## CHAPTER IV

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

## A. Description of the Data Test

The research held in Junior High School of 02 Karangtanjung, Pandeglang for two week, and it was down for the students of class eight. In those class eight D consist of 31 students and in those class eight C 31 students. Class eight D as experimental class and eight C as control class.

The result of pre-test and post-test of experimental class can be seen in the table:

Table 4. 1
The result of Experimental Class

| No. Name | Score |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Pre-test | Post-test |
| 1. | AHMAD SETIAWAN | 55 | 65 |
| 2. | ALFIAH | 60 | 85 |
| 3. | AMIN HIDAYAT | 50 | 90 |
| 4. | ASEP SAEPULLOH | 55 | 90 |
| 5. | GEBIYAH | 65 | 90 |
| 6. | GUGUN SURYADI | 60 | 95 |
| 7. | HILALUDDIN RAHMAN | 50 | 75 |
| 8. | HOLID | 50 | 90 |
| 9. | LIA URIP SA'ADAH | 55 | 85 |
| 10. | LILI | 60 | 85 |
| 11. | M. ILHAM | 55 | 85 |
| 12. | MAULANA FIKRIANSYAH | 60 | 85 |
| 13. | MAULIA JUPRIYAH | 50 | 75 |
| 14. | MUHAMMAD DONI | 75 | 90 |
| 15. | MUHAMMAD HAIKAL FIKRI |  | 85 |


| 16. | MUHAMMAD ROYANI | 60 | 85 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 17. | MUHAMMAD TORIK ALFALAH | 65 | 95 |
| 18. | NUR IKBAL | 50 | 85 |
| 19. | NUR'AENI | 50 | 65 |
| 20. | NURLELA | 55 | 90 |
| 21. | REGI HERYANTO | 55 | 95 |
| 22. | RIFKI FIRMANSYAH | 75 | 85 |
| 23. | RISTIA APRILIANI | 60 | 90 |
| 24. | SUHANIAH | 80 | 95 |
| 25. | SUHERNI | 55 | 85 |
| 26. | SURDI | 55 | 75 |
| 27. | TINA | 60 | 85 |
| 28. | YANI | 70 | 90 |
| 29. | YANTI | 55 | 85 |
| 30. | WULAN DARI P | 70 | 95 |
| 31. | USWATUN HASANAH | 70 | 95 |
| Jumlah Rata-rata |  | 1860 | 2665 |
|  |  | 60 | 85,96 |

From the table above, the researcher could calculate the mean of student' score. Determine of pre-test VIII D as Experimental class by formula:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{M} & =\frac{\sum S C O R E}{N} \\
& =\frac{1860}{31} \\
& =60
\end{aligned}
$$

Then, determine of post-test VIII D as experiment class by formula:
$\mathrm{M}=\frac{\Sigma S C O R E}{N}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =\frac{2665}{31} \\
& =85,96
\end{aligned}
$$

The table above shows about the student's pre test score and also post-test score in the use of Cloze Procedure Technique to improve students' reading skill at the experiment class. The data shows that the lowest score pre-test at the experiment class is 50 , gotten by ten student, the highest score post-test at the experimental class is 80 , gotten by seven students, average score of pre-test at the experimental class is 60 .

The students score after treatment of post-test at the experimental class has good score and the exercise score that highest from pre-test. Post-test was given after treatment. The data shows that the lowest score post-test at the experimental class is 65 , gotten by two students. The highest score of post-test at the experimental class is 95, gotten by five students, average score of post-test at the experimental class is 85,96 .

After conducting pre-test and post-test score, the researcher calculated the score of distribution frequency as following table:

Table 4. 2
The Score of Distribution Frequency of Pre-test and Post-test of Experimental class

| No | Name | Score |  | X | Gained Score | Squared Deviation$\left(x^{2}\right)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pre- <br> test $\left(x_{1}\right)$ | Post- <br> test $\left(x_{2}\right)$ |  |  |  |
| 1. | AHMAD SETIAWAN | 55 | 65 | 60 | -10 | 100 |
| 2. | ALFIAH | 60 | 85 | 72,5 | -25 | 625 |
| 3. | AMIN HIDAYAT | 50 | 90 | 70 | -40 | 1600 |
| 4. | ASEP SAEPULLOH | 75 | 90 | 82,5 | -15 | 225 |
| 5. | GEBIYAH | 55 | 90 | 72,5 | -35 | 1225 |


| 6. | GUGUN SURYADI | 65 | 95 | 80 | -30 | 900 |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7. | HILALUDDIN <br> RAHMAN | 60 | 75 | 67,5 | -15 | 225 |
| 8. | HOLID | 50 | 90 | 70 | -40 | 1600 |
| 9. | LIA URIP SA'ADAH | 50 | 85 | 67,5 | -35 | 1225 |
| 10. | LILI | 55 | 85 | 70 | -30 | 900 |
| 11. | M. ILHAM | 60 | 85 | 72,5 | -25 | 625 |
| 12. | MAULANA <br> FIKRIANSYAH | 55 | 85 | 70 | -30 | 900 |
| 13. | MAULIA JUPRIYAH | 60 | 75 | 67,5 | -15 | 225 |
| 14. | MUHAMMAD DONI | 50 | 90 | 70 | -40 | 1600 |
| 15. | MUHAMMAD HAIKAL <br> FIKRI | 75 | 85 | 80 | -10 | 100 |
| 16. | MUHAMMAD <br> ROYANI | 60 | 85 | 72,5 | -25 | 225 |
| 17. | MUHAMMAD TORIK <br> ALFALAH | 65 | 95 | 80 | -30 | 900 |
| 18. | NUR IKBAL | 50 | 85 | 67,5 | -35 | 1225 |
| 19. | NUR'AENI | 50 | 65 | 57,5 | -15 | 225 |
| 20. | NURLELA | 55 | 90 | 72,5 | -35 | 1225 |
| 21. | REGI HERYANTO | 55 | 95 | 75 | -40 | 1600 |
| 22. | RIFKI FIRMANSYAH | 75 | 85 | 80 | -10 | 100 |
| 23. | RISTIA APRILIANI | 60 | 90 | 75 | -30 | 900 |
| 24. | SUHANIAH | 80 | 95 | 87,5 | -15 | 225 |
| 25. | SUHERNI | 55 | 85 | 70 | -30 | 900 |
| 26. | SURDI | 55 | 75 | 65 | -20 | 400 |
| 27. | TINA | 60 | 85 | 72,5 | -25 | 625 |
| 28. | YANI | 70 | 90 | 80 | -30 | 400 |
| 29. | YANTI | 55 | 85 | 70 | -30 | 900 |
| 30. | WULAN DARI P | 70 | 95 | 82,5 | -25 | 625 |
| 31. | USWATUN HASANAH | 70 | 95 | 82,5 | -25 | 625 |
|  | Jumlah <br> Rata-rata | 1860 | 2665 | 2262,5 | -815 | 23175 |
|  | 60 | 85,96 | 72,98 | -815 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

The tables above tell us about differences score of pre-test and post-test $\sum \mathrm{X}$ is the result of post-test minus pre-test, the result of
$\sum \mathrm{X} 2$ is quadrate of $\sum \mathrm{D}$, and then result of each is calculated. The writer found that $\sum \mathrm{X}=-815$ and $\sum x^{2}=23175$.
$\mathrm{M}=\frac{\sum S C O R E}{N}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =\frac{2262,5}{31} \\
& =72,98
\end{aligned}
$$

The interpretation of the means score of pre-test and post-test of experiment class there are:

Table 4. 3
The interpretation of the mean $X$ variable

| No. | The mean | Interpretation the <br> mean |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1. | $80-100$ | Excellent |
| 2. | $70-79$ | Very good |
| 3. | $60-69$ | Good |
| 4. | $50-59$ | Average |
| 5. | $<50$ | Poor |

Beside on calculated of mean in experiment class above gives score 85 and after interpreted by the interpreted by the interpretation table, apparently score 85 is between $80-100$ the interpretation is excellent

The following table is student's score of pre-test and post-test of control class.

Table 4.4
The result of Control Class
From the table above, the researcher could calculate the mean of

| No. | Name | Score |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pre-test | Post-test |
| 1. | AD | 70 | 100 |
| 2. | AHF | 60 | 80 |
| 3. | AF | 50 | 70 |
| 4. | AN | 40 | 70 |
| 5. | DM | 55 | 80 |
| 6. | DH | 45 | 75 |
| 7. | EI | 65 | 85 |
| 8. | EY | 55 | 75 |
| 9. | FMN | 65 | 80 |
| 10. | FR | 50 | 90 |
| 11. | HR | 60 | 85 |
| 12. | HH | 65 | 80 |
| 13. | HAK | 55 | 80 |
| 14. | LAF | 75 | 100 |
| 15. | MH | 55 | 85 |
| 16. | MA | 75 | 100 |
| 17. | MY | 70 | 100 |
| 18. | MIM | 70 | 100 |
| 19. | MAF | 60 | 100 |
| 20. | MS | 70 | 85 |
| 21. | NM | 75 | 90 |
| 22. | NV | 50 | 90 |
| 23. | NR | 60 | 70 |
| 24. | RNS | 55 | 80 |
| 25. | RF | 50 | 80 |
| 26. | RY | 65 | 70 |
| 27. | SUD | 60 | 80 |
| 28. | SN | 65 | 70 |
| 29. | SM | 65 | 90 |
| 30. | TH | 65 | 95 |
| 31. | YM | 75 | 95 |
| Jumlah <br> Rata-rata |  | 1895 | 2630 |
|  |  | 61,12 | 84,83 |

student score. Determine mean of pre-test VII C as control class by formula:

$$
\begin{aligned}
m_{X 1}= & \frac{\sum X 1}{N_{1}} \\
& =\frac{1895}{31} \\
& =61,12
\end{aligned}
$$

Then, determine of post-test VIII C as control class by formula:

$$
\begin{aligned}
M_{X 2} & =\frac{\sum_{X 2}}{N 1} \\
& =\frac{2630}{31} \\
& =84,83
\end{aligned}
$$

Based on the conclusions in table I assessment of pre-test and post-test class control, the highest score post-test in controlled is 100 and lowest score is 50 . It was known that the cumulative value of pretest was 1895, when on average the pre-test result of control class was 61,12 . In addition from the above table it could be seen also that the cumulative result of post-test of control class 2630, when on average the post-test result was 84,83 .

After applying learning reading by using Cloze Procedure Technique based, the researcher knew that the assessment result in control class, a significant changed from pre-test value of cumulative amount to 1895 to reach a value of cumulative post-test amounted 2630.

Table 4.5
The score of Distribution Frequency of Control Class

| No. | Name | Score |  | X | Gained Score | $\begin{aligned} & D^{2} \\ & =(X-y)^{2} \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pre-test | Post-test |  |  |  |
| 1. | AD | 70 | 100 | 85 | -30 | 900 |
| 2. | AHF | 60 | 80 | 70 | -20 | 400 |
| 3. | AF | 50 | 70 | 60 | -20 | 400 |
| 4. | AN | 40 | 70 | 55 | -30 | 900 |
| 5. | DM | 55 | 80 | 67,5 | -25 | 625 |
| 6. | DH | 45 | 75 | 60 | -30 | 900 |
| 7. | EI | 65 | 85 | 75 | -20 | 400 |
| 8. | EY | 55 | 75 | 65 | -20 | 400 |
| 9. | FMN | 65 | 80 | 72,5 | -15 | 225 |
| 10. | FR | 50 | 90 | 70 | -40 | 1600 |
| 11. | HR | 60 | 85 | 72,5 | -25 | 625 |
| 12. | HH | 65 | 80 | 72,5 | -15 | 225 |
| 13. | HAK | 55 | 80 | 67,5 | -25 | 625 |
| 14. | LAF | 75 | 100 | 87,5 | -25 | 625 |
| 15. | MH | 55 | 85 | 70 | -30 | 900 |
| 16. | MA | 75 | 100 | 87,5 | -25 | 625 |
| 17. | MY | 70 | 100 | 87,5 | -30 | 900 |
| 18. | MIM | 70 | 100 | 87,5 | -30 | 900 |
| 19. | MAF | 60 | 100 | 80 | -40 | 1600 |
| 20. | MS | 70 | 85 | 77,5 | -15 | 225 |
| 21. | NM | 75 | 90 | 82,5 | -15 | 225 |
| 22. | NV | 50 | 90 | 70 | -40 | 1600 |
| 23. | NR | 60 | 70 | 65 | -10 | 100 |
| 24. | RNS | 55 | 80 | 67,5 | -25 | 625 |
| 25. | RF | 50 | 80 | 65 | -30 | 900 |
| 26. | RY | 65 | 70 | 67,5 | -5 | 25 |
| 27. | SUD | 60 | 80 | 70 | -20 | 400 |
| 28. | SN | 65 | 100 | 82,5 | -35 | 1225 |
| 29. | SM | 65 | 90 | 77,5 | -25 | 625 |
| 30. | TH | 65 | 95 | 80 | -30 | 900 |
| 31. | YM | 75 | 95 | 85 | -20 | 400 |
| Jumlah <br> Rata-rata |  | 1895 | 2630 | 1125 | -765 | 21025 |
|  |  | 61,62 | 84,83 | 36,29 |  |  |

The table above tells us about differences score of pre-test and post-test $\sum \mathrm{D}$ is the result of post-test minus pre-test, the result of $\sum \mathrm{D} 2$ is quadrate of $\sum \mathrm{D}$, and then result of each is calculated. The writer found that $\sum \mathrm{D}=-765$ and $\sum \mathrm{D} 2=21025$.

Beside above the score of distribution frequency of pre-test and post-test of experimental class as follow:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{M} & =\frac{\sum S C O R E}{N} \\
& =\frac{1125}{31} \\
& =36,29
\end{aligned}
$$

The interpretation of the means score of pre-test and post-test of control class:

Table 4. 6
The interpretation of the mean $X$ variable

| No. | The mean the |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1. | $80-100$ | Interpretation <br> mean |
| 2. | $70-79$ | Excellent |
| 3. | $60-69$ | Very good |
| 4. | $50-59$ | Good |
| 5. | $<50$ | Average |

Based on calculated of mean in control class above gives score 36,29 and after interpreted by the interpretation table, apparently score 36,29 is between $70-79$ the interpretation is very good.

## B. Data Analysis

Based on data above, the writer has calculated the result of $\sum \mathrm{D}=-765$ and $\sum D^{2}=21025$ then the writer tried to find out the standard deviation with the formula:

$$
\begin{aligned}
S D_{D} & =\sqrt{\frac{\sum D^{2}}{N}}-\left(\frac{\sum D}{N}\right)^{2} \\
& =\sqrt{\frac{21025}{31}}-\left(\frac{-765}{31}\right)^{2} \\
& =\sqrt{678,2-(-24,67)^{2}} \\
& =\sqrt{678,2-608,9} \\
& =\sqrt{69,3} \\
\mathrm{SD} & =8,32
\end{aligned}
$$

Based on the data table I as the score of pre-test and post test, the writer tried to calculated the mean of differences (MD) between pre test and post-test with the formula:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{MD} & =\frac{\sum D}{N} \\
& =\frac{-765}{31} \\
& =-24,67
\end{aligned}
$$

After going the result of $\mathrm{SD}=8,3$ the writer calculated the standard error from mean of differences (SE MD) between pre-test and post-test by using formula:

$$
\begin{aligned}
S E_{M D} & =\frac{S D}{\sqrt{N-1}} \\
& =\frac{8,32}{\sqrt{31-1}} \\
& =\frac{8,32}{\sqrt{30}} \\
& =\frac{8,32}{5,477}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\mathrm{SE} \quad=1,51
$$

The last procedure of the calculate is determining the result of $t_{o}(\mathrm{t}$ observation) of the test by the formula :

$$
\begin{aligned}
t_{o} \quad & =\frac{M}{S E} \\
& =\frac{1125}{1,51} \\
& =745,03
\end{aligned}
$$

The result $(745,03)$ indicates that there is a different of degree as much $(745,03)$ regardless the minus for does not indicated the negative score.

If $t_{\text {observation }}>t_{\text {table }}$ the alternative hypothesis is accepted, it means there is any significant different of teaching English Reading use cloze procedure technique.

If $t_{\text {observation }}<t_{\text {table }}$ the alternative hypothesis is rejected, it means there is no significant different of teaching English Reading use cloze procedure technique.

Then order to complete the result of this research, the writer tried out degree of freedom (df) by the formula:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{DF} & =\mathrm{N}-1 \\
& =31-1=30
\end{aligned}
$$

Based on the result calculation, the writer obtain the value of $t_{o}=745,03$ and degree of freedom (df) is 30 . In significance $5 \%$ from $30(\mathrm{t}$ table $)=1,69$. In degree of significant $1 \%$ from $30(\mathrm{t}$ table $)=2$, 45.

After gets the data the writers compared it with $t_{\text {table }}$ both in degree significance $5 \%$ and $1 \%$. Therefore, $t_{o}: t_{t}=745,03>1,69$ in degree of significance $5 \%$ and $t_{o}: t_{t}=745,03>2,45$ in degree of
significance $1 \%$. It means there is significance the use cloze procedure technique to Improve students reading comprehension.

## C. The test Hypothesis

Before deciding the result of hypothesis the writer proposes interpretation toward $t_{0}\left(t_{\text {observation }}\right)$ with procedure as follow:

1. Formulating alternative hypothesis $\left(H_{a}\right)$ : there are significant mean differences between X variable and Y variable.
2. Formulating null hypothesis $H_{o}$ : there are not significant mean differences between $X$ variable and $Y$ variable.

Furthermore, the writer followed some assumption as the statistic hypothesis state:
a. If the result of calculation $t_{o}\left(t_{\text {observation }}\right)$ is higher then $t_{t}$, the zero hypothesis $\left(H_{o}\right)$ is rejected. It means that the experiment technique is accepted.
b. If the result of calculation that $t_{o}\left(t_{\text {observation }}\right)$ is smaller than $t_{t}$ $\left(t_{\text {table }}\right) t_{o}<t_{t}$ the hypothesis $\left(H_{o}\right)$ is accepted. It means that the experiment technique is rejected.

## D. Data Interpretation

From the result of control class is mean of pre test score 59,6 and post-test 85,9 . The result of experiment class is mean of pre-test 65 and post-test 95 . It mean of control class is lower than experiment class.

If that $t_{0}>t_{t}$ hypothesis is accepted. It means that there is significant different between students understanding in learning reading without using cloze procedure technique in controlled class and which using aesthetic realism method in experiment class.

If that $t_{0}>t_{t}$ the alternative hypothesis in learning reading is accepted. It means that there is no significant between by using Cloze Procedure Technique in experiment class and learning reading without using Cloze Procedure Technique in controlled class.

Based on calculation above is know that $t$ table with level significance $5 \%$ and $1 \%$. Therefore, $t_{0}>t_{t}=745,03>1,69$ in degree of significance $5 \%$ and $t_{o}: t_{t}=745,03>2,45$ in degree of significance $1 \%$. It means there is significance the use Cloze Procedure Technique Toward students reading skill. The writer can conclude that there is Improving Student's English Reading Comprehension through Cloze Procedure Technique at Second Grade of SMPN 02 Karangtanjung

