 30 students, so the mean of the students is 64,5 and it is still low. While in a post-test 1 that is cycle one were found the lowest student score is 55 points, and the highest is 83,7 points then the total score of a student is 2204,05. From the data above, it can be seen that there is an increase in student scores. Starting from the pre-test to post-test assessment in cycle 1. There are 12 students who have been able to pass the minimum standard of the curriculum. The author again conducted a post-test for the second cycle. In the regulations of the Ministry of National Education, learning it is written that to be successful if it reaches an average of 85%. In this post-test the lowest number of students is 71,2 points, the highest is 100 points then the total score of a student is 2612,6 so the mean of the student is 87,3. The writer given assignments to students after giving online teaching using WhatsApp and Google Meet applications. During the assignment, students are prohibited from leaving the meeting before the assignment is given to the teacher.

Table 4. 3 Student’ Writing Score

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | Students’ initial | Pre-test | Post-test 1 | Post-test 2 | Grade |
| 1 | MYD | 57,5 | 77,5 | 82,5 | Very Good |
| 2 | TNZ | 57,5 | 62,5 | 95 | Excellent |
| 3 | DO | 52,5 | 70 | 87,5 | Very Good |
| 4 | NH | 46,2 | 55 | 78,7 | Good |
| 5 | MDS | 58,7 | 66,2 | 88,7 | Very Good |
| 6 | VAP | 78,7 | 82,5 | 100 | Excellent |
| 7 | UA | 76,2 | 82,5 | 87,5 | Very Good |
| 8 | DTM | 70 | 78,7 | 86,2 | Very Good |
| 9 | EGP | 76,2 | 81,2 | 92,2 | Excellent |
| 10 | MPS | 53,7 | 66,2 | 83,7 | Very Good |
| 11 | REM | 46,2 | 61,2 | 77,5 | Good |
| 12 | TA | 58,7 | 70 | 83,7 | Very Good |
| 13 | PH | 67,5 | 78,7 | 80 | Good |
| 14 | SAH | 62,5 | 78,7 | 82,5 | Very Good |
| 15 | ABP | 73,7 | 82,5 | 100 | Excellent |
| 16 | MT | 58,7 | 61,2 | 75 | Good |
| 17 | MAG | 73,7 | 82,5 | 95 | Excellent |
| 18 | P | 62,5 | 71,2 | 76,2 | Good |
| 19 | GRS | 53,7 | 66,2 | 71,2 | Good |
| 20 | MR | 68,7 | 73,7 | 86,2 | Very Good |
| 21 | GBIT | 71,2 | 83,7 | 100 | Excellent |
| 22 | MBG | 73,7 | 78,7 | 100 | Excellent |
| 23 | FM | 61,2 | 66,2 | 88,7 | Very Good |
| 24 | SDN | 67,5 | 78,7 | 100 | Excellent |
| 25 | NS | 58,7 | 71,2 | 82,5 | Very Good |
| 26 | RP | 75 | 82,5 | 95 | Excellent |
| 27 | L | 78,7 | 83,7 | 91,2 | Excellent |
| 28 | YN | 73,7 | 81,25 | 96,2 | Excellent |
| 29 | CS | 70 | 73,7 | 78,7 | Good |
| 30 | AF | 52,5 | 56,2 | 80 | Good |
| Total |  | $∑x$ = 1935,3 | ∑x = 2204,05 | ∑x = 2621,6 |  |
|  |  | $\overbar{X}$ = 64,5 | $\overbar{X}$ = 73,4 | $\overbar{X}$ = 87,3 |  |

There are five times meeting was done by writer and get mean of students from the score that have done by test use formula :

$$\overbar{X}=\frac{∑x}{N} X 100\%$$

Where:

$\overbar{x}$: The pupils' average

∑x: The overall score.

N: Total number of a participant in the class

The mean of student score in every test

Pretest $\overbar{X}=\frac{1935,3}{30} X 100\%$= 64,5%

Post-test Cycle I $\overbar{X}=\frac{2204,05}{30} X 100\%$= 73,4%

Post-test Cycle II $\overbar{X}=\frac{2621,6}{30} X 100\%$= 87,3 %

 From the data above, the mean student's score in every test improved from 64,5% to 87,3%. It means that the example and non-example method could help students to improve their skills in writing. The result of students score in the writing test who got score ≥75 in each cycle can be seen in table 4.3.

That was calculated by applying the following formula:

$$P= \frac{R}{P } X 100$$

Where:

P: Percentage of pupils that received a score of 75 or above.

R: Number of students who received a score of 75

T: The total number of pupils who have taken the exam.

Pretest$ P1= \frac{4}{30 } X 100=13,3\%$

Post-test 1 $P2= \frac{15}{30 } X 100=50\%$

Post-test 2 $P3= \frac{29}{30 } X 100=96,6\%$

**Table 4. 4 The Result of score 75-100**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | Test | Total of students | Percentage |
| 1 | Pre-test | 4 | 13,3% |
| 2 | Post-Test Cyle I | 15 | 50% |
| 3 | Post-Test Cycle II | 29 | 96,6% |

In the pre-test, there are four student got a score≥ 75, whereas in Post-test 1 were fifteen students and post-test II were twenty nine students. The comparison of student's scores for each cycle can be seen in table 4.4

Table 4. 5 The Comparison of Student’s Score in Reading Comparison Test

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Name of Test | Lowest Score  | Highest Score  |
| Pre Test | 46,2 | 78,7 |
| Post Test I | 55 | 83,7 |
| Post Test II | 71,2 | 100 |

From the table above, it can be seen that students' scores keep improving. Pretest, the lowest score was 46,2, and the highest score was 78,7. In Posttest I, the lowest score was 55 and the highest score was 83,7. In Post test II, the lowest score was 71,2 and the highest score was 100. That score showed a significant improvement in the student's ability in writing skills.

## Analysis of Qualitative Data

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Qualitative Data** | **Cycle 1** | **Cycel 2** |
| 1. Observation
 | Students join the meet on time. Students also want to respond to the teacher's greeting. On Google Meet there are some students who still don't understand so the author continues the explanation through private chat. | Students have an improvement in joining on time to the point of wanting to open the camera while teaching. More and more students are more understanding in making texts. But all students still can't be regular in using the mic properly. |
| 1. Interview
 | Students have difficulty in finding topics and even distinguishing the structure from descriptive text. The difficulty that often occurs is finding vocabulary related to the topic they will write about. | Students are better able to sort things that need to be written in their essays. |
| 1. Diary Notes
 | The writer conducted research from February 11 to March 11, 2022, during 5 meetings the writer found that a lot happened. On the first day, there were still many students who didn't join the google meet. Students respond more often via WhatsApp. On the second day before the researcher started the study, the writer gave information so that students entered google meet in learning the example non-example method. So that students are willing to join through Google meet even though they don't turn on the camera but still respond to the teacher's explanation and they active in distinguishing example and non-example images.. | Then on the third day, the post-test was carried out for the first cycle. Many students only join via WhatsApp because it is raining so the signal is bad. The teacher no longer does the explanation. The fourth day is due to the low grades of students. The writer returned to cycle 2 but on the fourth day, the writer explained again about example non-example. Students want to turn on the camera and only four students still join via WhatsApp. The fifth day is a Post-Test for cycle 2. Students joined on time and understand more about how to apply the example non-example method. |

## The Research Findings

The result indicated that there was an improvement in students' writing ability in the descriptive text through the example non-example method of the two-cycle. Cycle I consisted of two meetings and cycle II also consisted of two meetings. After collecting the data, the total mean score of students in the pre-test was 1935,3 where cycle I was 2204,05 and cycle II was 2621,6. Cycle I and cycle II were done by using the example and non-example method as the treatment. It was shown by improvement in the mean of students' scores from cycle I and cycle II. Then, the observation sheet showed that students were more active in learning. While the interview sheet showed that students were interested in example non-example. The writer’s diary also showed not only the score but also the duration of the students. Previously they completed the text in forty minutes and above. However, after post-test cycle II students who joined Google Meet submitted their assignments on time in thirty minutes.

## 4.4 Discussion

Example non example (Istarani, 2012), this method is learning by presenting material to learners through a parade applicable bitmap, and intellects have the opportunity to parse the images single or in groups and discuss the images. This means that picture can improve the writing skill. This method has been used by several previous researchers from speaking to writing.The first relevant research is from (Marsani, 2018). The title of this research is "Improving Students' Speaking Ability Using Examples Non-Examples Method at the Eight Grade of Student of SMP Somba Opu Gowa". The goal of this research was to find out a posteriori proof about the appearance of using Example Non-Example on graduates’ speaking skills.

Non-example examples have been used to improve students' writing at SMPN5 Percut Sei Tuan. The authors found an increase both qualitatively and quantitatively. According to the author, many have used this method in writing, it can be seen from 2.8 previous studies.

From this research, the writer can find an improvement in students' writing so that the author strongly supports and suggests that further research both in teaching this method can be used even more so that students understand more about essay writing and have a lot of vocabulary to be poured into the text.