

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

In this chapter, the researcher presents the research findings as well as a discussion of the findings. The researcher provides detailed information in this section pertaining to the research findings derived from the data examined in order to answer the two formulated problems, which are: (1) the implementation of the Picture Word Inductive Model (PWIM) Approach towards Students' Descriptive Text Writing Skill at SMPN 48 Surabaya, and (2) the improvement of students' writing skills through the implementation of the Picture Word Inductive Model (PWIM) Approach at SMPN 48 Surabaya, respectively.

#### **4.1 Research Findings**

This preliminary investigation was carried out at the beginning of the research. Nurul Hakimah worked as an English teacher as well as the researcher for this research at SMPN 48 Surabaya, where she completed the research accompanied by the collaborator teacher to control the actions. This research was conducted from May 27<sup>th</sup>, 2021 to June 17<sup>th</sup>, 2021 in two cycles, with each cycle consisting of three meetings lasting 2x40 minutes each. Initial observations were made of classroom activity during an English lesson before students were taught to write descriptive texts using the Picture Word Inductive Model (PWIM), which was implemented in this study as part of the preliminary research. Action research is a type of research that was proposed by Wallace and is defined as follows: "A kind of research is done systematically in collecting the data on the lesson from the participants and examining them to

gain the solutions to some decisions about what the future lesson should be (Wallace, 1998, p. 17).” It is implied that the researcher does not only require the theories that support the research, but also the opportunity to practice and act with the subjects of the research in order to solve the problems in the class7-B at SMPN 48 Surabaya, as well as other resources. The implementation of the pre-test, cycle 1 and cycle 2 of the research conducted are described as follow:

#### 4.1.1 Pre-research

The researcher conducted an observation in order to gain insight into the difficulties encountered in the online classroom of the teaching and learning process using the Microsoft Teams platform. Furthermore, on May 27<sup>th</sup>, 2021, a preliminary test was conducted. The test was administered in order to obtain information about the students' writing abilities. Preliminary testing consisted of the researcher asking the students to write a descriptive text on the topics that were provided. The students were given 40 minutes to complete the writing assignment, which was assigned by the teacher. When they were doing the preliminary research, they needed a lot of time to come up with ideas. Many students have not written a single word in the first ten minutes of the assignment. They asserted that they lacked imagination for writing ideas. The researcher has provided an example of descriptive text in the pre-test sheet, which is displayed on the screen, in order to make it easier for the students to develop their own stories. The following is the results of student's writing before the action.

Table 4.1 The Result of the Pre-test

<b>No</b>	<b>Code</b>	<b>Pre-test</b>
1	S7B-1	50
2	S7B-2	65
3	S7B-3	52
4	S7B-4	68
5	S7B-5	72
6	S7B-6	60
7	S7B-7	50
8	S7B-8	64
9	S7B-9	64
10	S7B-10	50
11	S7B-11	60
12	S7B-12	64
13	S7B-13	64
14	S7B-14	68
15	S7B-15	56
16	S7B-16	60
17	S7B-17	72
18	S7B-18	56
19	S7B-19	50
20	S7B-20	68
21	S7B-21	60
22	S7B-22	56
23	S7B-23	68
24	S7B-24	84
25	S7B-25	84
26	S7B-26	72
27	S7B-27	56
28	S7B-28	72
29	S7B-29	56
30	S7B-30	70
31	S7B-31	70
32	S7B-32	52
33	S7B-33	64
34	S7B-34	68
35	S7B-35	56
36	S7B-36	52

37	S7B-37	72
38	S7B-38	68
39	S7B-39	60
40	S7B-40	64
41	S7B-41	60
42	S7B-42	64
<b>Mean</b>		<b>62,88</b>
<b>Lowest Score</b>		<b>50</b>
<b>Highest Score</b>		<b>84</b>
<b>Passed</b>		<b>2</b>
<b>Percentage</b>		<b>4.76%</b>

The data presented in Table 4.1 was based on the assumption that the students performed below the average in terms of academic achievement. It was determined that the mean score was 62.88, with the lowest score being 50 and the highest score being 84. According to the agreement at SMPN 48 Surabaya, only two students passed the test based on the Minimum Mastery Criteria (*KKM*), which is  $\geq 83$  points on the scale. There were only two students who were successful out of the entire class (4.76%).

Knowing the outcome of the pre-test, which was extremely poor, the researcher discussed the results with the collaborator teacher during the observation period in preparation for the research study. She argued that the student's ability to write descriptive text was highly limited. There were a few students who made these types of grammatical mistakes. In terms of grammatical rules, they were unable to demonstrate their understanding of how to use simple tense when writing a descriptive text. They also made the mistake of not using the proper pronouns. Their grasp

of the English language was so limited that their sentences were devoid of meaning. Consequently, they complied with the requirement to use proper punctuation and capitalization. After all was said and done, the researcher discovered that many students had difficulties generating ideas, choosing the appropriate verb, organizing their thoughts into a coherent paragraph, as well as using proper grammar. Considering these problems, the researcher chose “Picture Word Inductive Model (PWIM)” as an appropriate approach in online classroom teaching and learning activities. This strategy should help students improve their descriptive text writing skills.

Following the receiving of the results of the pre-research, the researcher and collaborator devised a plan for addressing the issues that had been identified. The actions, which were divided into two cycles, were focused on the use of the Picture Word Inductive Model (PWIM) to improve the students' ability in writing descriptive texts for the students in class 8-B at SMPN 48 Surabaya in the academic year 2020/2021.

#### 4.1.2 Cycle 1

During the first cycle, there were three meetings that took place. Beginning on June 1<sup>st</sup>, 2021 and lasting until June 8<sup>th</sup>, 2021, the meetings were held in an online classroom using the Microsoft Teams platform, with each meeting lasting 2x40 minutes in length. Plan, act, observe, and reflect were the four stages in which PWIM was implemented.

During the planning phase, the teacher developed the teaching learning design, which included organizing lesson plans in accordance with the teaching material. After that, she prepared the resources for the teaching-learning process, such as the materials, the observation sheets, and the test evaluation. The next stage involved the teacher preparing a present list in order to determine whether or not students were actively participating in the teaching-learning process through the use of PWIM.

In the first cycle, the teaching and learning process was based on PWIM, which was divided into four stages: Building Knowledge of Field (BKOF), Modeling of the Text (MOT), Joint Construction of the Text (JCOT), and Independent Construction of the Text (ICOT). During the action phase, prior to conducting the online class, the researcher distributed the observation checklist to the collaborator. Based on the lesson plan, the researcher and collaborator chose an interesting topic for discussion in the leading activities. The pictures displayed on screen were representations of the texts that would be discussed in the following activities. “My Favorite Animals” was the topic of discussion at the first meeting. The class began with a question about the students' health and then a check on their attendance. The students responded by stating that all 42 students were present.

There were some plans to implement the PWIM technique made by the researcher and collaborators during the BKOF stage, but they were never implemented. In the first step, Selecting Pictures, the researcher

and collaborator selected visually appealing images to use as media in the leading activities. It is the pictures that serve as representations of the texts that were discussed in the following activities. In the second activity, Identifying and Labeling Items, the researcher and collaborators devised the leading activities by posing a series of questions related to the photographs. They also devised activities to entice students to write down as many words as they could from the illustrations. In addition, they provided a descriptive text as well as the general structure of the text in question. Finally, Reading and Reviewing the Picture Word Chart, by providing the picture word chart and encouraging students to read and review it, the researcher provided opportunities for the students to improve their vocabulary mastery and expand their knowledge of the English language. Students can make additions to the picture word chart by drawing pictures of the words.

In the MOT stage, the researcher and her collaborator developed some ideas for implementing the PWIM. The plans focused on assigning students tasks that were related to the narrative descriptive text as well as the language used in the descriptive text. It was made up of two parts: “Classifying Words” and “Completing Sentence”. During the activity “Classifying Words”, the students were instructed to classify the words that they learned from the pictures into the appropriate category, whether it was a noun, verb, adjective, or adverb. Meanwhile, in “Completing Sentences”, they were also preparing to give an exercise called “fill in

the blank” as part of their preparation. When asked to complete this exercise, students were instructed to use the proper verb form to complete the sentence.

When it came to the JCOT stage, there were two activities: “Generating Sentences and Paragraphs”, which was followed by “Reading and Reviewing Sentences and Paragraphs”. While participating in the activity, “Generating Sentences and Paragraphs”, the researcher created a worksheet that contained jumbled sentences from a descriptive text that was displayed on the screen. Students were instructed to arrange sentences in the proper sequence. As a result of their work together during the “Reading & Reviewing Sentences and Paragraphs” session, the researcher and her collaborator planned to correct and provided feedback on the students' writing in order to make them aware of their mistakes, such as misspelt words and improper grammar.

The plans discussed at the second meeting based primarily on implementing the activities and media of the PWIM during the ICOT stage. The researcher followed the steps of the writing process, which are described in considerable detail. In the section titled “Selecting Pictures”, the researcher prepared and selected a picture for the students to use as a stimulus to help them generate an idea. The students would be provided with pictures related to the word “A Bird”. In the activity “Identifying and Labeling Items”, the students were asked to identify items and ideas



that were related to the pictures they were shown. The researcher also provided a picture word chart in “Reading and Reviewing the Picture Word Chart”, in which the students were required to label each item by writing the words on it.

During the cycle’s observation stage, the researcher acted in the role of the teacher, carrying out the actions. During the online class, the collaborator kept track of everything and observed the learning process. The researcher opened the class with a welcome, a prayer, and a count of the students’ attendance. She went on to introduce herself as well as the collaborator who would be accompanying her while conducting the research. The steps of the PWIM process were explained to the students at the beginning of the class. As soon as the students had a clear understanding of the procedures, the researcher went over the material that they would be learning during the lessons. The descriptive text material was chosen in accordance with the curriculum of eighth grade students at SMPN 48 Surabaya. During this research, a PowerPoint presentation was used to engage students in the teaching and learning process, allowing them to effectively implement PWIM while writing a descriptive text.

The researcher then continued to provide some grammar exercises at the beginning of the MOT stage (Modeling of the task). When completing these exercises, the students were instructed to use the proper verb form to complete each sentence. They completed the task and the

picture word chart by responding directly to the questions posed by the teacher, which they did. Some of them, on the other hand, were apprehensive about taking on the responsibility. To assist students in filling out the picture words chart, the researcher provided a list of words to represent to. The words on the list provided by the researcher drew the students' attention. Following that, they began to fill in the blanks with their own words directly when the students were asked by the teacher. As part of the online class, the researcher approached each student individually and asked them to review their work.

By asking students to generate sentences and paragraphs, the researcher used the PWIM technique's JCOT stage (Joint Construction of the Text). They were required to rewrite the previous task's sentences into a coherent paragraph. Their worksheet included a chart of generic structure to assist them in organizing the text. While the majority of them were capable of performing this task competently, the remaining students were hesitant to write. The second meeting proceeded in the same manner as the previous one. At the end of the cycle, during the third meeting, the researcher, in the capacity of an English teacher, administered a post-test in cycle 1 on the topic of writing descriptive text based on the teacher-provided topics. Cycle 1's post-test was conducted on June 11<sup>th</sup>, 2021. Cycle 1's post-test result was as follows:

Table 4.2 The Result of the Pos-test Cycle 1

<b>No</b>	<b>Code</b>	<b>Pos-test Cycle 1</b>
1	S7B-1	65
2	S7B-2	65
3	S7B-3	60
4	S7B-4	68
5	S7B-5	72
6	S7B-6	70
7	S7B-7	60
8	S7B-8	68
9	S7B-9	70
10	S7B-10	60
11	S7B-11	76
12	S7B-12	76
13	S7B-13	72
14	S7B-14	78
15	S7B-15	70
16	S7B-16	76
17	S7B-17	84
18	S7B-18	70
19	S7B-19	65
20	S7B-20	68
21	S7B-21	70
22	S7B-22	62
23	S7B-23	78
24	S7B-24	84
25	S7B-25	84
26	S7B-26	78
27	S7B-27	60
28	S7B-28	84
29	S7B-29	65
30	S7B-30	78
31	S7B-31	84
32	S7B-32	65
33	S7B-33	78
34	S7B-34	84
35	S7B-35	76
36	S7B-36	65

37	S7B-37	84
38	S7B-38	76
39	S7B-39	78
40	S7B-40	76
41	S7B-41	76
42	S7B-42	78
<b>Mean</b>		<b>72,76</b>
<b>Lowest Score</b>		<b>60</b>
<b>Highest Score</b>		<b>84</b>
<b>Passed</b>		<b>7</b>
<b>Percentage</b>		<b>16.67%</b>

According to table 4.2, implementation of PWIM improved students' achievement in writing descriptive text, but it was still necessary to conduct the next cycle because the first cycle's implementation of PWIM strategy failed to meet the research's minimum standard of success, as the students who passed the test based on the criteria of success were still 7 students (16.67%). On the other hand, the mean score for students' writing ability was 72.76, with the lowest score being 60 and the highest being 84. Nevertheless, when compared to the pre-test results, the improvements in students' descriptive text writing ability were significant in terms of mean scores increasing from 62.88 to 72.76, the highest score remaining the same at 84, and the lowest score remaining between 50 and 60. Meanwhile, the number of students passing the test increased from 2 to 7. One could argue that the number of students increased by 5 students, or 9.52%. In light of the cycle 1 results, the researcher decided to continue with the next cycle in order to ensure the success of this research.

After completing Cycle 1 actions, the researcher and collaborator conducted reflections to determine whether or not the research needed to be modified in the subsequent cycle. The actions' reflections can be summarized in the following points. In Cycle 1, the students were drawn to the use of PWIM. They appeared enthusiastic when the researcher introduced this technique in the online class. This technique included activities and some intriguing picture word charts that encouraged students to participate in the teaching and learning process of writing descriptive texts. However, when the researcher implemented PWIM, she revealed that many students were unfamiliar with the concept. They did not fully comprehend the instructions contained within each step. In terms of organization, some students were still unable to string together sentences to create an effective text. As a result, the paragraph was disorganized. Certain students disregarded writing mechanics such as punctuation, capitalization, and paragraphing. Additionally, some misspelt words could be found in their writing. Having identified these concerns, the researcher and collaborator must take a more proactive role in assisting students in writing activity in the cycle 2.

#### 4.1.3 Cycle 2

In cycle 2, three meetings were held on Tuesday and Thursday. The meetings began on June 10<sup>th</sup>, 2021 and ended on June 17<sup>th</sup>, 2021. They were held in an online classroom employing the Microsoft Teams

platform, and each meeting lasted 2x40 minutes. PWIM was implemented in four stages: planning, acting, observing, and reflecting. During the cycle 2 planning phase, the researcher and collaborator discussed ways to improve their plans for Cycle 2 actions. The following discussions could well outline the Cycle 2 plans. At the second cycle's first meeting, the plans focused on implementing PWIM to empower controls over students' behavior and attitudes in order to make the class run more efficiently. Additionally, the researcher reviewed previous materials by posing several pertinent questions. Additionally, PWIM was implemented in three stages of the genre-based approach, namely: Building Knowledge of Field (BKOF), Modeling of the Text (MOT), Joint Construction of the Text (JCOT), and Independent Construction of the Text (ICOT).

The researcher and collaborator devised several plans for implementing PWIM during the BKOF stage, including "Selecting Pictures", "Identifying and Labeling the Items", and "Reading and Reviewing the Picture Word Chart". In "Selecting Pictures", the researcher initiated the activity by displaying some pictures, and she intended to follow up with students by asking them questions and attempting to obtain their opinions about the pictures. In cycle 2, she chose images of buildings such as a school, a house, and an office. The images depict the building's characteristics. Then, in "Identifying and Labeling the Items", the researcher and collaborator devised an activity

to encourage students to take notes numerous words associated with the pictures shown on the screen. Additionally, the researcher intended to provide a model of descriptive text to provide students with additional language input. Finally, in “Reading and Reviewing the Picture Word Chart”, the pictures served as the picture word chart after they were labelled. The researcher devised an activity in which she and the students reviewed the picture word chart by reading and checking the words’ spelling.

At the MOT stage, the plans focused on providing additional explanation to students about the language features of descriptive texts in order to provide additional context for this text. This was accomplished through the use of PWIM activities, specifically “Classifying Words” and “Giving Exercises on the Present-tense Form”. In Cycle 2, students were required to not only determine whether a word was a noun, verb, adjective, or adverb, but also to incorporate it into their writing. The researcher intended to conduct an activity in which students would apply their knowledge of word classes. The exercise required students to describe various aspects of the provided images. The researcher and collaborator intended to provide some exercises on how to use the present tense in a descriptive text to ensure that they could apply their newly acquired knowledge. They were instructed to correct the verb's present-tense form.

There were two primary activities during the JCOT stage: “Generating Sentences and Paragraphs” and “Reading and Reviewing Sentences and Paragraphs”. In “Generating Sentences and Paragraphs”, the researcher intended to assign students tasks involving the re-arrangement of jumbled sentences. These sentences should be organized in a way that makes sense as descriptive text. To stay within the time limit, she prepared jumbled sentences from a descriptive text. Meanwhile, in “Reading and Reviewing Sentences and Paragraphs”, students were given time to proofread and edit their own work before submitting it to the researcher. Finally, the plans discussed how students transformed sentences into a cohesive narrative text using PWIM during the ICOT stage. The second cycle 2 meeting followed the same format as the previous meeting in terms of applying PWIM.

The researcher presented the results of the students' writing from the previous meeting during the “Action and Observation” phase of cycle 2, at the start of the lesson. Additionally, she reviewed the students' frequent mistakes and errors. Then she demonstrated how to correct their errors. During the BKOF stage, the activities continued. The activity began with the identification of pictures various architectural features. Students were instructed to label the pictures using the cue words provided. They appeared to have no idea what the cue words meant. They enquired as to the researcher's understanding of the cue words. The researcher then provided a sample of descriptive texts titled “My House”. Additionally,



she included images of the “House”. The students took an active role in labelling the items in the on-screen shared. Following the students’ labelling, the images served as the picture word chart. The researcher and collaborator then observed students reading the text. They carefully read the text. They appeared to have been exposed to a greater variety of vocabulary. They were able to respond to the researcher’s inquiries regarding the text's social function and generic structure. Nevertheless, some of them struggled to grasp the meaning of each sentence.

The researcher then progressed to the MOT stage. Following their comprehension of the vocabulary lists, the researcher explained the use of simple present-tense and sentence patterns. The students regarded the use of the simple present tense with suspicion. Several of them inquired about the proper use of the present simple tense. They were then instructed to locate nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs throughout the passage. This activity focused more on locating and rewriting verbs. Its objective was to improve students' command of present-tense forms of vocabulary. They did, however, encounter problems with the words' meanings. The researcher advised them to open their dictionary or re-check the picture word chart as a solution. At the ending of cycle 2, the researcher administered a post-test to determine the students' competency with descriptive writing. On June 11th, 2021, a post-test was conducted, with the following results:

Table 4.3 The Result of the Pos-test Cycle 2

<b>No</b>	<b>Code</b>	<b>Pos-test Cycle 2</b>
1	S7B-1	80
2	S7B-2	86
3	S7B-3	84
4	S7B-4	78
5	S7B-5	88
6	S7B-6	85
7	S7B-7	84
8	S7B-8	85
9	S7B-9	86
10	S7B-10	86
11	S7B-11	85
12	S7B-12	86
13	S7B-13	86
14	S7B-14	88
15	S7B-15	88
16	S7B-16	88
17	S7B-17	92
18	S7B-18	84
19	S7B-19	78
20	S7B-20	80
21	S7B-21	84
22	S7B-22	80
23	S7B-23	84
24	S7B-24	88
25	S7B-25	84
26	S7B-26	84
27	S7B-27	82
28	S7B-28	88
29	S7B-29	80
30	S7B-30	86
31	S7B-31	90
32	S7B-32	84
33	S7B-33	84
34	S7B-34	90
35	S7B-35	84
36	S7B-36	80

37	S7B-37	92
38	S7B-38	85
39	S7B-39	90
40	S7B-40	86
41	S7B-41	84
42	S7B-42	84
<b>Mean</b>		<b>85,00</b>
<b>Lowest Score</b>		<b>78</b>
<b>Highest Score</b>		<b>92</b>
<b>Passed</b>		<b>34</b>
<b>Percentage</b>		<b>80.95%</b>

As shown in Table 4.3, there was an increase in students' scores following the implementation of PWIM, which resulted in an increase in students' ability to write descriptive texts. It is possible that this increase was due to the implementation of PWIM. It was determined that the mean score for cycle 2 was 85 points. The lowest and highest scores, on the other hand, were 78 and 92, respectively. Following that, the percentage of students who passed the post-test for cycle 2 increased significantly. The test was passed by 34 students, for an 80.95 percent passing percentage. On the other hand, it is argued that the students passed their test based on the Minimum Mastery Criteria (KKM) of  $\geq 83$  that was agreed upon at SMPN 48 Surabaya, and that this research was ended once the students achieved the success criteria.

## 4.2 Discussion

The implementation of PWIM via an online classroom using Microsoft Teams for 7th grade students at SMPN 48 Surabaya resulted in significant improvements in students' ability to write descriptive texts and the teaching and

learning process. According to the result of this research, the first improvement should be made to the content. The first step of PWIM, identifying objects and concepts in the picture, was successfully completed. This step may encourage students to generate ideas. The second step of labelling words could assist students in brainstorming the critical ideas they needed to write. These findings corroborate Calhoun's (1999) assertion that the concept of using pictures as a stimulus for language experience activities in the classroom was developed specifically for the purpose of teaching young children to read and write.

The second improvement was in the aspect of organization. By following the PWIM steps, students were able to organize their thoughts in a manner consistent with the generic structure of descriptive text and in chronological order. By identifying pictures, labelling words, and creating sentences, students developed the ability to generate paragraphs in an orderly fashion. The findings are consistent with the frameworks of PWIM as defined by Calhoun (1999), who states that PWIM is intended to develop and support students' ability to share common meaning through words and to compose sentences and paragraphs that effectively convey ideas to readers.

The improvement in the students' writing abilities was further verified by quantitative data collected during the research. The information was provided in the form of the students' scores on the pre-test, post-test cycle 1, and post-test cycle 2 assessments. Following comparison of the students' mean scores in the pre-test, post-test cycle 1, and post-test cycle 2, it was revealed that there was a considerable improvement in every component of the students' writing

ability. According to this, the Picture Word Inductive Model (PWIM) could improve the students' ability to write descriptive texts in 7-B class at SMPN 48 Surabaya in the academic year 2020/2021.

During the preliminary research, it was revealed that the mean score was 62.88, with the lowest score being 50 and the best score being 84. It was agreed that only two students passed the test based on the Minimum Mastery Criteria (KKM), which is  $\geq 83$  points on a scale of 100. There were only two students who were successful out of the entire class (4.76%). During the online classroom, the researcher found that the students had only a few queries for the teacher about the topics. Furthermore, the quality of their writing, in terms of language usage, vocabulary, and organizational elements, remained deficient. The students found it difficult to express themselves in written language because some of them created noise while the teacher was teaching the content and because they were concerned about how to produce descriptive text. A strategy for perfecting their writing skills, particularly in the areas of descriptive composition and description, may have been required by this class. On the basis of this observation, it was established that the "Picture Word Inductive Model (PWIM)" would be the most appropriate technique to use during teaching and learning activities in an online classroom. As a result of studying this method, it is projected that students' achievement in writing abilities for the descriptive text will improve.

The first cycle, which took place on June 1<sup>st</sup>, 2021, was comprised of three meetings. Following the explanation of how the teaching and learning activity

took place during online learning, the cycle would be followed by the next cycles, which would be determined by the scenario. The researcher discovered certain facts that occurred in the online classroom during the course of the inquiry. It can be summarized as follows: Students were greeted by their teacher at the start of class. Also caused students to become more focused and attentive, and it allowed them to engage with one another by monitoring their attendance in an online classroom. Then she went into detail about descriptive text and everything that is associated with it, including the social role of descriptive language, its generic structure, and its characteristics. The generic structure is made up of identification and description, as well as linguistic aspects that are used in the descriptive text. Students were requested to participate in a conversation about descriptive texts in an online classroom led by the researcher, who served as the English teacher. The research offered a post-test cycle 1 at the conclusion of cycle 1 in order to assess the students' progress in the composition of descriptive texts.

After the implementation cycle 1, it can be argued the implementation of PWIM toward the students' achievement in writing descriptive text was improving, but it still needed to do the next cycle because the implementation of PWIM strategy on the first cycle couldn't reach the minimum standard success of the research where due to the students who passed the test based on the criteria of success were still 7 students, or it could be said the percentage of students' success was still 16.67%. On the other hand, the mean of the students' achievement in writing skill was 72.76. the lowest score was 60 and the highest

score was 84. Nonetheless, if it is compared to the results of the pre-test, the improvements toward the students' writing skill of the descriptive text were improved in matter of mean's results from 62.88 to 72.76, the highest score was same that was 84 and the lowest score was from 50 to 60. Meanwhile, the numbers of students who passed the test were improving from 2 students to 7 students. It can be argued the numbers of students increased 5 students in the percentage of 9.52%. Related to the results of the cycle 1, the researcher decided to continue the next cycle to make this research would be success.

Completing cycle 2, there was an increase in students' scores following the implementation of PWIM, which resulted in an increase in students' ability to write descriptive texts. The mean score for cycle 2 was determined to be 85. Meanwhile, the lowest and highest scores were 78 and 92. Following that, the percentage of students passing the cycle 2 post-test increased. 34 students passed the test with an 80.95 percent passing rate. It is argued that the students passed the test based on the Minimum Mastery Criteria (KKM) of  $\geq 83$  as agreed upon at SMPN 48 Surabaya, and that this research was stopped once the students met the success criteria. The researcher then calculated and analyzed the results of pre- and post-tests on students' abilities to write descriptive texts in the case of hypotheses testing. To begin, the normality test was used to determine whether the data were normally distributed. To determine the normality of the data, this study used the T-Test: Two-Samples for Variances formula. The result indicated that  $L_{count} < L_{table}$  was  $0.1075 < 0.1353$  which

indicates that  $L_{count} < L_{table}$  equals Normality Distribution. The researcher then conducted a hypothesis testing, as illustrated in the table below:

Table 4.4 t-Test: Paired Two Sample for Means

	<i>Pre-test</i>	<i>Post-test</i>
Mean	62.88095238	85
Variance	71.52206736	11.65853659
Observations	42	42
Pearson Correlation	0.450195659	
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
Df	41	
t Stat	-18.95687296	
P(T<=t) one-tail	3.35697E-22	
t Critical one-tail	1.682878002	
P(T<=t) two-tail	6.71395E-22	
t Critical two-tail	2.01954097	

The result of the t-Test is as follows: Paired Means from two samples indicated that the mean for Pre-test is 62.88 and the mean for Post-test is 85. The obtained t-value (t Stat) is -18.95687296, which is greater than the significance level of 0.05. The researchers calculated the results using the P(T=t) two-tail p-value, which is the p-value for the two-tailed form of the t-test. Because the p-value (6.71395E-22) is less than the 0.05 threshold for statistical significance, the researcher can accept the hypothesis ( $H_a$ ). As a result,  $H_a$  is accepted when the mean of the post-test is greater than the mean of the pre-test. It is concluded that students' writing scores improved significantly as a result of the PWIM strategy's application to students' descriptive text writing ability. This finding supports the primary hypothesis of the study, which is that students' reading comprehension has significantly improved as a result of accepting  $H_a$ .