CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY OF RESEARCH

4.1 Method of Research

This research used quantitative method. In this case, it was quasy-experimental research, which is divided in three parts, include pre-test, treatments and post test. These parts were done to find out the influence of facebook in teaching writing.

3.2 Source of Data

The research conducted at MA. Nurul Yaqin, one of Islamic school in Kota Gorontalo. In this case, the writer chooses the tenth grade as the source of data. The amount of students in tenth grade is 28 which consist of 15 men and 13 women. The reasons for choosing this grade because the writer wants to train them start from the first part of Senior High School and hopefully it will be develop in next grades.

3.3 Variable of Research

There were two variables in this research. In this research, the application of facebook as media was the independent variable. While, the dependent variable was a variable that is observed and measured in order to determine the effect of the independent variable. The students’ writing ability was the dependent variable.
3.4 Research Design

In design this research, the writer used quasi-experimental research, which was set by divide in three steps namely pre-test, treatments, and post test.

a. Pre-test

The pre-test was aimed to know the students’ basic ability in writing. It became initial information for the writer to measure the level of their writing ability. In this case, they asked to write short essay about certain topic. The topic was provided in the test, namely the review of students’ favorite movie or book; telling students’ impressing experience in holiday; and describing students’ favorite place which always be visited.

b. Treatments

In this part, the writer applied the facebook as their writing media. In this case, the writer had to make sure that all students already have facebook account. Then, writer made a group which the members were limited only for students who will be research object.

In the first treatment, I gave the title of writing in class meeting. The first topic was describing your (the students) favorite actress/actor/singer. Before they did the text, the writer gave an example of writing by describe favorite singer. In this case, it would be remain about tense which used in description essay by giving example, my favorite singer is ... She/he was born ..., etc. Then students are free to create their writing and posting it at the facebook group. The writer gave the comment or corrects their writing
also by facebook. Several results also were printed out for discussing in the next meeting.

The second treatment procedure was same with previous one. The writer entered the class by greeting, giving apperception and then showing them their previous results in treatment. Some correction was given especially in forming good sentences. Then, the writer gave the next topic about write a brief legend of historical story. It means that, it was kind of narration / narrative story. Thus, before they wrote the writer explained about narrative text; the definition, generic structure and the language would be used. Because that was short essay, so that students should make it in summary. Then, they would post the story in the group and the writers gave comment and prepare the result for the next treatment.

The third treatment was about telling your (the students’) unforgettable experience. As previous treatment, the writer began with explain about what they would going to write. In this case, the students would retell their impressing experience; happiness, sadness, frightened, embarrassing, and so on. While retelling, the writer remind that the students must use past tense by giving example of past verb. After all students understood, they could start to write and post their writing result in group.

The last treatment, students would going to write about a review of one your (the students’) favorite TV program. They would write about what program that mostly watched by the in daily and gave reason why they like it. Before they asked to write, the writer may discuss their opinion about
writing, what they think about using facebook in writing, they difficultness during writing in treatments and what good point of facebook in making the interest to write. Next, as usual, the students were demanded to posting their writing in facebook group and looked the corrections for better result in post-test. By this treatment, the writer would offer a new way in teaching and it can be proved that teaching and learning process are not only done in classroom.

c. Post-test

The last step was post-test. Post-test was done to know the students writing ability after treatments. It was aimed to measure whether the using of facebook in treatments give influence to improve students writing quality.

3.5 Technique of Collecting Data

The data collected trough test. In this case, this research used essay test as the instrument. The test contained instrument for asking students to make short essay. Then, the students result will be analyze according to the scoring rubrics. The instrument and rubric of scoring are available on appendixes.

3.6 Technique of Analyzing Data

Because this is quantitative research, it used statistic analysis in processing students’ writing result. This analysis would be done for both pre-test and post-test. By analyzing these data, the writer would know wheter the result is different, better or worse relating to research aim which find out the facebook influence in students’ writing. Logically, if the post test was better than pre test result, it could
be said that Facebook gave positive influence in writing. In this case, I used a rubric of scoring which is suggested by Siskandar adapt from *Contoh Silabus Berdiversifikasi dan Penilaian Berbasis Kelas* as described below.

**Table 1.**
**Table of Scoring Writing Ability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspek yang dinilai</th>
<th>Skor</th>
<th>Keterangan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grammar</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>- Hanya terdapat 1 atau 2 kesalahan kecil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>- Hanya beberapa kesalahan kecil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>- Terdapat 1 atau 2 kesalahan besar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>- Beberapa kesalahan besar membuat sulit dipahami, kurang menguasai penyusunan kalimat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>- Banyak kesalahan serius. Tidak menguasai penyusunan kalimat, hampir tidak dapat diaphami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vocabulary</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>- Menggunakan kosa kata dengan tepat dan beragam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>- Menggunakan kosa kata dengan tepat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>- Menggunakan kosa kata cukup tepat tapi terbatas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>- Menggunakan kosa kata terbatas tetapi tidak selalu tepat sehingga mengaburkan makna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>- Kosa kata sangat terbatas, penggunaan kosa kata tidak tepat dan pesan tak tersampaikan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spelling</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>- Tidak ada kesalahan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>- Hanya 1 atau 2 kesalahan kecil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>- Beberapa kesalahan tetapi tidak mengganggu komunikasi dan tidak terlalu sulit dipahami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>- Beberapa kesalahan dan menggang komunikasi. Beberapa kata sulit dikenali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>- Banyak kesalahan, banyak kata yang sulit dipahami, komunikasi sulit dipahami</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Adapted from Siskandar, 2005)*
Next, the analysis continued to find out the normality test and hypothesis testing. These steps will be described as follow:

a. **Normality Testing**

The aimed of normality testing is to know whether the data are normal or not. Based on Sudjana (2005 p.468), the writer used Liliefors method by real stage \( \alpha = 0.05 \) with using procedures below:

a. Observation \( X_1, X_2, X_3, \ldots X_n \) to become deviation \( Z_1, Z_2, Z_3, \ldots Z_n \). The formula used was:

\[
Z_i = \frac{X_1 - X}{S}
\]

Notes:
- \( X \) = Average total score
- \( S \) = Total score deviation

In this case, standard deviation \( (S) \) can be calculated by formula:

\[
S^2 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i (x_i - \bar{x})^2}{n - 1}
\]

b. The distribution of normal was used for every deviation and the formula of deviation was: \( F(Z_i) = P(Z \leq Z_i) \)

c. The text procedure to count proportion \( Z_1, Z_2, Z_3, \ldots Z_n \) which small or similar with \( Z_i \). If the proportion stated with \( S(Z_i) \), thus:

\[
S(Z_i) = \frac{\text{Amount of } Z_1, Z_2, \ldots Z_n \text{ that } \leq Z_i}{n}
\]

d. The next step is to count the deviation \( F(Z_i) - S(Z_i) \) then to set the absolute value.

e. Last, is taking the big value deviation and called as \( L_0 \).

To find out whether the data counting is normal distributed or not, it used the criteria namely the data is normal if \( t\text{-count} \leq t\text{-table} \). The value of \( t\text{-table} \) was found from Liliefors table in \( \alpha = 0.05 \) and \( n = 28 \).
After the data would have collected and analyzed, the writer calculated the students’ ability in writing by using t-testing formula as follow:

\[ t = \frac{\bar{D}}{\sqrt{\frac{\sum D^2 - (\sum D)^2}{N (N - 1)}}} \]

Notes:
\( t \) = the value of \( t \) for correlated sample
\( \bar{D} \) = the average difference between the score of pre-test and post-test for each sample
\( \sum D^2 \) = the amount of \( D \) quadrate
\( \sum D \) = the amount of average difference score of pre-test and post-test
\( N \) = the amount of sample

(Arikunto, 2010:395)

b. Hypothesis Verification

In verifying the hypothesis of this research, the writer used the level of significance \( \alpha = 0.05 \) with the criteria as follows:

- \( H_0 : \ H_0_1 = H_0_2 \)
- \( H_1 : \ H_0_1 \neq H_0_2 \)
  - \( O1 \) : Pre–test
  - \( O2 \) : Post–test

Note: Reject \( H_0 \) if \( \text{tab} \geq t \text{ count} \)

Receive \( H_0 \) \( t \)-count \( \leq t \)-table

From these formula, it could be summarized that the hypothesis was rejected if \( t \)-table was smaller than \( t \)-count (\( t \)-table \( \leq t \)-count) and the hypothesis was received if \( t \)-table was bigger than \( t \)-count (\( t \)-table \( \geq t \)-count).