## CHAPTER IV

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

## A. Data Description

In this chapter, the researcher would like to present the description of data obtained. The research is only directed to the students of the third grade of Daarul Muttaqien Tangerang. The writer divided them into two groups, 25 students as experimental class, it is from class IX C, and 25 students as control class, it is from class IX B. this research had been carried through four steps. They involve pre-test, two times treatment and post-test. The goal of the research is intended to prove the accurate data in accordance with the research title.

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

## Table 4.1

The result Score of Pre-test and Post-test Experimental Class

| No | Name | SCORE |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Main Idea | Specific <br> Information | Inference | Reference | Vocabulary |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { PRE-TEST } \\ \left(\mathbf{X}_{1}\right) \end{gathered}$ |  |  | POST-TEST <br> ( $\mathbf{X}_{2}$ ) |  |
| 1. | AAS | 65 |  |  | 85 |  |
| 2. | AAL | 60 |  |  | 80 |  |


| 3. | ANK | 60 | 80 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4. | DF | 75 | 95 |
| 5. | EAS | 40 | 60 |
| 6. | ES | 65 | 80 |
| 7. | DMR | 55 | 75 |
| 8. | HW | 40 | 70 |
| 9. | IF | 65 | 85 |
| 10. | FFAZ | 70 | 90 |
| 11. | PS | 65 | 85 |
| 12. | RNA | 45 | 75 |
| 13. | RR | 70 | 90 |
| 14. | SSP | 75 | 95 |
| 15. | SAR | 65 | 80 |
| 16. | STS | 70 | 85 |
| 17. | SN | 45 | 75 |
| 18. | SRSR | 70 | 90 |
| 19. | AN | 60 | 85 |
| 20. | AS | 45 | 70 |
| 21. | DA | 65 | 85 |
| 22. | ISF | 35 | 65 |
| 23. | KCQ | 70 | 85 |
| 24. | LA | 75 | 90 |
| 25. | MJ | 75 | 90 |
| $\sum \mathrm{XI}$ |  | 1525 | 2045 |
| MI |  | 61 | 81,8 |

Mean by formula:

Pre-test
$\mathrm{M}_{1}=\frac{\sum x \mathbf{1}}{N_{\mathbf{1}}}$
$\mathrm{M}_{1}=\frac{\sum 1525}{25}$

$$
=61
$$

Post-test

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{M}_{2} & =\frac{\sum x 2}{N_{2}} \\
\mathrm{M}_{2} & =\frac{\sum \mathbf{2 0 4 5}}{\mathbf{2 5}} \\
& =81,8
\end{aligned}
$$

Note:
$\sum$ XI : The score of pre-test experimental class
$\sum \mathrm{X} 2$ : The score of post-test experimental class
$\mathrm{M}_{1} \quad$ : Mean of pre-test experimental class
$\mathrm{M}_{2}$ : Mean of 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


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

Table 4.2

The result Score of Pre-test and Post-test Control Class

| No | Name | SCORE |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Main Idea | Specific Information | Inference | Reference | Vocabulary |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { PRE-TEST } \\ \left(\mathbf{Y}_{1}\right) \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { POST-TEST } \\ \left(\mathrm{Y}_{2}\right) \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 1. | SA | 60 |  |  | 70 |  |
| 2. | SHU | 50 |  |  | 60 |  |
| 3. | NFZ | 70 |  |  | 80 |  |
| 4. | NA | 60 |  |  | 70 |  |
| 5. | AP | 75 |  |  | 85 |  |
| 6. | AS | 65 |  |  | 75 |  |
| 7. | TDA | 70 |  |  | 75 |  |
| 8. | RS | 60 |  |  | 65 |  |
| 9. | SIA | 45 |  |  | 70 |  |
| 10. | SA | 70 |  |  | 75 |  |
| 11. | AF | 80 |  |  | 80 |  |
| 12. | WS | 45 |  |  | 65 |  |
| 13. | AS | 55 |  |  | 70 |  |
| 14. | A | 60 |  |  | 75 |  |
| 15. | AD | 60 |  |  | 70 |  |
| 16. | ACR | 55 |  |  | 70 |  |
| 17. | ATW | 50 |  |  | 70 |  |


| 18. | DA | 50 | 60 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19. | DAP | 55 | 70 |
| 20. | LN | 50 | 70 |
| 21. | MS | 65 | 70 |
| 22. | NI | 60 | 80 |
| 23. | NR | 55 | 60 |
| 24. | NF | 65 | 75 |
| 25. | RR | 60 | 80 |
|  | $\sum \mathrm{XI}$ | 1490 | 1790 |

Mean by formula:

Pre-test
$\mathrm{M}_{1}=\frac{\sum y \mathbf{1}}{N_{\mathbf{1}}}$
$\mathrm{M}_{1}=\frac{\sum 1490}{25}$
$=59,6$

Post-test
$\mathrm{M}_{2}=\frac{\sum y 2}{N_{2}}$
$\mathrm{M}_{2}=\frac{\sum 1790}{25}$
$=71,6$

Note:
$\sum \mathrm{YI}:$ The score of pre-test control class
$\sum \mathrm{Y} 2$ : The score of post-test control class
$\mathrm{M}_{1} \quad$ : Mean of pre-test control class
$\mathrm{M}_{2}$ : Mean of post-test control class
$\mathrm{N}_{1} \quad$ : Numbers of students of control class

## 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 is seemed from average score of post-test that is score of pre-test $71,6>59,6$. This class also realized can effect improvement but lower than experimental class.

## B. Analysis of Data

After getting the data from pre-test and post-test score of two classes. Than the researcher 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 |  | $\mathrm{X}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{y}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{x}_{1}{ }^{2}$ | $\mathrm{y}_{1}{ }^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | X1 | Y1 | (XI-M ${ }_{1}$ ) | $\left(\mathrm{Y} 1-\mathrm{M}_{2}\right)$ |  |  |
| 1. | 85 | 70 | 3.2 | -1.6 | 10.24 | 2.56 |
| 2. | 80 | 60 | -1.8 | -11.6 | 3.24 | 134.56 |
| 3. | 80 | 80 | -1.8 | 8.4 | 3.24 | 7.056 |
| 4. | 95 | 70 | 13.2 | -1.6 | 174.24 | 2.56 |
| 5. | 60 | 85 | -21.8 | 13.4 | 475.24 | 179.56 |
| 6. | 80 | 75 | -1.8 | 3.4 | 3.24 | 11.56 |
| 7. | 75 | 75 | -6.8 | 3.4 | 46.24 | 11.56 |
| 8. | 70 | 65 | -11.8 | -6.6 | 139.24 | 43.56 |
| 9. | 85 | 70 | 3.2 | -1.6 | 10.24 | 2.56 |
| 10. | 90 | 75 | 8.2 | 3.4 | 67.24 | 11.56 |
| 11. | 85 | 80 | 3.2 | 8.4 | 10.24 | 7.056 |
| 12. | 75 | 65 | -6.8 | -6.6 | 46.24 | 43.56 |
| 13. | 90 | 70 | 8.2 | -1.6 | 67.24 | 2.56 |
| 14. | 95 | 75 | 13.2 | 3.4 | 174.24 | 11.56 |
| 15. | 80 | 70 | -1.8 | -1.6 | 3.24 | 2.56 |
| 16. | 85 | 70 | 3.2 | -1.6 | 10.24 | 2.56 |
| 17. | 75 | 70 | -6.8 | -1.6 | 46.24 | 2.56 |
| 18. | 90 | 60 | 8.2 | -11.6 | 67.24 | 134.56 |
| 19. | 85 | 70 | 3.2 | -1.6 | 10.24 | 2.56 |


| 20. | 70 | 70 | -11.8 | -1.6 | 139.24 | 2.56 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21. | 85 | 70 | 3.2 | -1.6 | 10.24 | 2.56 |
| 22. | 65 | 80 | -16.8 | 8.4 | 282.24 | 7.056 |
| 23. | 85 | 60 | 3.2 | -11.6 | 10.24 | 134.56 |
| 24. | 90 | 75 | 8.2 | 3.4 | 67.24 | 11.56 |
| 25. | 90 | 80 | 8.2 | 8.4 | 67.24 | 7.056 |
| $\sum$ | 2045 | 1790 |  |  | 1944 | 781.98 |
| AVERAGE | 81,8 | 71,6 |  |  |  |  |

Note:
X1 = Score Post-Test (Experimental Class)
Y1 = Score Post-Test (Control Class)
$\mathrm{x}_{1} \quad=\mathrm{X} 1-\mathrm{M}_{1}($ Mean X1)
$\mathrm{y}_{1}=\mathrm{Y} 1-\mathrm{M}_{2}$ (Mean Y1)
$\mathrm{x}_{1}{ }^{2}=$ The squared value of $\mathrm{X}_{1}$
$y_{1}{ }^{2}=$ The squared value of $Y_{1}$

## Graphic 4.3

The Score of Distribution Frequency


1. Determine mean of variable X1 and X2

Variable X1
Post-test
$\mathrm{M}_{1}=\frac{\sum x 1}{N_{1}}$
$\mathrm{M}_{1}=\frac{\sum 2045}{25}$
$=81,8$

Variable Y1
Post-test
$\mathrm{M}_{2}=\frac{\sum y 1}{N_{2}}$
$\mathrm{M}_{2}=\frac{\sum 1790}{25}$
$=71,6$
2. Determine t-test

$$
t_{0}=\frac{M_{1}-M_{2}}{\sqrt{\left\{\frac{\sum X_{1}^{2}+\sum Y_{1}^{2}}{N_{1}+N_{2}-2}\right\}\left\{\frac{N_{1+N_{2}}}{N_{1 . N_{2}}}\right\}}}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& t_{0}=\frac{81,8-71,6}{\sqrt{\left\{\frac{1944+781,98}{25+25-2}\right\}\left\{\frac{25+25}{25.25}\right\}}} \\
& t_{0}=\frac{10.2}{\sqrt{\left\{\frac{2725.98}{48}\right\}\left\{\frac{50}{625}\right\}}} \\
& t_{0}=\frac{10.2}{\sqrt{\{56.79125\}\{0,08\}}} \\
& t_{0}=\frac{10.2}{\sqrt{4.5433}} \\
& t_{0}=\frac{10.2}{2.13} \\
& t_{0}=4.78
\end{aligned}
$$

## Note:

$\mathrm{M}_{1}=$ The average score of experimental class (Mean X1)
$M_{2}=$ The average score of control class (Mean Y1)
$\sum \mathrm{X}_{1}{ }^{2}=$ Sum of the squared deviation score of experimental class
$\sum \mathrm{y}_{1}{ }^{2}=$ Sum of the squared deviation score of control class
$\mathrm{N}_{1}=$ The number of student of experimental class
$\mathrm{N}_{2}=$ The number of student of control class
2 = Constant number
3. Degree of Freedom

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{df} \quad & =\mathrm{N} 1+\mathrm{N} 2-2 \\
& =25+25-2 \\
& =48
\end{aligned}
$$

There is no degree of freedom for 48 , so the researcher uses the closer df from 48. In degree of significance $5 \%$ from $48 t_{t}=1.67$ and in degree of significance $1 \%$ from $48 \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{t}}=2.40$.

Based on the result statistic calculation, it is obtained that the score of $t_{o}$ is $=4.78>t_{t}=1.67$ in degree of significance $5 \%$. The score of $t_{0}=4.78>t_{t}=2.40$ 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 $t_{\text {observation }}>t_{\text {table }}$ : The alternative hypothesis is accepted. It means there is a significant effect of Inference Prompter Chart towards students' reading comprehension at the third grade of SMP Daarul Muttaqien Tangerang.

If $\mathrm{t}_{\text {observation }}<\mathrm{t}_{\text {table }}$ : The Null hypothesis is rejected. It means there is no significant effect of Inference Prompter Chart towards students' reading comprehension at the third grade of SMP Daarul Muttaqien Tangerang.

## C. Interpretation of Data

From the result of pre-test and post-test in experimental class, the researcher can be concluded that from the lowest score in pre-test is 35 and the highest in pre-test score is 75 . After the writer conducted treatment of Inference Prompter Chart in teaching reading comprehension on narrative text and also conducted posttest. The lowest score in post-test is 65 and the highest score in post-test is 95 .

Before deciding the result of hypothesis, the researcher proposes interpretation towards with procedure as follow:
a. $\quad \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{a}}: \mathrm{t}_{\text {observation }}>\mathrm{t}_{\text {table }}=\mathrm{It}$ means there is a significant effectiveness of Inference Prompter Chart in teaching reading comprehension on narrative text.
b. $\mathrm{H}_{0}: \mathrm{t}_{\text {observation }}<\mathrm{t}_{\text {table }}=$ It means there is no significant effectiveness of Inference Prompter Chart in teaching reading comprehension on narrative text.
According to the data, the value of $t_{\text {observation }}$ is bigger than $\mathrm{t}_{\text {table. }} \mathrm{t}_{\text {observation }}=4.78>\mathrm{t}_{\text {table }}=1.67(5 \%)$ or $\mathrm{t}_{\text {observation }}=4.78>\mathrm{t}_{\text {table }}=$ $2.40(1 \%)$, so $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ is rejected and $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{a}}$ is accepted.

From the result above, the researcher give conclusion that it means there is a significant effectiveness of Inference Prompter Chart in teaching reading comprehension on narrative text. It can be seen that the student got better score by Inference Prompter Chart. This could be seen after comparing the score of pre-test (before Inference Prompter Chart) and post-test (after using Inference Prompter Chart).

Based on the data obtained from control and experimental class among the average scores, and $t$ observation, the writer summarizes that teaching narrative text through Inference Prompter Chart has significant effectiveness toward students' reading comprehension because the purpose of this technique inference prompter chart was to create a learning atmosphere in more engaging and creative way. Where students read more and enjoy it more, they will become better readers. Beside that the students please be understand between contents and what they read.

The result of the research shows that the experimental class (the students who are taught using Inference Prompter Chart) has
the mean value $(81,8)$, meanwhile the control class (the students who are not taught using Inference Prompter Chart) has the mean value $(71,6)$. It can be said that the achievement score of experimental class is higher than control class. The following was the table of pre-test and post-test students' average score.

## Table 4.4

The Pre-Test and Post Test Students' Average of the Experimental and Control Class

| Class | The Average of Pre-Test | The Average of Post- <br> Test |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Experimental | 61 | 81,8 |
| Control | 59,6 | 71,6 |

So, it could be concluded that Inference Prompter Chart is effective to facilitate students' reading comprehension on narrative text in experimental group. It can be seen at mean value of both groups. There is significant difference in the students' reading comprehension between experimental and control group.

Inference Prompter Chart more effective than other because of the inference prompter chart, students' are more familiar with a text given by the students'. Where with this method, students' will predict an event contained in the text and they also learn how to make inference of the event, then students' understand a text with carefully.

Inference Prompter Chart also can be quite personally rewarding for both students and educators. Readers are often asked
to interact with the literal meanings on the pages, but inference requires that each reader consider her own beliefs, values, and experiences before drawing conclusions.

