### **CHAPTER III**

### **RESEARCH METHOD**

# A. Research Design

This research was an experimental research. This research concerned the implement of Tell-Show strategy dependent variable and students' writing skill as independent variable. Researcher divided sample into two groups. They concerned for experimental research. According to Ian Peers (2006:10) Experimental research is distinguished from non-experimental research by the critical features of manipulation and control of variables to determine cause and effect relationships. Gay (2000: 367-368), the experimental research is the only type of research that can test hypotheses to establish cause-and effect relationship.

There were two classes involved in this research. The first was classified as the experimental (E) and the other one was the control class (C). Both of classes had the same topic, the same length of time. Both experimental class and control class were taught by researcher. The experimental class were taught by using Tell-Show Strategy and the control class were taught by conventional strategy. Both of classes were treated as many as six meetings. At the end of the reatment the researcher gave the students post test.

After deciding which class was experimental and control, the researcher continued with the treatment process for experimental class and no treatment process for the control class. This research describes like:

Table 3.1 Research Design

Group	Independent Variable	Dependent Variable
Е	Х	0
С	-	0

Where:

- E : Experimental Group
- C : Control group
- 0 : Post test (Writing Test)
- X : Treatment (Teaching through Tell-Show)

The researcher gave Tell Show strategy for the experimental class, and for the control class the researcher gave without Tell Show strategy. At the end of the research the researcher gave the post test to both samples. The test was written test. Every student made a descriptive text with their own word and they had to included the generic structure of the descriptive and also language features of descriptive text.

# **B.** Population and sample

1. Population

Gay (2000: 121) stated that the population is the group of interest to the researcher, the group to which she or he would like the result of the study to be generalized. The population of this research was all of the students at class VIII of Junior High School 2 Pariaman. The number of the students as shown by the table below:

No	Class	Total
1	VIII. 1	30
2	VIII. 2	32
3	VIII. 3	31
4	VIII. 4	31
5	VIII.5	31
	Total	155

Table 3.2Total of Students in Class VII at Junior High School 1 Pariaman

### 2. Sample

After deciding the population researcher choose the research sample. In deciding which class was the experimental class, the researcher used simple random sampling. Gay (2000:121) said that sampling the process of selecting a number of individuals for a study in such a way that they represent the large group from which they were selected. The individuals selected comprise a sample and the larger group was referred to as a population. To choose these classes which class would be a sample, the researcher choose random sampling.

In addition Gay (2000: 131) stated that random sampling is the best way to obain a representative sample. The sample in this research was class VII<sub>4</sub> and class VII<sub>5</sub>. Before the researcher took the sample, the researcher knew first the normality and homogenity of those classes whether that classes came from normal distribution or not, to get the representative sample of this research the researcher did these steps following:

# a. Test of normality

	VAR00001	Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>		Shapiro-Wilk			
		Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.
	1	,150	30	,083	,940	30	,092
	2	,120	32	,200 <sup>*</sup>	,960	32	,268
kelas	3	,140	31	,124	,941	31	,086
	4	,128	31	,200 <sup>*</sup>	,938	31	,072
	5	,119	31	,200 <sup>*</sup>	,937	31	,069

Table 3.3Test Normality of Population

a. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

b. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Based on the table of analysis of *Normality Test* above, it can be seen that the significance of all the classes bigger than 0.05 in both Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk.

b. Test of homogeneity

After doing the normality test, researcher analyzed the homogeneous of variation test. This test had an objective as to know whether the sample homogeny or not. The researcher did the test of homogeneity by using *Test of Homogeneity of Variance*. Population has homogeny variance if P-value was bigger than 0.05. See the table below:

Table 3.4Test Homogeneity of Variance Population

		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Kelas	Based on Mean	,300	4	150	,878,
	Based on Median	,267	4	150	,899
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	,267	4	145,493	,899
	Based on trimmed mean	,298	4	150	,879

Based on SPSS result above, writer got all of class VIII showing that normal and homogenous. Then, to determine experimental and control class, the researcher used cluster random sampling. It was chosen following the procedure of lottery to determine experimental class and control class. So, researcher got class VIII 5 as experiment class and class VIII 4 as control class. To get clearly, the total of the sample can seen in the following table:

Table	3.5
Some	ماد

		mpic
No	Class	Total
1	VIII.4	31
2	VIII.5	31
3	2 Classes	62

### C. Place and Time

This research was done in SMPN 2 Pariaman of grade VIII. This place was chosen because the researcher had ever teaching practice there. This research conducted there for six meetings in applying Tell-Show strategy.

After giving treatment by using Tell-Show strategy for six times in classroom activity, the researcher gave post test in order to know the students' writing after treatment and to see whether Tell-Show strategy was effective to improve students' writing ability, the researcher compared the result of post test for both experimental class and control class.

### **D.** Instruments of the Research

The instrument that used for this research was writing test. The researcher made the test and gave the test for the last meeting after applying Tell-Show strategy in the process of teaching. Test used to collect the data about the students' improvement of writing skill in terms of content, organization, language use, vocabulary and mechanics. In post-test, the students assigned to create a descriptive text based on the topic given. Then, the researcher evaluated students' achievement in terms of content, organization, language use, vocabulary and mechanics.

According to Gay (2000:191), validity is the most important quality of a test. It is the degree to which a test measures it was supposed to measure and consequently, permitted appropriate interpretations of test scores. To be able to test the hypothesis and get better result, a test should have internal and external validities: *First, Internal Validity*; the teacher teach the same class (experimental and control class), the students are asked to join the class while activities are going on, students' loss is controlled by tightening the absent list, contamination in experimental class is controlled by not telling the students about the research. *Second, External Validity;* the teacher divides the students into two classes (experimental and control class), the student divides the students into two classes (experimental class just as the daily situation, this research follows the school schedule, not tell the experimental students that they are as the object of research.

The researcher use Jacob's criteria (1981:90) in scoring the students' writing ability because it would be easy for researcher to score the students writing. Criteria to be measured in students' writing covered five points: content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. It can be seen as shown in the following table:

# Table 3.6

# Indicator of writing Based on Jacob's Theory

	SCORE LEVEL	CRITERIA
	30-27	<b>Excellent to very good</b> : knowledge, substantive, through development of thesis, relevant to assigned topic.
	26-22	<b>Good to average</b> : some knowledge of subject, adequate range, limited development of thesis; mostly relevant to topic, but lacks detail.
IENT	21-17	<b>Fair to poor</b> : limited knowledge of subject, little substance, inadequate development of topic.
CON	16-13	<b>Very poor</b> : does not show knowledge of subject, non-substance, not pertinent, or not enough to evaluate.
	SCORE LEVEL	CRITERIA
	20-18	<b>Excellent to very good</b> : fluent expression, ideas clearly stated supported, succinct, well organized, logical sequencing, cohesive.
NOIL	17-14	<b>Good to average</b> : somewhat choppy, loosely organized but main ideas stand out, limited support, logical but incomplete sequencing.
NIZA	13-10	<b>Fair to poor</b> : non-fluent ideas confused of disconnected, lacks logical sequencing and development.
ORG.	9-7	<b>Very poor</b> : does not communicate, no organization, or not enough to evaluate.

	SCORE LEVEL	CRITERIA
VOCABULARY	20-18	<b>Excellent to very good</b> : sophisticated range, effective word/idiom choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register.
	17-14	Good to average: adequate range, occasional errors of words/Idiom form, choice, usage but meaning not obscured.
	13-10	<b>Fair to poor</b> : limited range, frequent errors of words/idiom form, choice, usage, meaning confused or obscured.
	9-7	<b>Very poor</b> : essentially translation, little knowledge of English vocabulary, idioms, word form, or not enough to evaluate.

	SCORE LEVEL	CRITERIA
LANGUAGE USE	25-22	<b>Excellent to very good</b> : effective complex construction, few errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions.
	21-18	<b>Good to average</b> : effective but simple constructions, minor problems in complex constructions, several errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/ function, articles, pronouns, prepositions but meaning seldom obscured
	17-11	<b>Fair to poor</b> : major problems in simple/complex constructions, frequent errors of negation, agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions and /or fragments, run-ons, deletions, meaning confused or obscured.
	10-5	<b>Very poor</b> : virtually no mastery of sentence construction rules, dominated by errors, does not communicated, or not enough to evaluate.

	SCORE LEVEL	CRITERIA
MECHANICS	5	<b>Excellent to very good</b> : demonstrates mastery of conventions; few errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing.
	4	<b>Good to average</b> : occasional errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing, but meaning not obscured.
	3	<b>Fair to poor</b> : frequent errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing, poor handwriting, meaning confused or obscured.
	2	<b>Very poor</b> : no mastery of conventions dominated by errors of spelling, punctuations, capitalization, paragraphing, handwriting illegible, or not enough to evaluate.

# E. Procedure of the Research

# 1. Preparing

The researcher used two classes to collect the data, the researcher taught the students by using scaffolding technique for experimental class, and conventional strategy in control class. The material of the teaching was the same writing material.

2. Learning Process

The process of the class can be seen in the following table:

## Table 3.7

Fase	Learning Activity	Time
Pre-Teaching	Apperception	10
	<ol> <li>Greeting</li> <li>Praying</li> <li>Checking students' attendance list Motivation</li> </ol>	minutes
	<ol> <li>Teacher asks the students about last topic</li> <li>Teacher show a picture to students about Actrees</li> <li>Teacher writes the topic on whiteboard and introduces the topic</li> <li>Teacher gives questions based on the topic to build students' background knowledge about descriptive text.</li> </ol>	
Whilst- Teaching	<ul> <li>Observing <ul> <li>a. Teacher introduces a lesson by showing the picture to the students.</li> <li>a. Give students clear direction on what to do and reduce their confusion.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Questioning <ul> <li>a. Teacher leads student to give comment or ask question based on the picture.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

# **Treatment Procedure of Experimental Class**

	Exploring	
	<ul> <li>b. Teacher explains the material (descriptive text)</li> <li>c. Teacher explains how to identify generic structure and language features of the text Explain the purpose of what the student is asking for and why it matters.</li> <li>Associating</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>a. Explain the purpose of what the student is asking for and why it matters.</li> <li>b. Prepare the structure and keep students in charge so as not to wander off the task.</li> <li>c. Explain learning by providing a quality example as a reference.</li> <li>d. Allow students to select the resources available to use in their task.</li> <li>e. Reduce anxiety, fear, and frustration so that students maximize their learning.</li> <li>f. Provide efficiency in the learning process by helping students to focus on their tasks.</li> <li>g. Create momentum in the learning process by allowing new ideas and experiences to be created.</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li><i>a. Presentation</i>, each of group presents their result in front of class.</li> <li><i>b. Evaluate</i>, the assessment do to see how the students' motivation and their contribution in group</li> <li><i>c.</i> Students get the supporting comments from the teacher</li> <li><i>d.</i> Teacher gives emphasize about descriptive text</li> </ul>	
Post-Teaching	Post- Teaching	10 minutes
	Closing	
	1. Teacher concludes the material	
	2. Teacher closes the class	

### 3. Evaluation

After doing the learning process so the next step was the final test. The test was given to the both class (experimental class and control class). The test use a written test. The students give explanation about the components of writing that was measured such as content, language use, grammar, mechanic, and vocabulary.

In finishing:

- a. Giving test to experimental and control class in the last meeting
- b. Processing data towards experimental and control class
- c. Taking conclusion from technique of data collection

### F. Technique of Data Collection

The data was collected trough a post- test score. Researcher gave both of classes defferent treatment for writing test. Data of this research used the students' post-test score. The post-test score was taken in the last meeting after giving the treatment six times.

After researcher gave treatment to the students, the researcher taught both the experiment class and control class. For experimental class, researcher used Tell-Show strategy in teaching writing. For control class, researcher used conventional strategy in teaching writing. Finally, both of classs were given the post test. The post test was administered to got final result of the research.

### G. Technique of Data Analysis

The technique of data analysis used here was the statistical procedures. To analyze the students` score, the researcher used T-test means a statistical procedure used to determine whether both of classes were in the same ability or not. T-test was analyzed from students' writing score in post-test. T-test formulas develop which was presented as follow:

a. This formula was applied to decide mean of students` test score in experimental and control class;

$$\overline{X_{1}} = \frac{\sum F_{1} X_{1}}{\sum F_{1}}$$
(Experimental class)

$$\overline{\mathbf{X}_2} = \frac{\sum \mathbf{F}_2 \mathbf{X}_2}{\sum \mathbf{F}_2}$$
(Control class)

b. This formula was used to decide standard deviation of experimental class;

$$S_1^2 = \frac{n_{1\sum F1 X1^2 (\sum F1 X1)^2}}{n_1(n_1 - 1)}$$

This formula was used to decide standard deviation of control class;

$$S_2^2 = \frac{n_1 \sum F_2 X 2^2 (\sum F_2 X 2)^2}{n_2 (n_2 - 1)}$$

c. The formula of T-test was as follows (Subana, 2000: 171)

$$\mathbf{t} = \frac{X_1 - X_2}{S\sqrt{\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}}}$$

With:

$$\mathbf{S} = \sqrt{\frac{(n_1 - 1)S_1^2 + (n_2 - 1)S_2^2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2}}$$

Note:	$X_1$	= Mean score of experimental class
	$X_2$	= Mean score of control class
	$S_1$	= Standard deviation of experimental class

$S_2$	= Standard deviation of control class
$\mathbf{n}_1$	= Number of experimental class
n <sub>2</sub>	= Number of control class

The t-<sub>table</sub> was employed to see whether there was a significant difference between the mean score of both experimental class and control class. The value of t-<sub>obtained</sub> was consulted with the value of t-<sub>table</sub> at the degree of freedom  $(n_1-1) +$  $(n_2-1)$  and the level of confidence of 95% = 0. 05. If the value of t-<sub>obtained</sub> was less than the value t-<sub>table</sub>, the null hypothesis was accepted; on the contrary, if the value of t-<sub>obtained</sub> is equal or bigger than value of t-<sub>table</sub>, the alternative one was not accepted.