## CHAPTER IV <br> RESULT AND DISCUSSION

## A. Description of Data

In this chapter, the writer would like to present the description of the data obtained. As the writer stated at previous chapter that the population of the study was the second grade of junior Islamic high school SMPIT Bismilah Padarincang, as tested in this chapter, the writer divided them into two groups, 25 students as control class, it is from class A, and 25 students as experiment class, it is from class $b$. The goal of the research is intended to prove the accurate data in accordance with the research title.

To find out the effectiveness of using Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) strategy on students' reading comprehension, the writer identified some result, they are: the score of students before treatment, the score of students after treatment, the differences between pre test and post test score of students and from the differences of students between the students who are taught by using Listen-ReadDiscuss (LRD) strategy and the students who are not taught by using Listen-ReadDiscuss (LRD) strategy in teaching and learning process, the writer did an analysis of quantitative data. The data is obtained by giving test to the experimental class and control class after giving a different treatment both classes.

The students have poor ability of learning English before used Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) strategy. They find the difficulties in learning English but after used Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) strategy students has better achievement. It can be seen from the result of pre-test and post-test.

To know the effectiveness of using Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) strategy on students' reading comprehension, the writer gave the test to students as the sample both at the experimental class and at control class. The test that used in this research divided into two types, there are pre-test and post-test. The pre-test is the test that giving before treatment and the post-test is given after giving the treatment. On the test, the students should answer some questions that given by
the writer. In pre-test, the writer has given twenty of multiple choices in pre-test and also in post-test.

The writer describes the result of pre-test and Post-Test in experimental class by the table below:

Table I
The Students' Score of Pre-test and Post-test at Experimental Class

| No | Name | Score |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pre-Test | Post-Test |
| 1 | AR | 50 | 80 |
| 2 | AP | 40 | 75 |
| 3 | AZ | 35 | 80 |
| 4 | EJW | 50 | 80 |
| 5 | FS | 35 | 80 |
| 6 | HH | 30 | 70 |
| 7 | IS | 40 | 75 |
| 8 | JU | 25 | 70 |
| 9 | KA | 60 | 80 |
| 10 | MHS | 45 | 70 |
| 11 | MAS | 50 | 80 |
| 12 | MUF | 50 | 80 |
| 13 | NO | 50 | 75 |
| 14 | RFR | 45 | 75 |
| 15 | RA | 30 | 65 |
| 16 | RIS | 40 | 70 |
| 17 | SAB | 45 | 65 |
| 18 | SAL | 35 | 70 |
| 19 | SH | 60 | 85 |
| 20 | SI | 40 | 65 |
| 21 | SRI | 45 | 70 |


| 22 | SQ | 45 | 60 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23 | SU | 45 | 60 |
| 24 | UH | 45 | 70 |
| 25 | WIL | 45 | 60 |
| $\mathrm{~N}=25$ | Total Score | $\sum=1080$ | $\sum=1810$ |
|  | Average | 43,2 | 72,4 |

The table above shows about the students' pre-test score at the experimental class. The data the highest score of pre-test at the experimental class is 60 , it is gotten by one student and the lowest score of pre-test at the experimental class is 25 , it is gotten by one student and average score of pre-test is 43,2.

The result of post-test at experimental class is better score than score at control class. The data shows that the highest score of post-test at the experimental class is 85 , it is gotten by one student and the lowest score of posttest at the experimental class is 60 , it is gotten by four students and the average score of post-test is 72,4 .

Table II
The Students' Score of Pre-test and Post-test at Control Class

| No | Score |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pre-Test |  |
|  |  |  | Post-Test |
| 1 | AF | 30 | 45 |
| 2 | AN | 25 | 35 |
| 3 | AH | 25 | 35 |
| 4 | DF | 20 | 25 |
| 5 | EL | 55 | 65 |


| 6 | FS | 35 | 45 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7 | FIT | 50 | 55 |
| 8 | IA | 40 | 55 |
| 9 | KI | 55 | 65 |
| 10 | MA | 25 | 40 |
| 11 | MRA | 30 | 35 |
| 12 | MM | 45 | 55 |
| 13 | MUS | 35 | 40 |
| 14 | NUR | 45 | 50 |
| 15 | RF | 35 | 45 |
| 16 | RR | 50 | 60 |
| 17 | RN | 35 | 45 |
| 18 | SAE | 55 | 70 |
| 19 | SAN | 25 | 35 |
| 20 | SZ | 45 | 55 |
| 21 | SMAR | 25 | 30 |
| 22 | SMAS | 55 | 60 |
| 23 | UM | 40 | 50 |
| 24 | YA | 45 | 55 |
| 25 | MI | 25 | 40 |
| $\mathrm{N}=25$ | Total Score | $\sum=950$ | $\Sigma=1190$ |
|  | Average | 38 | 47,6 |

The table above shows about the students' pre-test score at the control class. The data the highest score of pre-test at the control class is 55 , it is gotten by two students and the lowest score of pre-test at the control class is 20 , it is gotten by one student and average score of pre-test is 38 .

The table above shows us about the students' post-test score at the control class. The data the highest score of post-test at the control class 70, it is gotten by
one student and the lowest score of post-test at the control class is 25 , it is gotten by 0 ne student and the average score of post-test is 47,6 .

## B. Data Analysis

## 1. Data Analysis of Test

Table III
The Difference Score between Pre-Test and Post-Test of experimental class

| NO | NAME | Pre- <br> Test <br> $\left(x_{1}\right)$ | Post- <br> Test <br> $\left(x_{2}\right)$ | Deviation <br> $\left(\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{x}_{2}\right.$ - $\left.\mathrm{x}_{1}\right)$ | Squared <br> Deviation <br> $\left(\mathrm{X}^{2}\right)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | AR | 50 | 80 | 30 | 900 |
| 2 | AP | 40 | 75 | 35 | 1225 |
| 3 | AZ | 35 | 80 | 45 | 2025 |
| 4 | EJW | 50 | 80 | 30 | 900 |
| 5 | FS | 35 | 80 | 45 | 2025 |
| 6 | HH | 30 | 70 | 40 | 1600 |
| 7 | IS | 40 | 75 | 35 | 1225 |
| 8 | JU | 25 | 70 | 45 | 2025 |
| 9 | KA | 60 | 80 | 20 | 400 |
| 10 | MHS | 45 | 70 | 25 | 625 |
| 11 | MAS | 50 | 80 | 30 | 900 |
| 12 | MUF | 50 | 80 | 30 | 900 |
| 13 | NO | 50 | 75 | 25 | 625 |
| 14 | RFR | 45 | 75 | 30 | 900 |
| 15 | RA | 30 | 65 | 35 | 1225 |
| 16 | RIS | 40 | 70 | 30 | 900 |
| 17 | SAB | 45 | 65 | 20 | 400 |
| 18 | SAL | 35 | 70 | 35 | 1225 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 19 | SH | 60 | 85 | 25 | 625 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20 | SI | 40 | 65 | 25 | 625 |
| 21 | SRI | 45 | 70 | 25 | 625 |
| 22 | SQ | 45 | 60 | 15 | 225 |
| 23 | SU | 45 | 60 | 15 | 225 |
| 24 | UH | 45 | 70 | 25 | 625 |
| 25 | WIL | 45 | 60 | 15 | 225 |
|  | TOTAL |  |  | $\sum \mathrm{X}=730$ | $\sum \mathrm{X}^{2}=$ <br> 23200 |

Table III above shows the difference score between pre-test and post-test at experimental class. The difference score is the results from post-test score subtract pre-test score. There is significant difference score between pre-test and post-test at experimental class, that is the biggest difference score is 45 and the lowest difference is 15 . All of students increased in their scores.

Graphic 1.1
The graphic of Pre-test and Post-test of Experimental Class


Based on the graphic above, it can be seen that the result of lowest score in pre-test is 25 and the post-test is 60 , and the highest score pre-test is 60 and posttest is 85 . So, it mean there is increasing significantly between pre-test and posttest.

Table IV
The Difference Score between Pre-Test and Post-Test of Control Class

| NO | NAME | Pre-Test <br> ( $\mathrm{y}_{1}$ ) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Post-Test } \\ \left(\mathrm{y}_{2}\right) \end{gathered}$ | Deviation $\left(\mathrm{Y}=\mathrm{y}_{2}-\mathrm{y}_{1}\right)$ | Squared <br> Deviation $\left(\mathrm{Y}^{2}\right)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | AF | 30 | 45 | 15 | 225 |
| 2 | AN | 25 | 35 | 10 | 100 |
| 3 | AH | 25 | 35 | 10 | 100 |
| 4 | DF | 20 | 25 | 5 | 25 |
| 5 | EL | 55 | 65 | 10 | 100 |
| 6 | FS | 35 | 45 | 10 | 100 |
| 7 | FIT | 50 | 55 | 5 | 25 |
| 8 | IA | 40 | 55 | 15 | 225 |
| 9 | KI | 55 | 65 | 10 | 100 |
| 10 | MA | 25 | 40 | 15 | 225 |
| 11 | MRA | 30 | 35 | 5 | 25 |
| 12 | MM | 45 | 55 | 10 | 100 |
| 13 | MUS | 35 | 40 | 5 | 25 |
| 14 | NUR | 45 | 50 | 5 | 25 |
| 15 | RF | 35 | 45 | 10 | 100 |
| 16 | RR | 50 | 60 | 10 | 100 |
| 17 | RN | 35 | 45 | 10 | 100 |
| 18 | SAE | 55 | 70 | 15 | 225 |
| 19 | SAN | 25 | 35 | 10 | 100 |
| 20 | SZ | 45 | 55 | 10 | 100 |
| 21 | SMAR | 25 | 30 | 5 | 25 |


| 22 | SMAS | 55 | 60 | 5 | 25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23 | UM | 40 | 50 | 10 | 100 |
| 24 | YA | 45 | 55 | 10 | 100 |
| 25 | MI | 25 | 40 | 15 | 225 |
|  | TOTAL |  |  |  | $\sum \mathrm{Y}=240$ |

Table IV above shows the difference score between pre-test and post-test at Control Class. The difference score is the results from post-test score subtract pre-test score. There is no significant difference score between pre-test and posttest at the control class, that is the highest difference score is 15 and the lowest difference is 5 . All of students increased in their score.

## Graphic 2.1

The Graphic of Pre-test and Post-test from control class


Based on the graphic above, it can be seen that the result from control class. The lowest score from pre-test is 20 and the post-test is 25 . The highest score from pre-test is 55 and post-test is 70 . So, there is no increasing significantly between pre-test and post-test.

From the data gotten above, the writer calculated t-test using some steps, there are:

1. Determining Mean of Score Experimental Class (MX), through formula :

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{MX} \quad & =\frac{\sum \mathrm{X}}{\mathrm{~N}} \\
& =\frac{730}{25} \\
& =29,2
\end{aligned}
$$

2. Determining Mean of Score Control Class ( MY ), through formula :

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text { MY } & =\frac{\sum Y}{N} \\
& =\frac{240}{25} \\
& =9,6
\end{aligned}
$$

3. Determining the total Square of Error of Experiment Class ( X ), through formula :

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum X^{2} & =\sum x^{2}-\frac{\left(\sum x\right)^{2}}{N} \\
& =23200-\frac{(730)^{2}}{25} \\
& =23200-\frac{532900}{25} \\
& =23200-21316 \\
& =1884
\end{aligned}
$$

The result above shows about the average score ( mean) at experimental class. The writer got the data from $\sum \mathrm{X}_{1}, \sum \mathrm{X}_{2}, \sum \mathrm{X}$ and $\sum \mathrm{X}^{2}$. After words she calculated the data based on the formula above.
4. Determine the total square of error of control class ( Y ), with formula :

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum Y^{2} & =\sum y^{2}-\frac{\left(\sum y\right)^{2}}{N} \\
& =2600-\frac{(240)^{2}}{25} \\
& =2600-\frac{57600}{25} \\
& =2600-2304 \\
& =296
\end{aligned}
$$

The result above shows about the average score (mean) at Control Class. The writer got the data from $\sum \mathrm{Y}_{1}, \sum \mathrm{Y}_{2}, \sum \mathrm{Y}$, and $\sum \mathrm{Y}^{2}$. After words she calculated the data based on the formula above.
5. Calculates T-test
$t=\frac{M x-M y}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\sum X^{2}+\sum Y^{2}}{N x+N y-2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{N x}+\frac{1}{N y}\right)}}$
$t=\frac{29,2-9,6}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1884+296}{25+25-2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{25}+\frac{1}{25}\right)}}$
$t=\frac{19,6}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{2180}{48}\right)\left(\frac{2}{25}\right)}}$
$t=\frac{19,6}{\sqrt{(45,41)(0,08)}}$
$t=\frac{19,6}{\sqrt{3,63}}$
$t=\frac{19,6}{1,90}$
$t=10,3$
The result above shows about the average score (mean) at experimental class. The writer got the data from MX, MY, $\sum \mathrm{X}^{2}$ and $\sum \mathrm{Y}^{2}$. After words she calculated the data based on the formula above.
6. Determine the Degree of Freedom, with formula:

Df $=\mathrm{Nx}+\mathrm{Ny}-2$
Df $=25+25-2$
Df $=48$
The result above shows about the score of sample both experiment and control class. The writer used 50 students as sample for research 25 students from VIII D as experimental class and 25 students from VIII C as control class.

Comparing " t " has been tested in calculating $\left(\mathrm{t}_{0}=10,3\right)$ and $\mathrm{df}=48$. There is no df (degree of freedom) for 48 , so the writer used the closer " df " from 50 , which has been tested on t -table $\left(\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{t}} 5 \%=2,01\right.$ and $\left.\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{t}} 1 \%=2,68\right)$. It can be known that $\mathrm{t}_{0}>\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{t}} 5 \%$ and $\mathrm{t}_{0}>\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{t}} 1 \%$, it means $2,01<10,3>2,68$.

From the result of test ( pre-test and post-test), the writer conclude that using Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) strategy on students comprehension has effective significant on students learning. In control class there is no increasing significantly between pre-test and post-test because when the teacher did not used Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) strategy as a teaching strategy in classroom, it is did
not give effective significant on students comprehension, but in experiment class, there is increasing significantly between pre-test and post-test because when teacher used Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) strategy as a teaching strategy in classroom, it is gave effective significant on students comprehension. It can be seen from result of pre-test and post-test of experiment class got increasing compared with control class.

## 2. Data analysis of Interview

In this research, the interview is used to know valid information about the students' condition in learning process especially in students' reading comprehension. The writer used direct interview where the interview is conducted directly between the interviewer and interviewer without going through intermediaries, this interview to aim for students. As quoted in interview that given by the writer to teacher and one of students that got the higher score:

1. For Teacher

Researcher : What is the difficulty of teaching especially English lesson?

Teacher : The difficulty is come from reading, writing and vocabulary they often don't know how to read or pronoun the text, don't know how to write the text and sometimes they have known the vocabulary but sometime also they forgot the mean.
Researcher : What is your method in teaching English?
Teacher : I use some method in teaching English like speech and many others.
Researcher : How about student skill in reading English especially in second class?

Teacher : Good enough, they ever read descriptive text, short story, recount text and many others.
2. For Student

Researcher: Do you like English lesson especially reading?

Student : I like English, and I like reading.
Researcher: Why?
Students : Because I like when the teacher read about short story, read the story in Descriptive text material and then I can read that story

Research : how about teacher's method when teaching especially in reading lesson?

Student : I like teacher's method
From the result of interview on student that teaching English lesson using new technique can effective on student learning. In this research, the writer interviews the teacher of English material and student who got the higher score. The writer can get summary that the student will be interesting and understanding the material if the teacher using new strategy or good strategy in teaching English lesson. Not only using demonstration strategy, there is time for the teacher using new strategy to make the student enjoy and understand with the material.

## C. Hypothesis Testing

Testing hypothesis is to know the significant of both variables, and tested as follows:
$\mathrm{Ha}=\mathrm{t}_{0}>\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{t}}$
$\mathrm{Ho}=\mathrm{t}_{0}<\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{t}}$
Notes:
$\mathrm{Ha}=$ Alternative Hypothesis
Ho = Null Hypothesis
$\mathrm{t}_{0}=$ The Value of t -observation
$t_{l}=$ The Value of $t$-table
To prove the data hypothesis, the data obtained from an experimental class and control class are calculated by using t-test formula with assumption as follows:

If $\mathrm{t}_{0}>\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{t}}$ :Tthe alternative hypothesis is accepted. it means there is significant effect by using Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) strategy on students' comprehension at VIII A as an experimental class and VIII B as a control class.

If $\mathrm{t}_{0}<\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{t}}$ : The alternative hypothesis is rejected. It means there is no significant effect by using Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) strategy on students' comprehension at VIII A as an experimental class and VIII B as a control class.

From the result calculation above, the value of $t_{0}=10,3$ the degree of freedom $(\mathrm{df})=50$. The writer used the degree of significant $5 \%=2,01$ and $1 \%=$ 2,68. It means that Ha (Alternative Hypothesis) of the research is accepted and Ho (Null Hypothesis) is rejected.

After getting the data, the writer compared it $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{t}}$ both degree of significant $5 \%$ and $1 \%$. $\mathrm{t}_{0}>\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{t}} 5 \%$ and $\mathrm{t}_{0}>\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{t}} 1 \%$, it means $2,01<10,3>2,68$. It means (Alternative Hypothesis) of the research is accepted.

## D. Interpretation Data

The data showed that the mean of pre-test scores obtained by students of VIII A as an experimental class $=43,6$ and pre-test scores obtained by students of VIII B as control class $=38$. The highest score in two classes was different that was class VIII as an experimental class got 60 and VIII B as a control class got 55. The lowest score in both classes was 25 for experimental class and 20 for control class.

The mean of post-test, score of VIII A as experimental class $=72,4$ was greater than VIII A as a control class $=47,6$. The highest score post-test of VIII B as experimental class got 85 and VIII B as a control class got 70. The lowest posttest of experimental class 60 and the lowest post-test of control class 25 .

By df $=50$ and analyzed by using t-test, the writer tested that there is effect in using Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) strategy on students' comprehension because t -count is higher than t -table in significant $5 \%$ and $1 \%$. The t -table with significant level $5 \%$ is 2,01 and significant level $1 \%$ is 2,68.

In chapter II, the writer had explained about some theory relating with the effectiveness of using Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) strategy on students' reading comprehension. In this research the writer took theory from Manzo Antony books as guide to strong this research.

According Manzo Antony V the Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) is comprehension strategythat builds students' prior knowledge before they read a text. ${ }^{1}$ These way used by the writer when the writer gave treatment on students in classroom. The writer concluded that Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) as teaching strategy has effective significant on students' reading comprehension. It is compared with the class which does not use Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) strategy and class that used Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) strategy as teaching strategy on students' reading comprehension like in control and experiment class.

From the interpretation above t-count > t-table means there is significance effect of Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) strategy on students' comprehension.

Based on the data obtained from control class and experiment class among the description of data, data analysis, hypothesis testing, Interpretation of data. The writer concluded that Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) strategy as teaching strategy on students' reading comprehension.

[^0]
[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Manzo,Antony V, and Casale, Ula P.A Conten reading heuristic.Listen-ReadDiscuss:Journal of Reading, 28,372-734.

