## CHAPTER IV

## RESULT OF THE RESEARCH

## A. Description of Data

In this chapter, the writer explained the result of the research. The writer took 60 students at second grade of Mts Daarul Falah Carenang Kopo. The goal of the research is intended to find out the accurate data in accord with the research. So the sample in this study is divided into two classes. There are 30 students of class VIII B as the experiment class and 30 students of class VIII A as the control class.

Based on the result of the test, the writer got two data. The first data is the result of pre-test and second one is the result of post-test. The result of post-test in experimental class is named variable (X1) and the result of post-test in control class is named variable (X2). The score is as follows:

1. The Score of Pre-test and Post-test of Experimental Class

Table 4.1

TheResult Score of Pre-test and Post-test in Experiment
Class

| No | Name | Score |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pre-test | Post-test |
| 1 | AAB | 40 | 65 |
| 2 | AIP | 55 | 75 |
| 3 | AJK | 50 | 80 |
| 4 | AR | 40 | 75 |
| 5 | AJA | 45 | 75 |
| 6 | AN | 45 | 70 |
| 7 | ANF | 55 | 80 |
| 8 | BMM | 60 | 85 |
| 9 | BP | 65 | 85 |
| 10 | BAM | 55 | 80 |
| 11 | DD | 50 | 75 |
| 12 | DAS | 45 | 70 |
| 13 | GR | 45 | 75 |
| 14 | HE | 60 | 80 |
| 15 | HR | 50 | 75 |


| 16 | IT | 55 | 80 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 17 | IA | 60 | 80 |
| 18 | IA | 45 | 70 |
| 19 | JGDB | 55 | 70 |
| 20 | MFA | 45 | 75 |
| 21 | MFF | 55 | 80 |
| 22 | MRZN | 60 | 80 |
| 23 | MRR | 60 | 85 |
| 24 | MR | 45 | 70 |
| 25 | MR | 60 | 80 |
| 26 | MRA | 50 | 75 |
| 27 | MRH | 45 | 75 |
| 28 | MZI | 50 | 75 |
| 29 | RAS | 40 | 75 |
| 30 | RFH | 60 | 80 |
| \X1 |  | 1545 | 2295 |
|  | $\mathrm{M}_{1}$ | 51.5 | 76.5 |

Mean by formula:

| Pre-test | Post-test |
| :---: | ---: |
| $\mathrm{M}_{1}=\frac{\sum \mathrm{X} 1}{\mathrm{~N}_{1}}$ | $\mathrm{M}_{1}=\frac{\sum \mathrm{X} 1}{\mathrm{~N}_{1}}$ |
| $\mathrm{M}_{1}=\frac{\sum 1545}{30}$ | $\mathrm{M}_{1}=\frac{\sum 2295}{30}$ |
| $=51.5$ | $=76.5$ |

Note:
$\sum \mathrm{X} 1$ : The score of pre-test and post-test experimental class
$\mathrm{M}_{1} \quad:$ Mean of pre-test and post-test experimental class
$\mathrm{N}_{1} \quad$ : Numbers of students of experimental class

## Graphic 4.1

The Score in Pre-Test and Post-Test in Experimental Class


Based on graphic above, it showed that the result of experimental class got the significant improvement after giving treatment. It can be seen from average score of post-test is better than the average score of pre-test that $76,5>51,5$, it means that using short story can develop students reading comprehension skill.

## 2. The Score of Pre-test and Post-test of Control Class

Table 4.2
The Score of Pre-test and Post-test in Control Class

| No | Name |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pre-test | Post-test |
| 1 | AMA | 50 | 50 |
| 2 | AAF | 45 | 55 |
| 3 | AFE | 50 | 50 |
| 4 | ARH | 55 | 60 |
| 5 | AFF | 60 | 45 |
| 6 | AF | 50 | 50 |
| 7 | AM | 45 | 60 |
| 8 | AN | 65 | 50 |
| 9 | ANS | 45 | 55 |


| 10 | BKYA | 60 | 50 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11 | DAK | 55 | 60 |
| 12 | DAS | 50 | 60 |
| 13 | DA | 60 | 55 |
| 14 | FS | 45 | 50 |
| 15 | F | 45 | 55 |
| 16 | GA | 55 | 55 |
| 17 | GMR | 40 | 50 |
| 18 | HK | 60 | 50 |
| 19 | IAM | 65 | 60 |
| 20 | KAP | 50 | 55 |
| 21 | MY | 55 | 50 |
| 22 | MAS | 45 | 60 |
| 23 | MADR | 60 | 55 |
| 24 | MAK | 40 | 50 |
| 25 | MAH | 65 | 60 |
| 26 | MNH | 60 | 55 |
| 27 | NLS | 55 | 50 |
| 28 | RP | 55 | 60 |
| 29 | RAG | 50 | 55 |
| 30 | RAL | 65 | 60 |


| $\sum \mathrm{X} 2$ | 1590 | 1630 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{M}_{2}$ | 53 | 54,3 |

Mean by formula :

Pre-test

$$
\mathrm{M}_{2}=\frac{\sum \mathrm{X} 2}{\mathrm{~N}_{2}}
$$

$$
\mathrm{M}_{2}=\sum 1590
$$

30
$=53$

Post-test

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{M}_{2} & =\frac{\sum \mathrm{X} 2}{\mathrm{~N}_{2}} \\
\mathrm{M}_{2} & =\frac{\sum 1630}{30} \\
& =54,3
\end{aligned}
$$

## Graphic 4.2

The Score in Pre-test and Post-Test in Control Class


Based on graphic above, it showed that the result of control class did not have the significant improvement, It can be seen from average score of post-test that is score of pre-test $54,3>53$. This class also realized can effect improvement but lower than experiment class.

## B. Analysis of Data

After getting the data from pre-test and post-test score of two classes. Then the writer analyzed it by using t-test formula with the degree of significant $5 \%$ and $1 \%$, the writer used step as follows:

Table 4.3
The Score of Distribution Frequency

| No | Score |  | $\mathrm{X}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{X}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{X}_{1}{ }^{2}$ | $\mathrm{X}_{2}{ }^{2}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | X 1 | X 2 | $\left(\mathrm{X} 1-\mathrm{M}_{1}\right)$ | $\left(\mathrm{X} 2-\mathrm{M}_{2}\right)$ |  |  |
| 1 | 65 | 50 | -11.5 | -4.3 | 132,25 | 18,49 |
| 2 | 75 | 55 | $-1,5$ | 0,7 | 2,25 | 0,49 |
| 3 | 80 | 50 | 3,5 | $-4,3$ | 12,25 | 18.49 |
| 4 | 75 | 60 | $-1,5$ | 5,7 | 2,25 | 32,49 |


| 5 | 75 | 45 | $-1,5$ | $-9,3$ | 2,25 | 86,49 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 6 | 70 | 50 | $-6,5$ | $-4,3$ | 42,25 | 18,49 |
| 7 | 80 | 60 | 3,5 | 5,7 | 12,25 | 32,49 |
| 8 | 85 | 50 | 8,5 | $-4,3$ | 72,25 | 18,49 |
| 9 | 85 | 55 | 8,5 | 0,7 | 72,25 | 0,49 |
| 10 | 80 | 50 | 3,5 | $-4,3$ | 12,25 | 18,49 |
| 11 | 75 | 60 | $-1,5$ | 5,7 | 2,25 | 32,49 |
| 12 | 70 | 60 | $-6,5$ | 5,7 | 42,25 | 32,49 |
| 13 | 70 | 55 | $-6,5$ | 0,7 | 42,25 | 0,49 |
| 14 | 80 | 50 | 3,5 | $-4,3$ | 12,25 | 18,49 |
| 15 | 75 | 55 | $-1,5$ | 0,7 | 2,25 | 0,49 |
| 16 | 80 | 55 | 3,5 | 0,7 | 12,25 | 0,49 |
| 17 | 80 | 50 | 3,5 | $-4,3$ | 12,25 | 18,49 |
| 18 | 50 | $-6,5$ | $-4,3$ | 42,25 | 18,49 |  |
|  | 70 |  |  |  |  |  |


| 19 | 70 | 60 | $-6,5$ | 5,7 | 42,25 | 32,49 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 20 | 75 | 55 | $-1,5$ | 0,7 | 2,25 | 0,49 |
| 21 | 80 | 50 | 3,5 | $-4,3$ | 12,25 | 18,49 |
| 22 | 80 | 60 | 3,5 | 5,7 | 12,25 | 32,49 |
| 23 | 85 | 55 | 8,5 | 0,7 | 72,25 | 0,49 |
| 24 | 70 | 50 | $-6,5$ | $-4,3$ | 42,25 | 18,49 |
| 25 | 80 | 60 | 3,5 | 5,7 | 12,25 | 32,49 |
| 26 | 75 | 55 | $-1,5$ | 0,7 | 2,25 | 0,49 |
| 27 | 80 | 50 | 3,5 | $-4,3$ | 12,25 | 18,49 |
| 28 | 75 | 60 | $-1,5$ | 5,7 | 2,25 | 32,49 |
| 29 | 75 | 55 | $-1,5$ | 0,7 | 2,25 | 0,49 |
| 30 | 80 | 60 | 3,5 | 5,7 | 12,25 | 32,49 |
| $\Sigma$ | 2295 | 1630 |  |  | 757,5 | 586,7 |

## Note:

| X 1 | $=$ Score Post-Test (Experimental Class) |
| :--- | :--- |
| X 2 | $=$ Score Post-Test (Control Class) |
| $\mathrm{X}_{1}$ | $=\mathrm{X} 1-\mathrm{M}_{1}$ (Mean X1) |
| $\mathrm{X}_{2}$ | $=\mathrm{X} 2-\mathrm{M}_{2}$ (Mean X2) |
| $\mathrm{X}_{1}{ }^{2}$ | $=$ The squared value of $\mathrm{X}_{1}$ |
| $\mathrm{X}_{2}{ }^{2}$ | $=$ The squared value of $\mathrm{X}_{2}$ |

## Graphic 4.3

## The Score of Distribution Frequency



Based on the graphic above the experimental class $=2295$ that higher than control class= 1630 was had different value. The experimental class higher than the control class.

From the table above, the writer got the data $\sum \mathrm{X} 1=2295$, $\sum \mathrm{X} 2=1630, \sum \mathrm{X}_{1}{ }^{2}=757,5$ and $\sum \mathrm{X}_{2}{ }^{2}=586,7$, where as $\mathrm{N}_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=30$.

After getting the data from pre-test and post-test, the writer analyzed it by using statistic calculation of $t$-test formula with the degree of significance $5 \%$ and $1 \%$ the formula as follow:

1. Determine mean of variable X 1and X 2

Variable X1
$\mathrm{M}_{1}=\frac{\sum \mathrm{X} 1}{\mathrm{~N}_{1}}$
$\mathrm{M}_{1}=\frac{\sum 2295}{30}$

$$
=76,5
$$

Variable X2

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{M}_{2} & =\frac{\sum \mathrm{X} 2}{\mathrm{~N}_{2}} \\
\mathrm{M}_{2} & =\frac{\sum 1630}{30} \\
& =54,3
\end{aligned}
$$

2. Determine $t$-test

$$
t=\frac{M_{1}-M_{2}}{\sqrt{\left\{\frac{\sum X_{1}^{2}+\sum X_{2}^{2}}{N_{1}+N_{2}-2}\right\}\left\{\frac{N_{1}+N_{2}}{N_{1} \cdot N_{2}}\right\}}}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& t=\frac{76,5-54,3}{\sqrt{\left\{\frac{2295+1630}{30+30-2}\right\}\left\{\frac{30+30}{30.30}\right\}}} \\
& t=\frac{22,2}{\sqrt{\left\{\frac{3.925}{58}\right\}\left\{\frac{60}{900}\right\}}} \\
& t=\frac{22,2}{\sqrt{\{67,67\}\{0.06\}}} \\
& t=\frac{22,2}{\sqrt{4,06}} \\
& t=\frac{22,2}{2,01} \\
& \mathrm{t}=11,04
\end{aligned}
$$

Note :
$\mathrm{M}_{1}$ = The average score of experiment class (Mean X1)
$\mathrm{M}_{2}$ = The average score of control class (Mean X2)
$\sum X_{1}{ }^{2}=$ Sum of the squared deviation score of experimental class
$\sum X_{2}{ }^{2}=$ Sum of the squared deviation score of control class
$\mathrm{N}_{1} \quad=$ The number of student of experimental class
$\mathrm{N}_{2} \quad=$ The number of student of control class
2 = Constant number
3. Degree of Freedom

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{df} & =\mathrm{N} 1+\mathrm{N} 2-2 \\
& =30+30-2 \\
& =58
\end{aligned}
$$

There is no degree of freedom for 58 , so the writer uses the closer df from 58. In degree of significance $5 \%$ from $58 \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{t}}=2,00$ and in degree of significance $1 \%$ from $58 \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{t}}=2,66$.

Based on the result of statistic calculation, it is obtained that the score of $t_{0}$ is $=11,04>t_{t}=2,00$ in degree of significance $5 \%$. The score of $t_{0}=11,04>t_{t}=2.66$ in degree of significance $1 \%$. To prove the hypothesis, the data obtained from the experimental class is calculated by using t -test formula with assumption as follow:

If $\mathrm{t}_{\text {observation }}>\mathrm{t}_{\text {table }}:$ The alternative hypothesis is accepted. It means there is a significant influence of use short stories to develop students reading comprehension skill.

If $\mathrm{t}_{\text {observation }}<\mathrm{t}_{\text {table }}$ : The alternative hypothesis is rejected. It means there is no significant influence of use short stories to develop students reading comprehension skill.

## C. Interpretation of Data

From the result of pre-test and post-test in experiment class, the writer can be concluded that from the lowest score in pre-test is 40 and the highest in pre-test score in pre-test is 65 . After the writer conducted treatment of short stories on reading comprehension and also conducted post-test. The lowest score in post-test is 65 and the highest score in post test is 85 .

Before deciding the result of hypothesis, the writer proposes interpretation towards with procedure as follow:
a. Ha : t observation $>\mathrm{t}$ table $=$ It means there is a significant influence of use short stories on students' reading comprehension skill.
b. Ho : t observation $<\mathrm{t}$ table $=$ It means there is no significant influence of use short stories on students' reading comprehension skill.

According to the data, the value of $t$ observation is bigger than $t$ table. t observation $=11,04>\mathrm{t}$ table $=2,00$ $(5 \%)$ or t observation $=11,04>\mathrm{t}$ table $=2,66$ (1\%), so Ho is rejected and Ha is accepted.

From the result above, the writer give conclusion that it means there is a significant influence of use short stories on students' reading comprehension skill.. It can be seen that the student got good or better score by Short Stories.

