CHAPTER IV
RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, it is presented the result of research as follows:

4. 1. Research Findings

In research findings, there were three steps which I have done to do that, namely pre-test, treatment and post-test.

4.1.1 The Data Description of the Pre-Test

After giving pre-test to the students, it is got the students’ result toward writing descriptive text, dealing with topic “Supiyanto, My English Teacher.” (See appendix 13 on page 68-69).

Based on the table of interval frequency of Pre-Test Data in appendix 9 on page 64, it could be concluded that the students’ ability toward writing descriptive text was decreased.

In fact, the interval frequency of Pre-Test Data has been derived from the steps as follows:

1.) The total number of students as sample in pre-test was 28 students
2.) The students’ lowest score was 20 (See appendix 13 on page 68)
3.) The students’ highest score was 65 (See appendix 13 on page 68)
4.) The mean of score was 30.89 (See appendix 10 on page 65)
5.) The range of interval class (R) was 45

It is derived from:

\[ R = \text{the student’s highest score} – \text{the student’s lowest score} \]
6.) The amount of class interval (K) was 6

   It is derived from:

   \[ K = 1 + 3.3 \log n \]

   \[ = 1 + 3.3 \log 28 \]

   \[ = 1 + 3.3 \cdot 1.447 \]

   \[ = 1 + 4.775 \]

   \[ = 5.775 \Rightarrow 6 \]

7.) The width of class interval (P) was 8

   \[ P = \frac{R}{K} = \frac{45}{6} = 7.5 \Rightarrow 8 \]

8.) The standard deviation was 12.77, see appendix 10 on page 65
Here is the following polygon graphic of writing descriptive text in pre-test data. It can describe clearer about students’ result.

**Figure 4.1**

The Polygon Graphic of Writing in Pre-Test

![Students' Score in Pre-test](image)

From the figure above, it is very obvious that the students’ highest score in pre-test is about 60-65 and the lowest score is 20-27. Also, from the figure above, the students’ score in pre-test is showed that there are 14 students who get 20-27 (50%) as the lowest score, 2 students get score 60-65 (7.14%) as the highest score. Meanwhile, there were 7 students get score 28-35 (25%), 2 students get 36-43 (7.14%), 3 students get score 44-51 (10.71%), and 0 student get score 52-59 (0%).

It can be concluded that the students’ result of writing descriptive text in pre-test was decreased.
4.1.2 The Data Description of Treatment

The researcher gave the treatment to the students about six times. The class which was conducted by me is VII\textsuperscript{C} of SMP N 1 Boliyohuto that has 28 students. Below is the description of each treatment.

*Treatment I*

After I did pre-test in that class, I was doing first treatment to the students which I firstly explained about the concept of descriptive text which contains of the definition, the function and the generic structures as well. Then, I was explaining to the students about mind mapping; the definition of mind mapping, the steps of mind mapping and the usage of mind mapping into descriptive text. At that moment, I provided the students the text of descriptive. The title of that text was *My Bombi*. I was invited the students to identify that topic by using mind mapping technique.

*Treatment II*

The next treatment, I did something like in the previous treatment. Actually, I gave the the text of descriptive to the students. The tittle of that text was *My Diva*. The students were asked to identify that text by using mind mapping technique. They were informed to finish that by their own selves.

*Treatment III*

In this case, I did the third treatment which it looked like with in the previous treatment. In addition, I gave the topic of descriptive text to the students.
The title of that text was *My Hero*. The students were asked to identify that topic by using mind mapping technique.

*Treatment IV*

In this treatment, I invited the students to remind first about mind mapping technique and the usage of that technique into descriptive text. The, I divided the students into five groups and each group had to write a descriptive text by using mind mapping technique.

*Treatment V*

In the fifth treatment, I instructed to the students to form five groups anymore and each group was ordered to write on descriptive by using mind mapping technique. The students felt free to choose what topic that good to be arranged by the students. Each group discussed their own topic to be written by using mind mapping technique.

*Treatment VI*

In the last treatment, the students were asked to make a descriptive text by using mind mapping technique. They did it by their own self.

4.1.3 The Data Description of the Post-Test

The data description of post test has derived from the result of post-test. In this case, the written text used mind mapping as the technique to write before
producing the descriptive text. Meanwhile, the result of post-test can be described in appendix 14 on page 70.

From the table in appendix 11 on page 66, it can be described that there are 4 students got the highest score about 85-90 scales. It also can be described that the numbers of students got lower scores have been reduced. In this case, mind mapping technique can help students to write descriptive text well.

In fact, the interval frequency of Post-Test Data has been derived from the steps as follows:

1.) The total number of students as sample in post-test was 28 students
2.) The students’ lowest score was 35 (See appendix 14 on page 70)
3.) The students’ highest score was 90 (see appendix 14 on page 70)
4.) The mean of score was 62.32 (See appendix 12 on page 67)
5.) The range of interval class (R) was 55

   It is derived from:
   
   \[ R = \text{The student’s highest score} - \text{The student’s lowest score} \]
   
   \[ = 90 - 35 \]
   
   \[ = 55 \]
6.) The amount of class interval (K) was 6

   It is derived from:

   \[ K = 1 + 3.3 \log n \]
   
   \[ = 1 + 3.3 \log 28 \]
   
   \[ = 1 + 3.3 \times 1.447 \]
= 1+4.775

= 5.775 \Rightarrow 6

7.) The wide of class interval (P) was 9

\[ P = \frac{R}{K} = \frac{55}{6} = 9.2 = 9 \text{ or } 10 \]

8.) The standard deviation was 15.54 (See appendix 12 on page 67)

Below is the following polygon graphic of writing descriptive text in pre-test data. It can describe clearer about students’ result.

**Figure 4.2**

The Polygon Graphic of Writing in Post-Test

From the figure above, the students’ score in post-test obviously could be presented that the students who get the highest score are 4 students with 85-90 scales. On the other hand, there are 4 students too that get the lowest score in 35-44 scales. There are also 4 students that get score about 45-54. Then, 6 students
that get score about 55-64 scales. Meanwhile, there are 2 students get score 75-84. So, I conclude that the result of students’ score in post-test is more increased than the result in pre-test.

4.1.4 Hypothesis Verification

In verifying the hypothesis of this research, I used the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ with the criteria as follows

$H_0$ is untenable, $H_1$ is tenable if $t_{\text{count}} > t_{\text{table}}$

$H_0$ is tenable, $H_1$ is untenable if $t_{\text{count}} < t_{\text{table}}$

Where:

$H_0 = \text{There is no influence of mind mapping technique toward students’ writing descriptive text}$

$H_1 = \text{There is any influence of mind mapping technique toward students’ writing descriptive text}$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>t count</th>
<th>t table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>2.052</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where:

$n$ : The number of sample

df : Degree of freedom (n-1)

t$_{\text{count}}$ : The value that is obtained from computation result of t-test analysis
\( t_{table} \): The value that is obtained from a statistic table of t-distribution at the level of significance \( \alpha = 0.05 \)

From the table above, I described that \( t_{count} = 8.90 \), (See appendix 16 on page 74) with the degree of freedom \( = 27 \) \((n-1)\) and the level of significance \( \alpha = 0.05 \). I also found the value of \( t_{table} = 2.052 \) (See appendix 17 on page 75).

Clearly, it can be concluded that the mind mapping could influence the students’ ability toward writing descriptive text. It is stated that \( t_{count} > t_{table} \) or \( 8.90 > 2.052 \). And this was appropriate with the criteria of hypothesis verification that was \( H_0 \) was untenable and \( H_1 \) was tenable. It means that there is any influence of mind mapping technique toward students’ writing descriptive text.

4.2 Discussion

In this section, I would like to define the implementation on research findings comprised of three phases: pre-test, treatment, and post-test. In the first phase, before the students received any instruction, all the students took papers for writing the descriptive text. In this case, they were asked for writing the topic of descriptive text, “Supiyanto, My English Teacher.” The instrument was designed to be given in class and takes approximately 25-30 minutes to writing.

The pre-test has done on May 21\textsuperscript{th}, 2013 from 08.00 a.m to 08.30 a.m o’clock. It is successfully implemented in class VII\textsuperscript{C} by taking sample was 28 students. In pre-test data, I obtained the result of writing descriptive text for each student as sample. These score were obtained after I analyzed students’ writing based on the assessment of writing in descriptive text namely: Grammar, Content,
Punctuation, and Generic Structure. I found the total score in writing descriptive text for each assessment (See appendix 13 on page 69).

Next, after doing pre-test on the time involved, I did the first treatment at the same time. It was starting from 08.30 a.m until 09.10 a.m. In the first meeting, as an introduction to the first lesson, students showed that they were going to learn about descriptive text. At the same time, I also explained about the definition of descriptive text, the function and the generic structures as well.

After that, I taught the students the procedures of mind mapping technique, how to use mind mapping technique into a descriptive text and how to identify a descriptive text by using mind mapping technique. At that moment, I gave a descriptive text to the students and asked them to identify that text by using mind mapping technique. In this case, I took the text entitled “My Bombi”

Bombi is my black cat. This cat is always playful. It likes playing with anything. It sometimes plays with me. It likes playing with a ball very much. It is very clever. It is sometimes very naughty. My Bombi is small but fat. It has soft fur. The fur is black. Bombi has a long tail. Its eyes are round. It looks cute. It is always near me.

(Derived from Contextual Teaching and Learning Bahasa Inggris for Junior High School, at the 7th grade students, 2008:129)

After applying the mind mapping technique, I conducted the post-test. In the post-test data, I obtained the result score of writing descriptive text for each student as sample. These score were obtained after analyzing the students’ writing based on assessment aspects namely: grammar, content, punctuation, generic
structure. In this case, it is found the total score of writing descriptive text in each components, (See appendix 14 on page 71).

Below is the third students’ result. I just chose three students to be represented a whole of those students. Besides, I took these samples, because the result of these samples seemed significant in composing writing descriptive text by using mid mapping technique.

☑ Sample of 14

In pre test, 14’s writing result was still confused. Below was 14’s result of pre-test.

Supiyanto is my English teacher. He teach usually in class I and another too. She kind person. While she teach, she teache good I like him teaching.

From the paragraph above that contained of 5 sentences, in grammar, she was right in 1 sentence only. Firstly, she made error in composing the sentence he teach usually in class I and another too. She is able to write, for the example, He usually teaches in my class and another class too. Then, the sentence she kind person. In that sentence, she made errors in putting pronoun and also she missed to be (is) after subject. Furthermore, to make the sentence clear, she should put in an article. Actually, it could be changed with He is a kind person. Furthermore, these sentences of while she teach and she teach good I like him teaching were so confused. That is way, I gave score 1 for the grammar in 14’s result of pre-test.
which has description error in grammar and word order so serve as to make speech virtually unintelligible. In content, I gave score 2 because the content made comprehension obscure. In this case, sample of 14 has tried to make a description about Supiyanto, but she was still making the sentences unclear. Furthermore, in punctuation, I gave score 1 to 14’s result of pre-test, because she has error in punctuation so frequent that reader must often rely on own interpretation. She always used small letter in the beginning of sentence. For example in the first sentence, she wrote *supiyanto is my english teacher*. She should use capital letter in the beginning of that sentence. For example, the sentence should become *Supiyanto is my English teacher*. Beside of Supiyanto is in the beginning of sentence, Supiyanto also is the people’s name which the people’s name should be written in capital letter. The last, generic structure. I gave score 2 in this aspect, because the description of generic structure was unclear for the reader.

In post-test, 14’s writing result was good. Below was 14’s result of post-test.

*Supiyanto is my English teacher. He teaches not only in my school, but also in another school. He has a slim body, brown skin, pointed nose, beautiful face, short straight black hair and small eyes. Everyday he ride motorcycle to school.*

In grammar, she had increased. In that paragraph, she only made 1 error in the last sentence. It could be proved by her result of post-test above which she wrote those sentences almost good. I gave score 4 for 14’s grammar result in post-test. For example in the second sentence, she wrote *He teaches not only in my*
school, but also in another school. She wrote that sentence grammatical. Besides, in last sentence, she wrote *Everyday he ride motorcycle to school*. In this case, she made an error which after personal *he*, she used verb one without adding *s*. Because of she used personal pronoun *he*, so she has to add *s* after verb one. It should become *Everyday he rides motorcycle to school*. In the aspect of content, I gave score 3 for her result, because she makes frequent of content which occasional obscure meaning. Then, in punctuation, I gave score 4 which she fixed her result in pre-test in using capital letter in each beginning of sentence. Last, in generic structure, I gave score 3 because she made frequent structure which occasional obscure meaning.

✔ Sample of 18

Below is the result of Fatni Ladiku in pre-test and post-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Test Result</th>
<th>Post-Test Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have a teacher english. Her name is Supiyanto. My Supiyanto have feature:</td>
<td>Supiyanto is my english teacher. except english teacher, he also a computer teacher. he teaches in my class on Tuesday and Thursday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-hair black</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-skin black and white</td>
<td>He has pointed nose, two black eyes, short straight hair, brown skin, good lips and high body. He is about 29 years old.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-he pointed, friendly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In pre-test, Fatni wanted to express about who Supiyanto was and what the features were. But, her grammar and content were obscured to understand. It could be proved, for example in her grammar, by this sentence “My supiyanto have features.” In that case, I gave score 2 for grammar which has description that grammar and word order errors make comprehension difficult must often rephrase. She should delete the us of My and after she wrote Supiyanto as the singular subject, she should not use have. Because of Supiyanto was sigular, so sample of 14 has to use has after that subject. Then, in the first sentence also, sample of 14 wrote I have a teacher english. In this case she would like to describe that Supiyanto is her English teacher, but she described that sentence without grammar. Actually, she just could add of between teacher and English. Then, for her content I gave score 1 which has description that error in content unintelligible. Furthermore, in punctuation and generic structures, I gave score 2 for each aspect. In punctuation, she always missed to use capital letter in starting her writing. And then for generic structure as well, I gave score 2 for her, because her describing about Supiyanto was not clear enough.

Fortunately, in post-test, sample of 14 had improved. It could be seen by the result above which she had explained about Supiyanto almost clear enough. In grammar for example in the first sentence, she wrote Supiyanto is my english teacher. In this case, 14’s sentence was so clear which she wrote that sentence grammatical. That is way, I gave score 4 for 14’s result of grammar. Then, in content as well, she had increased which she made frequent of content which
occasional obscure meaning. I gave score 3 for her content. Same with content, I also gave score 3 for her punctuation and generic structure.

✔ Sample of 23

Below was 23’s result in pre-test.

I have an English teacher. His name is Supiyanto. Sometimes, people call he supi. He has skin white, pointed nose, oval face, and two black lovely eyes. He is so teacher so I love to teacher with his.

In that text, I gave score 3 for 23’s grammar. It could be seen in that paragraph which Meri made frequent errors of grammar and word order which occasional obscure meaning. For example the sentence “he has skin white...”, that sentence was clear eogh which she wrote has after personal noun he. Besides, in the third sentence she did wrong in using personal pronoun. She wrote “Sometimes, people call he supi.” She should change it with personal pronoun him that refers to Supiyanto. Then, in content I gave score 4 for her result in pre-test, because her content was good enough. Besides, in punctuation I gave score 2, which she made frequent error in punctuation; lead sometimes to obscurity, sometimes required on reader's part. In starting her writing, she often missed to use capital letter, for example in the second sentence, she wrote his name is Supiyanto. Besides, in describing people’s name, she should use capital letter as well. That sentence should become His name is Supiyanto. Then, in generic structure I gave score 4, because she occasionally made generic structure obscure.
meaning. Her description about Supiyanto was good enough which the reader would get with her description about who Supiyanto was.

Moreover, below was the result of 23’s post-test

Supiyanto is my English teacher. Sometimes, people call him Supi. He is about thirty years old. He is a smart teacher and creative teacher. I like his way in teaching English, because I totally get understanding his explain. He has oval face, two black eyes, pointed nose, small lips, short black straight hair and slim body.

In this case, 23’s result had increased. She wrote that paragraph great enough. For example in grammar, she wrote those sentences grammatical, but in the fifth sentence she did wrong in using the word of explain. She wrote I like his way in teaching English, because I totally get understanding his explain. The word of explain should be changed with explanation. That is way I gave score 4 for 23’s result in post-test. In content as well, I gave score 4 for her result, because she occasionally made content obscure meaning. Furthermore, in punctuation and generic structure, I gave score 5 for each those aspects. In punctuation, she made a few (if any) noticeable lapses. For example in these sentences Supiyanto is my English teacher. Sometimes, people call him Supi. He is about thirty years old. He is a smart teacher and creative teacher. She did not get any mistakes in using punctuation for describing that text. She used capital letter in putting name of people and also in writing a sentence. The last was aspect of generic structure. I gave score 5 for her result, because she made a few (if any) noticeable error of generic structure.
From the explanation above, I concluded that the mind mapping technique could increase the students’ ability toward writing descriptive text. Also, it is found that the Ho was untenable. From the calculation of the data by using t-test, it is found that $t_{\text{count}} > t_{\text{table}}$ or $8.90 > 2.052$. 