CHAPTER IV
RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In chapter IV, this paper presents research and analysis performed by students on the comparative effectiveness of T.G.T. (Team Game Tournament) learning models and Traditional Methods for improving student writing skills on a descriptive text in Class VII MTs Yanbuul Qur'an in 2022/2023. This research was carried out in MTs Tahfidz Yanbuul, Menawan Kudus.

A. Description of Research Results Data

1. Overview of Research Locations

MTs Tahfidz Yanbuul Qur'an Menawan Kudus is located on Jl. Rahtawu Raya Menawan Kudus Central Java. It's 54 m from Kudus Downtown. This school was built by the collaboration and ideas of Islamic Master teachers K.H.M. Ulin Nuha Arwani and K.H.M. Ulil Albab Arwani on August 8 2009. The headmaster in Mts Yanbuul Qur'an Menawan Kudus now is Yuniar Fahmi Latif, M.Pd. The total number of teachers who taught there is 30, and the total of students is 534. There is some office at the school, such as the headmaster's office, teacher's office, and administration office. This school also has a library, cooperation, mosque, B.K. room, student health room, and computer laboratory. As for sports facilities, the school is provided with a futsal court and Volleyball court. In the MTs Tahfidz Yanbuul Qur'an Menawan Kudus has some English teachers are Ahsan, M.Pd and Adji Joyokerto, S.Pd.

2. Overview of The Experiment Object

This research was conducted in class VII MTs Tahfidz Yanbuul Qur'an Menawan Kudus. This research was conducted from December 17, 2022, to January 21, 2023. Referring to the method used in this research is an experiment. Researchers obtain data through observation and surveys. Observation with the provision of learning using the T.G.T. and T.M. learning models.

In contrast, the survey is in a form of providing evaluation instruments to control objects and manipulate objects (experiments). The research involved two classes.

Classes are taken randomly. So that 40 students were selected for class VII C and 40 for class VII-E—a total of 80 students.

When the experimental learning process was carried out, the teaching and learning process went through two stages. The first stage of the experiment in learning to write descriptive text was carried out in classes VII C, and VII E. Class VII C served as the control group with the traditional learning model. In contrast, class VII E is a manipulation group with the T.G.T. (Team Game Tournament) learning model. In the second stage of the experiment, writing descriptive texts was taught in a class that was initially a control group. In the second stage, it was made into a manipulation group with the T.G.T. (Team Game Tournament) learning model. While the class, which was initially a manipulation group, was used as a control group with a traditional learning model in the second stage.

To see whether the T.G.T. (Team Game Tournament) learning model and traditional learning models in increasing students' understanding of writing descriptive texts are effective, after the learning process, a post-test is carried out, which is analyzed and proven statistically by different t-tests.

3. Description of the Experimental Material

One of the objectives of the experimental method is to prove the hypothesis of whether the T.G.T. (Team Game Tournament) learning method is more effective for achieving success when compared to the traditional learning model. The material taught in this experimental research is writing descriptive texts about describing people and describing animals. The argument that students' understanding of writing descriptive text can increase is one of them determined by the suitable learning model. The effectiveness of the learning model used is expected to foster student enthusiasm, namely arousing student awareness. The brief description of the material taught to students within the framework of this experimental research is as follows:

a. Teaching Materials Describing People

The "description of people" topic means to describe people. Describing people is part of descriptive text. To tell people, vocabulary is needed to make it easier to make sentences. Defining people (people) can come from their characteristics

(traits) and physical appearance (physical appearance). Students are intended to be able to identify, criticize, write, and create short and simple texts about physical descriptions, traits, or actions taken by other people or people close to them.

In this experiment, the main topic taught to students is a descriptive text about describing people. As for a brief description of the subjects taught to students within the experimental framework of using the T.G.T. learning model and the use of traditional learning models, they are:

1) Standard Competence
   a) 3.5. Understanding the Social Functions of describing, identifying, criticizing, and giving judgments about people, animals and objects in terms of their nature.
   b) 4.5. Identifying a person's character (kind, pleasant, friendly, etc.)
2) Basic Competences
   a) Writing skill (Describing people/Adjective)
3) Indicator
   a) Understanding descriptive text about an idol character.
   b) Understand the use of Simple Tense (verb one s/es),
   c) Understand the use of to be (is, am, are) in describing someone.
   d) Understand the proper adjective according to the context in describing someone
   e) Make sentences in the form of Present Tense (with/without s/es), question words and negative statements, and prepositions:

in, on, and at for the right place and time according to their function.
f) Mention someone's character (kind, pleasant, friendly, etc.)
g) Understanding and making descriptive text about an idol character.

4) Content Material
a) Definition
b) Social Function
c) Generic Structure
d) Language Features

5) Source
a) English on Sky seven grade
b) LKS

b. Teaching Materials Describing Animals

The next topic regarding the material taught in the experiment using the learning model between the TGT learning model and the traditional (TM) learning model is describing animals. Students are also intended to be able to identify, criticize, write, and create short and simple texts about the physical descriptions, characteristics, or actions performed by animals around them.

As for a brief description of the topics taught to students within the experimental framework of using the TGT learning model and traditional learning models in learning to write descriptive texts about animals, they are:

1) Standard Competence
a) Understand the Social Functions of describing, identifying, criticizing, and giving judgments about people, animals and objects in terms of their nature.
b) Pinnacle of animal traits (good, kind, friendly, big, small, tall etc.)

2) Basic Competence
a) Writing Skills (Describing Animals/ Adjective)

3) Indicator
   a) Understanding descriptive text (Adjective) about the behaviour and nature of animals around them.
   b) Understand the use of Simple Tense (verb one s/es),
   c) Understanding the use of to be (is, am, are) in describing pets around students.
   d) Understand the appropriate adjective according to the context in describing animals.
   e) Make sentences in the form of Present Tense (with/without s/es), question words and negative statements, and prepositions: in, on, and at for the right place and time according to their function.
   f) Mention the nature of animals (big, small, cute, kind, friendly, etc.)
   g) Understand and write short and straightforward descriptive texts about pets around you.
4) Content Material
   a) Definition
   b) Social Function
   c) Generic Structure
   d) Language Features
5) Source
   a) English on Sky for Seventh Grade
   b) LKS

4. Instrumen of The Learning Evaluation Questions

As a form of completeness of the experimental procedure and, at the same time, proving the effectiveness of the learning model, in addition to designing the teaching materials presented, posttest questions are also designed to determine the evaluation of the learning outcomes carried out. The form of the evaluation questions is as follows:

a. First Stage Post-test Instrumen

Subject : English Writing Skills

Matter : Describing People
Class : VII
Allocation : 2X40 Minutes

1) Instruction :
   a) Write your name and your class clearly on the paper.
   b) Use your time adequately and work Individually.
   c) Write the sentence according to the number of words requested
   d) (50-100 words), because if there is an excess of words, it is not counted as the result of your writing.
2) Direction :
   a) Make a descriptive text that consists of the identification and description of the object that has been chosen.
   b) Write the text carefully and pay attention to the mechanism of descriptive text.
   c) Write your text about ± 50 100 words.
   d) Write to your reader about your favourite Idol.

b. Second Stage Posttest Instrument

Subject : English Writing Skills
Matter : Describing Animals
Class : VII
Allocation : 2X40 Minutes

1) Direction
   a) Write your name and your class clearly on the paper.
   b) Use your time adequately and work Individually.
   c) Write the sentence according to the number of words requested (5-100 words) because if there is an excess of words, it is not counted as the result of your writing.
2) Instruction
   a) Make a descriptive text that consists of the identification and description of the object that has been chosen.

b) Write the text carefully and pay attention to the mechanism of descriptive text.
c) Write your text about ± 50 – 100 words.
d) Write your text about your pets or your favourite animals.

5. The Instrument of Rubric Assessment or Scoring Guides.

Assessment is given to determine students' level of understanding and insight regarding the learning material given to them. The judgment in question is the evaluation results that have been given to students after the experiment was carried out.

The assessment rubric used as a reference in this study is described in the table below:

Table 4.1
Rubric Assessment of Knowledge & Skills Writing

Element of Writing	Score			
	Very Good	**Good**	**Poor**	**Fair**
Content	27- 30	22-26	17-21	13-16
Organization	18-20	14-17	10-13	6-9
Vocabulary	18-20	14-17	10-13	6-9
Grammar	22-25	18-21	11-17	5-10
Mechanical	5	4	3	2
Total of Score	**100**			

6. Stages of Experiment Implementation

This research was conducted in two stages. Each stage continued with learning experiments using two learning models, namely the TGT (Team Game Tournament) learning model and the traditional learning model (direct learning). The material for the control group is through the Traditional Method (TM) learning model, namely describing people, and the material taught through the TGT learning model also describes people. To provide an overview of the experimental design and preparation for experimenting, it is explained as follows:

a. Experiment Preparation Stage

The preparatory stage is the stage of making preparations, such as preparing the material to be taught, the TGT (Team Game Tournament) design, the evaluation design, and the experimental settings in the control group and the manipulation group. Detailed description as follows:

1) Carry out learning observations in class VII MTs Tahfidz Yanbuul Qur'an Menawan Gebog Kudus to find out the characteristics of students and the methods used by the teacher in teaching.
2) Developing material to be taught in stage I and stage II experiments. This teaching material was developed mainly related to display design, especially the fabric that will be conducted using the determined TGT (Team Game Tournament) learning model.
3) Develop and adapt material about a descriptive text that will be taught in experiments with competency standards. This includes designing lesson plans that refer to K13 using the TGT (Team game Tournament) learning model and the traditional learning model.
4) Formulate (design) essay questions as a posttest posttest that will be used to evaluate students related to the material.
5) Post-test questions in the first and second stages according to the recommendations and approval of the teaching teacher.

b. Implementation of the First Stage Experiment

The experiment was carried out in two stages, and each stage will test the effectiveness of each learning method on students' understanding of the learning material. In the first stage of the experiment, the learning material describes people and animals. The class is divided into two in this first stage of the investigation. One class will be taught about telling people using the traditional model learning and another type using the TGT model learning. The conventional model learning is the

control group, while the TGT learning model is the experimental group. To give a clearer picture, it is described as follows:

1) Classes are grouped into two, namely the experimental group and the control group.
2) The control group here will receive learning with the Traditional method. That class is class VII-C, while the experimental group will receive learning through the TGT (Team Game Tournament) learning model. That class is class VII-E.
3) Each group consists of 40 students for the control group and 40 for the experimental group.
    a) Learning in the Control Group (Traditional Learning Model)
        (1) The teacher enters the class and says hello.
        (2) The teacher invites students to open the subject matter by describing people.
        (3) The teacher opens the lesson by describing the essence of the meeting in question and providing a material grid.
        (4) The teacher explains things related to describing people.
        (5) Material is presented using Traditional Methods such as lectures and question-and-answer methods with the help of blackboards in the learning process.
        (6) Besides giving lectures, the teacher also writes various things related to explaining the material being taught to clarify.
        (7) The learning process is carried out for 60 minutes.
        (8) Before the learning session is closed, dialogue is first carried out—and questions and answers are to provide student responses and feedback.

(9) In order to find out the learning outcomes, students are given evaluation questions.
(10) Each question is given a time allocation of 20 minutes.
(11) The meeting was closed by the teacher.

b) Learning In The Manipulation Group (TGT Model)

Another learning method used in the first stage of the experiment is the TGT learning model. The first stage of experimental learning material is still about describing people. Classes taught using the TGT learning model are classes VII-E. This class is considered the experimental (manipulation) group. Clearly, the experimental learning process (using TGT learning) is described as follows:

(1) The teacher enters the class and says hello.
(2) The teacher invites students to open the subject matter by describing people.
(3) The teacher opens the lesson by describing the essence of the meeting in question and providing a material grid.
(4) The teacher explains at a glance things related to describing people.
(5) The material is presented with the design of the TGT (team game tournament) learning model.
(6) The teacher forms eight student groups with a total of 5 student members.
(7) Next, the teacher gives the task, and then the teacher instructs students to have a discussion guided by the team leader regarding the teaching material.

(8) After the discussion, each group explains the results of the conversation and asks questions about the material that has been studied.
(9) Quiz with prizes related to the material studied to measure each group's mastery of the material.
(10) The teacher provides opportunities for students to express their opinions about the learning that has been followed.
(11) The teacher and students make conclusions/summaries of learning outcomes during the meeting as a response and feedback between the teacher and students.
(12) The learning process is carried out for 60 minutes.
(13) The teacher gives evaluation questions at the end of the lesson for 20 minutes.
(14) The meeting was closed by the teacher.

c. Implementation of the second stage of the experiment

In the second stage of the experiment, learning was carried out by describing animals. In this second stage of the experiment, the class was divided into two: one learning class using the lecture learning method and another type using the TGT (Team Game Tournament) learning method. The lecture method is the control group, while the TGT method is the experimental group. To give a clearer picture, it is described as follows:

1) Classes are grouped into two, namely the experimental group and the control group.
2) The control group here will receive learning using the lecture method, namely class VII-E. In contrast, the experimental group will receive an education using the TGT (Team Game Tournament) learning method, namely class

VII-C (the opposite of class division in the first stage).

3) The control group (class VII-E) gets learning to write descriptive texts about describing animals through the Traditional Method approach with the following steps:
   a) Learning In The Control Group (Traditional Model)

      The control group (class VII-E) gets learning to write descriptive texts about describing animals through the Traditional Method approach with the following steps:
      (1) The teacher enters the class and says hello.
      (2) The teacher invites students to open the subject matter by describing animals.
      (3) The teacher opens the lesson by describing the main points of the meeting in question and providing a material grid.
      (4) The teacher explains things related to describing animals.
      (5) Material is presented using Traditional Methods such as lectures and question-and-answer methods with the help of blackboards in the learning process.
      (6) Besides giving lectures, the teacher also writes various things related to explaining the material being taught to clarify.
      (7) The learning process is carried out for 60 minutes.
      (8) Before the learning session is closed, dialogue and questions and answers are first carried out to provide responses and feedback from students.

(9) To find out the learning outcomes, students are given evaluation questions.
(10) Each question is given a time allocation of 20 minutes.
(11) The meeting was closed by the teacher.

b) Learning In The Manipulation Group (TGT Model)

Another learning method used in the second stage of the experiment is the TGT learning model. The second stage of experimental learning material is still about describing animals. Classes taught using the TGT learning model are class VII-C. This class is considered the experimental (manipulation) group. Clearly, the experimental learning process (using TGT learning) is described as follows:

(1) The teacher enters the class and says hello.
(2) The teacher invites students to open the subject matter by describing animals.
(3) The teacher opens the lesson by describing the essence of the meeting in question and providing a material grid.
(4) The teacher explains at a glance things related to describing animals.
(5) The material is presented with the design of the TGT (team game tournament) learning model.
(6) The teacher forms eight student groups with a total of 5 student members.
(7) Next, the teacher gives the task, and then the teacher instructs students to have a discussion guided by the team leader regarding the teaching material.

(8) After the discussion, each group explains the results of the conversation and asks questions about the material that has been studied.
(9) Quiz with prizes related to the material studied to measure each group's mastery of the material.
(10) The teacher provides opportunities for students to express their opinions about the learning that has been followed.
(11) The teacher and students make conclusions/summaries of learning outcomes during the meeting as a response and feedback between the teacher and students.
(12) The learning process is carried out for 60 minutes.
(13) The teacher gives evaluation questions at the end of the lesson for 20 minutes.
(14) The meeting was closed by the teacher.

7. Experimental Findings

a. Phase I Experiment Data

The results of the control group posttest are the results of evaluating learning achievement using traditional learning models. This evaluation is critical because competence in English material for this topic, besides being expected to increase students' understanding, students must also be able to practice it in everyday life. To provide a more detailed description of the results of the evaluation of the cognitive aspects of the stage one control group, it is described in the following sub-chapters:

1) The Data of Controlled Class

After the learning process is carried out, and then the learning evaluation is carried out by giving questions to students to fill in (test). The results are shown in the following table:

Table 4.2 First Stage
Results of The Evaluation Control Group

No	Students' Name	C	O	V	G	M	Total Score
1	A. Fawwaz D	26	15	15	21	4	81
2	A. Ahnaf R	20	10	12	15	3	60
3	A Aziz BJ	16	10	10	14	2	52
4	A. Fahim K	22	13	15	17	3	70
5	A. Harish N	21	11	14	16	3	65
6	A. Bahrul A	21	10	14	15	3	63
7	Amir HKS	17	10	10	13	2	52
8	Aqil L	22	14	14	17	4	71
9	Arrafi AE	19	11	13	16	3	62
10	Atif JR	19	11	14	17	3	64
11	Azka AA	18	11	14	17	3	63
12	Dhimas HA	16	10	10	13	3	52
13	Dhiya AW	18	11	13	18	3	63
14	Faiz AG	18	11	14	16	3	62
15	Fayik AT	20	14	15	21	3	73
16	Hamzah HAT	18	13	13	16	2	62
17	Heaven MF	22	13	15	17	3	70
18	Hilmy TA	21	13	13	19	4	70
19	In'Am R	23	14	14	20	4	75
20	Kenzie FAP	17	10	9	12	2	50
21	M. Fadhil HA	14	8	8	11	2	43
22	M. Atha ZG	23	14	14	20	4	75
23	M. Faith F	20	10	12	15	3	60
24	M. Faras RA	14	8	10	9	2	43
25	M. Hilman A	20	15	14	18	4	72

No	Students' Name	C	O	V	G	M	Total Score
26	M. Masykur AH	22	13	15	20	4	74
27	M Nabil FW	17	10	9	12	2	50
28	M. Na'Im AF	21	11	14	17	3	66
29	M. Nashif RA	17	8	10	13	2	50
30	M. Razzan D	20	12	13	17	3	65
31	M. Salman ZM	19	9	10	15	2	55
32	M. Syafiq N	22	10	14	17	3	66
33	Nabil AR	19	9	10	14	3	55
34	Najma LFM	18	10	10	15	2	55
35	Naufal RG	17	10	9	12	2	50
36	Qaysar FA	21	11	13	18	3	66
37	Raihan AA	20	11	12	17	3	63
38	Rais AA	17	10	9	12	2	50
39	Taufiqi H	20	10	12	15	3	60
40	Ulil AWS	19	11	11	16	3	60

Data source: Class VII-C MTs Tahfidz Yanbuul Qur'an Menawan

The table above shows that the achievement of student learning in writing descriptive texts about describing people using traditional learning models is very varied. Of the 40 students who received learning about writing telling people, the level of understanding of students was quite good. The description of results of the first phase evaluation of the control group is described in the following table:

Table 4.3 Descriptive Statistics
First Stage Evaluation Results (Control Group)

N	Valid	40
	Missing	0
Mean		61,42
Median		62,50
Range		38
Minimum		43
Maximum		81

Source: Primary Data Processed

The table above shows that the average score achieved by 40 students who received Writing Descriptive Text learning about describing people using the Traditional learning model (control group) the average value achieved was 61.42, with the lowest score being 43 and the highest score being 81. The highest number of students obtained a score of 50.

For more clarity about the results of the scores achieved by students, it can be seen in table 4.3 below:

Table 4.4 Descriptive Statistics
First Stage Evaluation Results(Control Group)

Score	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
43	2	5%	5%	5%
50	5	12,5%	12,5%	17,5%
52	3	7,5%	7,5%	25%
55	3	7,5%	7,5%	32,5%
60	4	10%	10%	42,5%
62	3	7,5%	7,5%	50%
63	4	10%	10%	60%

Score	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
43	2	5%	5%	5%
50	5	12,5%	12,5%	17,5%
52	3	7,5%	7,5%	25%
64	1	2,5%	2,5%	62,5%
65	2	5%	5%	67,5%
66	3	7,5%	7,5%	75%
70	3	7,5%	7,5%	82,5%
71	1	2,5%	2,5%	85%
72	1	2,5%	2,5%	87,5%
73	1	2,5%	2,5%	90%
74	1	2,5%	2,5%	92,5%
75	2	5%	5%	97,5%
81	1	2,5%	2,5%	100%
Total	40	100%	100%	

Source: Primary Data Processed

The results of the first stage of evaluation in the control group (use of the TM learning model) in improving students' understanding of writing descriptive texts, the table above shows that of the 40 students who were the object of the experiment, 1 student (2.5%) got a score of 81, a score of 75 2 students (5%). Score 74 as much as one student (2.5%). Score 73 as much as one student (2.5%). Score 72 as much as one student (2.5%). Score 71 as much as one student (2.5%). Students who get a score of 70 are three students (7.5%), Students who earn a score of 66 are three students (7.5%), get a score of 65 for two students (5%), get a score of 64 for one student (2, 5%) 5%), obtained a score of 63 for four students (10%). Students who scored 62 were

three students (7.5%). Students who get a score of 60 are four students (10%), Students who earn a score of 55 are three students (7.5%), Students who earn a score of 52 are three students (7.5%), Students who get a score of 50 are five students (12.5%), and students who scored 43 were two students (5%).

The evaluation results imply that the traditional learning model in describing people is sufficient. The average value of student evaluation results from students of 61,42 indicates that.

2) The Data of Manipulation Group

The learning model used in learning to write a descriptive text about describing people is the TGT learning model. This class is called the Manipulation group, with 40 students. After the process of learning to write descriptive text through the TGT learning model has been carried out, then an evaluation is carried out, and the result values are obtained as in the following table:

Table 4.5 First Stage
Evaluation Result Data (Manipulation Group)

No	Students' Name	Understanding Ability					
		C	O	V	G	M	Total Score
1	A. Nawaf NF	25	16	16	18	4	79
2	Ahsanta AH	23	15	14	18	4	74
3	Aldy KA	25	16	15	19	4	79
4	Alexander BAR	21	13	13	19	4	70
5	Ananda RAL	21	16	15	18	4	74
6	Athaya GH	19	9	10	13	2	53
7	Dhafa DP	21	13	13	17	3	67
8	Faathir HA	25	16	16	19	4	80
9	Farrel NA	22	13	14	17	4	70
10	Hafidz ZM	22	13	14	17	4	70

No	Students' Name	Understanding Ability					
		C	O	V	G	M	Total Score
11	Haidar AM	15	12	13	13	2	55
12	Hanif GA	22	14	13	17	4	70
13	Humam AK	22	13	14	17	4	70
14	Irsyad HA	17	13	13	17	3	63
15	Kayoza AR	21	13	13	17	3	67
16	M Wildan H	22	14	15	19	4	74
17	M Akbar FS	20	13	13	16	3	65
18	M putra NS	15	10	10	18	2	55
19	M Ali M	21	11	13	17	3	65
20	M Azka NR	17	10	9	12	2	50
21	M. Brian J	20	11	12	17	3	63
22	M.Fakhri z	21	13	13	17	3	67
23	M.Fatih AK	22	13	13	18	4	70
24	M.Hasyemi RI	15	10	12	15	3	55
25	M.Ibrahim	12	9	9	13	2	45
26	M. Khoirul F	20	13	12	15	3	63
27	M.Mazadino D	19	13	13	17	3	65
28	M.Naufal R	15	10	10	18	2	55
29	M.Raffa A	20	13	12	15	3	63
30	M.Sabil MH	20	13	12	15	3	63
31	M.Suttan FE	17	11	10	15	2	55
32	M.Ulil F	16	9	9	14	2	50
33	M.U Alhaq	16	9	9	14	2	50
34	Revansa ASB	19	9	10	15	2	55
35	Rizkia AIA	19	13	13	11	2	58
36	Saad	20	13	13	16	3	65
37	Syarif RA	16	13	13	11	2	55
38	Taufiqi H	14	9	12	13	2	50
39	Wishnu W	17	10	10	16	2	55

No	Students' Name	Understanding Ability					
		C	O	V	G	M	Total Score
40	Zafran AA	15	9	9	10	2	45

Sources Data: Class VII-E MTs Tahfidz Yanbuul Qur'an Menawan

The table above shows that the achievement of student learning by using TGT has increased compared to traditional. Of the 40 students who received learning about describing people, their level of understanding was classified as increasing. This is indicated by an increase in the average value achieved by students of 62.42. and students who scored 45 were only two students, while students who scored 70 to 80 also increased.

To provide a further description of the results of the first stage evaluation in the manipulation group (TGT learning model) it is explained in the following table:

Table 4.6 Descriptive Statistics
First Stage Evaluation Result Data
(Manipulation Group)

N	Valid	40
	Missing	0
Mean		62,42
Median		63,00
Range		35
Minimum		45
Maximum		80

Source: Primary Data Processed

Table 4.6 above shows that the average score achieved by the 40 students who received learning to write descriptive texts about describing people through the TGT learning model (training group) the average value

achieved was 62, 42. The lowest score is 45, and the highest score is 80.

To be more explicit about the results of the scores achieved by students, it can be seen in the following table:

Table 4.7 Descriptive Statistics
First Stage Evaluation Result Data (Manipulation Group)

Nilai	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
45	2	5%	5%	5%
50	4	10%	10%	15%
53	1	2,5%	2,5%	17,5%
55	8	20%	20%	37,5%
58	1	2,5%	2,5%	40%
63	5	12,5%	12,5%	52,5%
65	4	10%	10%	62,5%
67	3	7,5%	7,5%	70%
70	6	15%	15%	85%
74	3	7,5%	7,5%	92,5%
79	2	5%	5%	97,5
80	1	2,5%	2,5%	100%
	40	100%	100%	

Primary Data Source Processed.

The results of the evaluation of the first stage of the experiment in the control group, Using the TGT learning model in learning to write descriptive text in the table above, shows that out of 40 students who scored 80, only one student (2.5%). Students who obtained a score of 79, 2 students (5%), a value of 74, 3 students (7.5%), and a value of 70 were six students (15%), a value of 67, 3 students (7.5%), a value 65, 4 students (10%), value 63 were five students (12.5%), value 58 was one student (2.5%), value 55 were eight students (20%),

value 53 was one student (2 .5%), score 50, 4 students (10%), and two students (5%) got a score of 45.

The evaluation results above seem clear that most of the evaluation results of student learning obtain scores between 45 to 58, 63 to 67, and 70 to 80. This fact implies that using the TGT learning model can increase students' understanding of the subject matter provided by the teacher. The TGT learning model offers a dual response, named through sight, hearing, and unsaturation.

3) Data Test Results Of Different Levels Of Understanding Experimental Materials.

One of the aims of this study was to empirically prove the effectiveness of the use of learning models on the level of student's understanding of writing descriptive texts. Therefore, the two TM and TGT learning models' effectiveness must be proven statistically. This statistic is a tool for processing empirical data.

After completing the experimental process of the two learning models through the TM learning model (control group) and the TGT learning model (manipulation group), as well as carrying out a posttest, then it is analyzed by testing different levels of students' understanding of subject matter using traditional learning models and learning models TGT.

The difference test used to prove the difference in students' absorption rate of learning to write a descriptive text about describing people is the correlated t-test. The output of the correlated t different tests provides the analysis about whether or not there is a significant difference in the effectiveness of using the TGT and Traditional learning models

on students' understanding of writing descriptive texts.

To provide an overview of the results of the correlated t-difference test, it is explained in the following table:

Table 4.8 Different Test Results Related Mean First Stage Control And Manipulation Group

Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
tm 1	40	61.4250	9.17602	1.45086
tgt 1	40	62.4250	9.43232	1.49138

Source: Primary Data Processed

The table above describes the results of the correlated t-test in the form of the difference in mean and standard deviation of the learning evaluation results between learning using the Traditional (TM) learning model and the TGT learning model. Statistical output (t correlated) shows that the mean of learning evaluation results with the TM model is 61.42, while the learning evaluation results using the TGT model produce a value of 62.42. The difference is insignificant when looking at the average of the two learning evaluation results from using the two learning models. The average learning evaluation value using the two models is almost the same, meaning the evaluation results are only slightly different. This is consistent with the results achieved by the TM model in the first stage.

The difference in the evaluation results between using the TM learning model and the TGT learning model in learning students' understanding of writing descriptive text material lies in the standard deviation. The standard deviation for using the TM learning model produces a value of 9.176 which is

different from the TGT learning model showing a value of 9.432. So it can be said that there is no difference in the average score of students' writing comprehension in learning descriptive text using the traditional or TGT learning models. This implies a change in student responses when using the TGT learning model.

Table 4.9
Dependent T Test Results
First Stage TGT and Traditional Learning Models

Treatment	*n*	*Mean*	*Std deviasi*	*t*	*p value*
TM	40	61,42	9,17602	-0,552	0,584
TGT	40	62,42	9,43232		

Source: Primary Data Processed

Based on table 4.9 above, it can be seen that the average score of students' understanding of writing descriptive text, learning using traditional models in class VII students of MTs Yanbuul Qur'an Menawan is 61.42 with a different standard deviation of 9.17602. while in learning using the TGT model of 62.42 with a different standard deviation of 9.43232.

The results of the dependent t test obtained a p-value of 0.584 > 0.05 (α), so it can be said that there is no difference in the average score of students' understanding of writing descriptive text before and after learning using the traditional model in class VII students of MTs Yanbuul Qur' an Menawan.

Even though there is no significant difference, it does not mean that the TGT learning model does not have responsiveness capabilities, but rather that the responsiveness is not superior. The lack of superiority of the response is due to the very short horizon of the experimental context, and the research does not look at the respondents' perceptions. Research only involves the consequences of learning,

namely the evaluation results, which are considered a proxy for the effectiveness of the learning methods.

b. Second Stage Description Data of The Experimental Results

As research requires the validity of the research results, to obtain the validity of the research results, repeated experiments were carried out in different settings to see the consistency of the results. The purpose of the various locations is that the group positioned initially as the control group was set as the manipulation group in the second stage of the experiment. The second stage of the investigation, which became the manipulation class with the TGT Learning Model, was VII-C with 40 students. In comparison, the class that became the control group with the Traditional Learning Model was class VII-E, with 40 students. The material taught in the second stage is writing descriptive texts about describing animals.

1) Results of Evaluation Second Stage In the Control Group.

The results of the posttest in the control group evaluate the achievement of learning using the TM learning model so that it can be seen to what extent the level of absorption of students' knowledge after the descriptive text material is delivered. The experiment's second stage is learning descriptive writing about describing Animals. The control class with the Traditional Learning Model is VII-E 40 students. After the learning process is carried out, and then a learning evaluation is carried out by giving a posttest to students, the results are shown in the following table:

Table 4.10 Evaluation Results
Second Stage Control Group

No	Students' Name	Understanding Skills					
		C	O	V	G	M	Total Score
1	A. Nawaf NF	20	9	10	15	2	56
2	Ahsanta AH	22	11	14	16	3	66
3	Aldy KA	19	9	10	15	2	55
4	Alexander BAR	19	9	10	15	2	55
5	Ananda RAL	17	10	9	12	2	50
6	Athaya GH	21	11	14	17	3	66
7	Dhafa DP	20	11	12	17	3	63
8	Faathir HA	17	10	10	12	2	51
9	Farrel NA	20	10	12	15	3	60
10	Hafidz ZM	18	11	13	16	3	61
11	Haidar AM	14	8	10	9	2	43
12	Hanif GA	23	14	14	20	4	75
13	Humam AK	20	11	12	15	3	61
14	Irsyad HA	14	8	10	9	2	43
15	Kayoza AR	22	14	14	17	4	71
16	M Wildan H	22	13	15	20	4	74
17	M Akbar FS	17	10	9	12	2	50
18	M putra NS	22	10	14	17	3	66
19	M Ali M	17	10	10	12	2	51
20	M Azka NR	20	12	13	17	3	65
21	M. Brian J	18	11	13	18	3	63
22	M.Fakhri z	17	11	10	13	2	53
23	M.Fatih AK	20	11	12	17	3	63
24	M.Ibrahim	21	11	12	15	3	62

No	Students' Name	Understanding Skills					
		C	O	V	G	M	Total Score
25	M.Hasyemi RI	21	13	15	20	4	73
26	M. Khoirul F	21	11	12	15	3	62
27	M.Mazadino D	22	13	15	17	3	70
28	M.Naufal R	22	14	14	17	4	71
29	M.Raffa A	23	14	14	20	4	75
30	M.Sabil MH	17	10	10	12	2	51
31	M.Suttan FE	26	15	15	21	4	81
32	M.Ulil F	20	11	12	15	3	61
33	Revansa ASB	16	10	10	13	3	52
34	M.U Alhaq	22	14	14	17	4	71
35	Rizkia AIA	20	12	13	17	3	65
36	Saad	20	11	12	17	3	63
37	Syarif RA	17	11	10	13	2	53
38	Taufiqi H	22	14	14	17	4	71
39	Wishnu W	21	11	12	15	3	62
40	Zafran AA	19	11	14	17	3	64

Source: Data from Class VIIE MTs Tahfidz Yanbuul Qur'an Menawan

The table above shows that the achievement of student learning in the second stage of the experiment using the traditional learning model is very varied. Of the 40 students who received learning about writing describing animals, their level of understanding was classified as less when compared to the first stage of the experiment. This can be seen from the relatively high range of scores. That is, some students score 43 to 81, of which most score 63 and 74.

To provide a further description of the results of the evaluation of the second stage of the manipulation group in the first stage of the experiment, it is explained in the following table:

Table 4.11 Descriptive Statistics
Second Stage Evaluation Result (Control Group)

N	Valid	40
	Missing	0
Mean		61,70
Median		62,50
Std. Deviation		9,056
Range		38
Minimum		43
Maximum		81

Source: Primary Data Processed

The table above shows that the average score achieved by the 40 students who received learning to write descriptive texts about describing animals using the Traditional learning model achieved was 61.70, with the lowest score of 43 and the highest score of 81, and some Most of the students got scores of 63 and 74.

To be more explicit about the results of the scores achieved by students, it can be seen below:

Tabel 4.12 Descriptive Statistics Of The Evaluation Result Second Stage (Control Group)

Score	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
43	2	5%	5%	5%
50	2	5%	5%	10%
51	3	7,5%	7,5%	17,5
52	1	2,5%	2,5%	20%

Score	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
53	2	5%	5%	25%
55	2	5%	5%	30%
56	1	2,5%	2,5%	32,5%
60	1	2,5%	2,5%	35%
61	3	7,5%	7,5%	42,5%
62	3	7,5%	7,5%	50%
63	4	10%	10%	60%
64	1	2,5%	2,5%	62,5%
65	2	5%	5%	67,5%
66	3	7,5%	7,5%	75%
70	1	2,5%	2,5%	77,5%
71	4	10%	10%	87,5%
73	1	2,5%	2,5%	90%
74	1	2,5%	2,5%	92,5%
75	2	5%	5%	97,5%
81	1	2,5%	2,5%	100%
	40	100%	100%	

Source: Primary Data Processed

The results of the evaluation of the second stage of the control group (using the TM learning model) in improving students' understanding of writing descriptive texts, as the table above shows, that of the 40 students who were the object of the experiment, one student (2.5%) scored 81, scored 75 as many as two students (5%). Score 74 as much as one student (2.5%). Score 73 as much as one student (2.5%). Score 71 as many as four students (10%). Students who get a score of 70 are one student (2.5%), Students who earn a score of 66 are three students (7.5%), get a score of 65 is two students (5%), get a score of 64 is one student

(2, 5%), four students (10%) got a score of 63. Three students earned a score of 62 (7.5%). Students who get a score of 61 are three students (7.5%), Students who get a score of 60 are one student (2.5%), Students who earn a score of 56 are one student (2.5%), Students who get a score of 55 as many as two students (5%), Students who earn a score of 53 are two students (5%), Students who earn a score of 52 are two students (5%), Students who get a score of 51 are one student (2.5%), Students who got a score of 50 were three students (7.5%). Two students earned a score of 43 (5%).

The evaluation results above seem clear that most of the students on the evaluation results scored 43 to 50, between 51 to 56, 60 to 66, between 70 to 74 and 81. The evaluation results imply that the TM learning model is for learning to write a descriptive text describing animals classified as moderate. This is indicated by the average student score of 61.70.

2) Manipulation Group Posttest Results

In the second learning stage, the manipulation group learned descriptive text about describing Animals using the TGT Learning Model. The class that received learning in this session was class VII-C, with 40 students. Then a learning evaluation posttest is carried out with the result values as in the following table:

Tabel 4.13 Descriptive Statistics of The Evaluation result Second Stage Manipulation Group

No	Students' Name	Understanding Ability					
		C	O	V	G	M	Total Score
1	A. Fawwaz D	22	14	15	17	4	72
2	A. Ahnaf R	26	16	17	18	4	81

No	Students' Name	Understanding Ability					
		C	O	V	G	M	Total Score
3	A Aziz BJ	22	14	15	15	4	70
4	A. Fahim K	27	14	15	16	3	75
5	A. Harish N	22	13	13	14	3	65
6	A. Bahrul A	25	17	17	18	4	81
7	Amir HKS	25	14	16	19	4	78
8	Aqil L	22	13	13	14	3	65
9	Arrafi AE	27	14	15	16	3	75
10	Atif JR	27	14	15	16	3	75
11	Azka AA	21	13	12	14	3	63
12	Dhimas HA	27	18	19	21	5	90
13	Dhiya AW	27	14	15	16	3	75
14	Faiz AG	20	14	14	15	5	68
15	Fayik AT	26	17	19	20	4	86
16	Hamzah HAT	27	19	18	21	4	89
17	Heaven MF	22	13	13	14	3	65
18	Hilmy TA	26	16	17	18	4	81
19	In'Am R	22	13	13	14	3	65
20	Kenzie FAP	27	18	16	18	4	83
21	M. Fadhil HA	25	14	16	19	4	78
22	M. Atha ZG	22	14	10	16	5	67
23	M. Faith F	24	17	15	18	4	78
24	M. Faras RA	26	17	15	22	5	85
25	M. Hilman A	27	19	18	21	4	89
26	M. Masykur	23	17	17	18	4	79
27	M Nabil FW	26	17	15	22	5	85
28	M. Na'Im AF	26	17	15	22	5	85

No	Students' Name	Understanding Ability					
		C	O	V	G	M	Total Score
29	M. Nashif RA	29	20	19	24	5	97
30	M. Razzan D	23	14	14	17	3	71
31	M. Salman Z	30	20	20	25	5	100
32	M. Syafiq N	24	14	14	19	5	76
33	Nabil AR	20	14	14	15	5	68
34	Najma LFM	26	17	15	22	5	85
35	Naufal RG	27	15	15	18	5	80
36	Qaysar FA	24	15	17	18	4	78
37	Raihan AA	20	13	14	16	4	67
38	Rais AA	26	17	19	20	4	86
39	Taufiqi H	25	16	14	17	5	77
40	Ulil AWS	23	17	17	18	4	79

Sourcess Data: Class VII-C MTs Tahfidz Yanbuul Qur'an Menawan

The table above shows that the achievement of student learning using the TGT model increases compared to the TM model. Of the 40 students who received learning about describing Animals through TGT, their level of understanding was classified as increasing. This was indicated by an increase in student scores, where the average score was 78.00, and only one obtained a score of 63, while students who scored above 80 also increased, and some even obtained a score of 100 as much as one student.

To provide a further description of the results of the evaluation of the second stage of the manipulation group in the second stage of the experiment, it is explained in the following table:

Table 4.14 Descriptive Statistics
Second Stage Evaluation Results
(Manipulation Group)

N	Valid	40
	Missing	0
Mean		77,80
Median		78,00
Std. Deviation		8,979
Range		37
Minimum		63
Maximum		100

S*ource: Primary Data Processed.*

The table above shows that the average score achieved by the 40 students who received learning to write descriptive texts about describing Animals using TGT was 77.80, with the lowest score being 63 and the highest score being 100. The highest number of students scored 65, 75, 78 and 85.

To be more explicit about the results of the scores achieved by students, it can be seen in the following table:

Table 4.15 Descriptive Statistics
Second Stage Evaluation Results (Manipulation Group)

Score	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
63	1	2,5%	2,5%	2,5%
65	4	10%	10%	12,5%
67	2	5%	5%	17,5%
68	2	5%	5%	22,5%
70	1	2,5%	2,5%	25%
71	1	2,5%	2,5%	27,5%
72	1	2,5%	2,5%	30%

Score	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
75	4	10%	10%	40%
76	1	2,5%	2,5%	42,5%
77	1	2,5%	2,5%	45%
78	4	10%	10%	55%
79	2	5%	5%	60%
80	1	2,5%	2,5%	62,5%
81	3	7,5%	7,5%	70%
83	1	2,5%	2,5%	72,5%
85	4	10%	10%	82,5%
86	2	5%	5%	87,5%
89	2	5%	5%	92,5%
90	1	2,5%	2,5%	95%
97	1	2,5%	2,5%	97,5%
100	1	2,5%	2,5%	100%
Total	40	100%	100%	

Source: Primary Data Processes

The results of the evaluation of the first stage of the manipulation group using the TGT learning model in learning Writing Descriptive Text about describing places and things, as in the table above, shows that out of 40 students who were experimental objects, one student (2.5%) received a score of 100. Students who get a score of 97 are one student (2.5%), get a score of 90 by one student (2.5%), get a score of 89 by two students (5%), get a score of 86 by two students (5%), obtaining a score of 85 by four students (10%), obtaining a value of 83 by one student (2.5%), obtaining a discount of 81 by three students (7.5%), getting a deal of 80 by one student (2.5%), obtaining a score of 79 by

two students (5%), receiving a value of 78 by four students (10%), getting a deal of 77 by one student (2.5%), obtaining a value of 76 by one student (2.5%), obtaining a value 75 by four students (10%), 72 by one student (2.5%), one student (2.5%) for 71, 1 student (2.5%) for 70, 1 student (2.5%) 68 by two students (5%), 67 by two students (5%), 65 by four students (10%), and 63 by one student (2.5%).

The description of the results of the second evaluation stage using the TGT learning model implies that using the TGT learning model gives more responses to students' concentration, memory and understanding. That can be seen from the increase in student scores and students' opinions that variations in learning with team games in class make students not dull. The selection of the TGT learning model also provides an opportunity to increase concentration on various sensory activities in students so that students can develop a love for learning and learning English in class.

3) Test Results for Different Levels of Absorption of Experimental Materials.

Testing the difference in the effectiveness of the second stage of the TM and TGT learning models is intended to obtain further confirmation of the role of the point of learning media in the absorption of learning material by students. Testing the level of difference in the effectiveness of the learning model used the t-test correlation.

After the experimental process, the learning process was with the TM learning model (control group) and the TGT learning model (manipulation group). A post-test was carried out after the learning was completed. The data analysis was carried out with a different test of students' absorption rates on the

subjects that had been accepted. The difference test used to prove the difference in students' absorption rate of comprehension in writing a descriptive text about describing places and things is the correlated t-test. The output of the correlated t-difference test strengthens the analysis of whether or not there is a significant difference in the effectiveness of using the TM and TGT learning models on the level of absorption of the subject matter given to students. To provide an overview of the results of the correlated t-difference test, it is explained in the following table:

Tabel 4.16
Related Mean Difference Test Results
Second Stage Control And Manipulation Group

Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
tm 1	40	61.70	9.05595	1.43187
tgt 1	40	77,80	8.97918	1,420

Source: Primary Data Processes

The table above explains the results of the correlated t-test, namely the difference in mean and standard deviation of the learning evaluation results between learning using the TM learning model and knowledge using the TGT learning model. Statistical output (t correlated) shows that the mean of the evaluation results of learning to write descriptive texts describing animals using the TM learning model is 61.70. While the results of the evaluation of learning using the TGT learning model produce a value of 77.80. The difference is high in the average of the two learning evaluation results from the use of the two learning means. That is, the average learning evaluation value using the two media is

different, which means the evaluation results differ.

The comparison of the evaluation results between using the TM learning model in learning writing descriptive text lies in the standard deviation. The standard deviation for using TM in learning produces a value of 9.055 which is different when using the TGT learning model, which shows a value of 8.979. Based on these outputs, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference in comparing students' average scores in using the learning model between the TGT learning model and the traditional learning model.

The output of the correlated t statistic above is confirmed by the output of the other correlated t statistics, as explained in the following table:

Tabel 4.17
Independent T Test Results
Second Stage Control And Manipulation Group

Treatment	*n*	*Mean*	*Std deviasi*	*t*	*p value*
TM	40	61,70	9,05595	-38,029	0,000
TGT	40	77,80	8,97918		

Based on table 4.16 above, it can be seen that the average score of students' understanding of writing descriptive text, learning using traditional learning models for class VII MTs Yanbuul Qur'an Menawan is 61.70 with a standard deviation difference of 9.05595, while learning uses the learning TGT (Team Game Tournament) of 77.80 with a standard deviation of 8.97918.

The independent t test results obtained a p-value of 0.000 <0.05 (α), so it can be said that there is a difference in the average score of students' understanding of writing descriptive text between learning using the TGT (Team

Game Tournament) and Traditional learning models in class students VII at MTs Yanbuul Qur'an Menawan.

The evaluation results imply that the TGT learning model to improve students' understanding of writing descriptive texts has a more muscular response and sensory power in students than traditional learning models. This is indicated by an increase in the average value of students and a general rise in evaluation results when using the TGT learning model.

B. Discussion

This research discussion was designed to compare the effectiveness of using TM and TGT learning models on students' writing skills in seventh-grade MTs Tahfidz Yanbuul Qur'an Menawan. This research is expected to know the improvement of students' writing ability. This study uses two classes. The class includes class VII C as an experimental class consisting of 40 students and VII E as a control class with 40 students.

1. Discussion of the results of the first stage of the experiment.

Observing the experimental results using the TM and TGT learning models has shown interesting facts. The actual interesting fact is that the results of the evaluation (posttest) in the first stage of the experiment have shown that when the teacher uses the traditional learning model the average student score is 61.42. This was triggered by one student (2.5%) getting a score of 81 when using the TM learning model, and two students (5%) getting a score of 43 (5%) out of 40 students. While when learning uses the TGT (team game tournament) learning model, the average value increases to 62.42. The increase in value was triggered by 1 student (2.5%) getting a score of 80. And 2 students (5%) got a score of 45, and no student got a score of 43 out of 40 students.

Students' understanding in writing descriptive texts through traditional learning models. The lowest total score of students' understanding in writing descriptive

texts through traditional learning models is the lowest on the mechanics indicator, namely 2.875, while the highest score is on the content indicator, which is 19.35. According to Dalman, the use of spelling in essays should be guided by the General Guidelines for Enhanced Spelling (EYD). This means that spelling plays an important role. Included in the use of spelling is writing capital letters, writing words, and using punctuation marks[1]. According to the author, there are still many students who ignore spelling and punctuation, especially the placement of commas in separating sentences and punctuation at the end of sentences that have been compiled. There are still many students who make mistakes in writing capital letters, especially at the beginning of the sentence when pronouncing the subject's name.

According to Evita, According to Evita, traditional learning models tend to focus on memorizing and practicing in text. This learning model has weaknesses, including the pattern of the lecture method which tends to be teacher-centered, making it difficult for the teacher to know for sure how much students understand the information conveyed. Interaction patterns tend to be one-way and students tend to be inactive during learning so that students have little opportunity to think creatively and innovatively because they are "forced" to think individually[2]. According to the author, the traditional teacher-centered learning model causes difficulties in knowing students' understanding of the information that has been given so that students pay less attention to the use of punctuation and capital letters. The one-way interaction pattern causes students to be inactive in learning so that some students cannot develop the

[1] Dalman. "*Keterampilan Menulis*". (Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada, 2015),23 .

[2]Evita Evita, Ahmad Syahid, and Nurdin Nurdin , Understanding Students' Learning Outcomes Differences Through the Application of the Market Place Activity Type of Cooperative Learning Model and the Application of Conventional Learning Models , *International Journal of Contemporary Islamic Education* 1, No. 1 (2019): 78

specified theme, although some others can adjust the theme, fill it with the title they choose. The results of this study are in accordance with research at SMP Negeri 2 Raha showing that class VII students in the use of capital letters are mostly incapacitated (66.37%).[3]

Students' understanding in writing descriptive text through the TGT learning model, the lowest total score on the mechanics indicator is 2.925, while the highest score on the content indicator is 19.225. Students' understanding of content in writing descriptive text shows the highest average score. According to Dalman, themes or ideas are the things that underlie our essays. To make good essays, a theme or topic is needed. The success of writing is largely determined by whether or not the chosen theme or topic is appropriate. A good essay must have a match between the contents and the title. The title of an essay will describe the contents as a whole[4]. According to the author, students can adjust the title with the contents of the writing. Even the ideas raised are also in accordance with the theme of the writing made. They are also able to explore a wide range of selected writing subjects. The topics they have chosen can be developed in breadth and depth.

The TGT and traditional learning model did not significantly improve the understanding of writing descriptive text in class VII MTs Yanbuul Qur'an Menawan. This can be seen from the increase in the average answer score of the ability to write descriptive text indicators used. The average score of answers from students in learning using Traditional and TGT learning models is the lowest, namely spelling and punctuation skills and the highest indicator, namely the ideas conveyed which show almost the same value. According to the author, the understanding of students' ability to

[3]Muliani." Kemampuan Menulis Teks Deskripsi Siswa Kelas VII SMP Negeri 2 Raha." *Jurnal BASTRA* 4, No. 3 (2019), http://ojs.uho.ac.id/index.php/BASTRA.

[4] Dalman, *Keterampilan Menulis*. (Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada, 2015), 25.

write descriptive texts through TGT and traditional learning models have only slightly increased. Only a small number of students were able to use comma and full stop correctly and started using capital letters at the beginning of sentences.

Nevertheless, the learning process using the TM and TGT learning models in the first stage showed no significant value when the evaluation was carried out with a different test using a correlated t-test. That, confirmed by the study results, showed that the average total score of students' understanding of writing descriptive text using traditional methods in class VII students of MTs Yanbuul Qur'an Menawan was 61.42 with a standard deviation difference of 9.176 while learning the TGT learning model was 62.42 with a standard deviation of 9.432. The results of the dependent t test obtained a p-value of 0.584 > 0.05 (α), so it can be said that there is no difference in the average score of students' understanding of writing descriptive text between learning using the TGT and traditional learning models in class VII students of MTs Yanbuul Qur 'an Menawan.

Looking at the description of the evaluation results with the results of the statistical test (correlation test) mentioned above, at first glance they are inconsistent. On the one hand, content analysis in descriptive statistics results of an evaluation of descriptive learning text writing skills about describing people using the TGT learning model experienced a slight change for the better when learning was changed using the TM learning model. However, after being tested using a correlated t-test, it turned out that there was no significant difference. Facts like this imply that changes in the evaluation results, which are positioned as a representation of the effectiveness of the learning model, need to be re-evaluated. That is, the use of new learning methods, even though substantially and the characteristics of the learning model meet the suitability of the material being taught, the accuracy of the learning model, the completeness of preparation and the ability of the teacher

to use the method and the context of the students must be considered.

Problems that often occur in group work are usually seen in the teaching of whatever method the teacher uses. Therefore, in the case of TGT as cooperative learning, students must be well informed of the principles before implementing them in class. For writing classes, in particular, students should be given more guidance on basic knowledge of sentence structure, word order, and vocabulary. The teacher must always pay attention to each member who leaves work to be carried out by other group members. Other ways of making ensure that they are responsible for their work, for example students by making evaluations where students can evaluate the responsibilities of other members in the group[5]. However, the TGT learning model as Cooperative learning has been proven to be one of the best learning models in improving students' performance in learning language, especially writing, because it offers collaboration between students and reduces peer competition and closeness, and further increases academic achievement and positive relationships[6]. And Johnson and Johnson, Slavin, their research has proven that TGT as cooperative learning simultaneously leads to higher group and individual commitment, healthier relationships with peers, and greater psychological health and self-esteem[7].

It seems that the inconsistent results of the evaluation, when analyzed according to the description of the results of the assessment with the results per statistical calculation, require re-examination by making adjustments to improve the learning model. Therefore,

[5] Qismullah Yusuf, Zalina Jusoh, Yunisrina Qismullah Yusuf ."Learning Strategies to Enhance Writing Skills among Second Language Learner". *International Journal of Instruction* 12,no.1 (2019):1409

[6]Qismullah Yusuf, Zalina Jusoh, Yunisrina Qismullah Yusuf ."Learning Strategies to Enhance Writing Skills among Second Language Learner". *International Journal of Instruction* 12,no.1 (2019):1409

[7]Qismullah Yusuf, Zalina Jusoh, Yunisrina Qismullah Yusuf ."Learning Strategies to Enhance Writing Skills among Second Language Learner". *International Journal of Instruction* 12, no.1 (2019):1409,

before further experiments (second stage) were carried out, improvements were made first, namely improving the learning design, mastery of the material and competencies by the teacher, mastery of skills by the teacher, and the setting of group division.

2. Discussion of the results of the second stage of the experiment.

The evaluation results in the first stage have seen that no consistency between the facts of the description of the evaluation results and the statistical t-test (correlated t count), so it requires repeated proof. This needs to be done because the evaluation results in content analysis on the descriptions show consistency. The experimental results in a posttest evaluation using either the learning model (traditional) or the TGT learning model for the material for writing descriptive texts show an increasing trend, namely the average value from 61.42 to 62.42. This is different from the results of the t-test correlated, which that there are not different.

In the second stage of the experiment, the settings were changed. In the first experimental stage, the class that was initially the control group (traditional learning model) in the second stage was positioned as the manipulation group (the category that received TGT (team game tournament) learning). Meanwhile, the class in the first stage was the manipulation group (the type that received learning with the TGT learning model). In the second stage, it is reversed. That is, it is made into a control group (a class that gets learning using a direct/traditional learning model). The material taught is different, in which, in the first stage the teaching material describes people in the second stage the material teaching describes animals.

The experimental results in the second stage have different results from the experimental results in the first stage. The results of the second stage of the experiment show consistency between the results of the descriptive analysis which shows that the value of learning evaluation tends to increase. As a result of differences in the use of

the traditional learning model and the TGT learning model, the results of the calculation of the t-test correlation test show that there is a difference. The average score of students' understanding of writing descriptive text in learning using traditional learning models for class VII MTs Yanbuul Qur'an Menawan is 61.70 with a standard deviation of 9.05595. Whereas in learning using the TGT learning model it is 77.80 with a standard deviation of 8.97918.

The results of the evaluation of learning using traditional learning models have shown that most students have obtained a score of 63, namely four students (10%) and a score of 71 as many as four students (10%) and the student who has obtained the highest score is 81 is one student (2, 5%). Meanwhile, learning through the TGT learning model, students' abilities have increased, namely students who have received the highest scores between 90-100, namely three people (7.5%), the most students get a score of 75 as many as four students (10%), a score of 78 by four students (10%), a score of 85 is four students (10%), then students who score 63 are four (10%), and no student scores below 60.

From the description of the results of the learning evaluation above, the acquisition of the lowest total score of students' understanding in writing descriptive text, learning through traditional learning models, the lowest is on the mechanics indicator (spelling and punctuation) which is 2.875, while the highest score is on the content indicator (ideas conveyed) that is equal to 19.35.

According to the author, the results of evaluating student learning in writing descriptive texts through traditional learning models, it has been found that several students still make mistakes in using spelling and punctuation that occur in the placement of commas and periods. There are still many students who make mistakes in writing capital letters for animal names and pronouns. This is in accordance with Nurgiyantoro's opinion that all aspects of the essay writing assessment can be presented in a deficient form when students do not master the rules of writing where there are many errors in writing. When

there are frequent errors in spelling and meaning so that it is confusing or obscure, it can be said is enough[8].

In learning through the TGT (Team Game Tournament) learning model in writing descriptive text, the lowest total student score on the mechanics indicator (spelling and punctuation) is 4.100, while the highest score on the content indicator (ideas conveyed) is 23.950. This is indicated by an increase in mastery of EYD spelling, the use of punctuation starting from periods, commas to question marks. They have also been able to pay attention to the spelling of their writing so that there are few mistakes and do not result in a blurring of meaning. The results of this study are in accordance with research in the city of Surakarta which shows that the ability to write descriptive texts on the mechanical aspects of vocational high school students is mostly in the good category (56.0%).[9]

In learning through the TGT (Team Game Tournament) learning model in writing descriptive text also the highest average score on content. According to the author, students have been able to carefully adjust the title to the desired idea even though it has not been supported by facts. Overall the title is in accordance with the theme of the writing they have compiled. This is in accordance with Dalman's statement that the theme or idea is to show the suitability of the title which is supported by the development of broad and deep ideas. This must be supported by in-depth subject knowledge so that topic development becomes optimal[10].

The understanding of students' ability to write descriptive texts through the TGT (Team Game Tournament) learning model has experienced a significant increase. The results of the t test correlate with a p value

[8] Burhan Nurgiyantoro, *Penilaian dalam pengajaran Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia* (Yogyakarta: BPFE-Yogyakarta, 2017), 25.

[9]Purbania ."Kemampuan Menulis Teks Deskripsi Siswa Sekolah Menengah Kejuruan." *BASASTRA Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajarannya* 8 no.1 (2020),

[10] Dalman, *Keterampilan Menulis*. (Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada, 2015): 25

of 0.000 <0.05 (α), so that it can be said that there is a difference in the average score of students' ability to write descriptively through the TGT and traditional learning models for class VII students at MTs Yanbuul Qur'an Menawan in year 2022-2023.

According to the author, traditional learning only emphasizes memorizing content, without giving enough time for students to reflect on the material presented, relate it to previous knowledge, or apply it to real life situations. This is in accordance with Triantono was statement that traditional learning causes the classroom atmosphere to tend to be teacher centered so that students become passive, students are not taught learning models that can understand how to learn to think and motivate themselves. The learning process becomes boring and students become passive, because students do not have the opportunity to discover the concepts being taught on their own. The density of the concepts given can result in students not being able to master and pay attention to the material being taught[11].

According to Lubis, the learning process is through the TGT learning model, subject matter delivered by the teacher to students by utilizing the same work team, and quizzes with weekly tournaments, where students play academic games with other team members to contribute points to their team. The TGT learning model allows students to hone and care for each other in teams, help each other solve problems, increase the desire to learn and compete in a meaningful learning atmosphere [12]. Thus the active role of students in deepening their knowledge can help them develop important skills, achievements, positive interactions between students, self-esteem, and an attitude of acceptance towards other students.

[11] Triantono, *Model-model Pembelajarn Inovatif* (Jakarta.Prestasi Pustaka, 2017), 24.

[12] Lollo Rosa Lubis." Pengaruh Model Pembelajaran TGT (Team Game Tournament) Dalam Pembelajaran Reading Comprehension". *Jurnal Education and development Institut Pendidikan Tapanuli Selatan* 5 ,no.1 (2018):35-36,

Based on the facts above, strengthening students' understanding of the material for writing descriptive texts in class is very important. For this reason, the use of the TGT learning model is important to note because the TGT learning model has a role in maintaining attention, concentration, fun, not sleepy, and not bored, and activates learning growth in students. The TGT Learning Model also gives the impression of sight, hearing, and involvement and provides a broader and less monotonous picture. It has been proven in this study that the TGT Learning Model can encourage students to be more active in learning English, especially in learning to write descriptive texts.