**CHAPTER IV**

**THE RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

1. **Description of Data**

In this chapter, the writer would like to present the description of the data obtained. As writer stated at the previous chapter that the population of the students of Second Grade of Junior High School Al-Khairiyah Pontang Serang-Banten and the subject of this research is the secod grade students. In this research, writer divided them into two classes, 30 students as experimental xlass, it is from clas VIII B, and 30 students as control class, it is from class VIII A. To find out how is the 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 scores of students and from the differences of students’ condition between the students who are taudht by listen-read-discuss strategy and the students naho are not taught by using listen-read-discuss strategy in teaching and learning process.

To know how is the use of listen-read-discuss strategy improving reading the reading comprehension, the writer give the test to students as the sample both at the experimental class and at conrol class. The testused in this research divided into two types, there are pre-test and post-test. The pre-test is the giving before treatment and the post-test is given after giving treatment. On the test, students should read text prepared by the writer. The writer describes the data at experimental and control class as bellow :

1. **Experimental class**

The writer describes the result of pre-test of the experimental class on the table bellows :

*Table 4.1*

*The students’ score of pre-test at the experimental class*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **NO** | **NAME** | **SCORES** |
| 1. | ARJ | 35 |
| 2. | AAT | 25 |
| 3. | AS | 20 |
| 4. | AR | 30 |
| 5. | ATK | 35 |
| 6. | AP | 40 |
| 7. | BYM | 35 |
| 8. | EM | 25 |
| 9. | FMT | 20 |
| 10. | HP | 25 |
| 11. | IS | 25 |
| 12. | JML | 30 |
| 13. | MD | 35 |
| 14. | MSH | 15 |
| 15. | MK | 30 |
| 16. | MM | 20 |
| 17. | NAM | 25 |
| 18. | NHF | 30 |
| 19. | OV | 15 |
| 20. | NYF | 30 |
| 21. | RA | 20 |
| 22. | RH | 20 |
| 23. | RHT | 35 |
| 24. | SM | 25 |
| 25. | STH | 35 |
| 26. | SRH | 55 |
| 27. | SA | 25 |
| 28. | SPL | 20 |
| 29. | SR | 25 |
| 30. | UH | 35 |
| N=30 | **Total** | **840** |
| **Average** | **28** |

The table 4.1 above show the result of the students’ pre-test sores in reading comprehension of experimental class. The data shows the maximum score is 55 and the minimum score is 15. There are one student who get the maximum score and two students who get the minimum score.

The average score of the pre-test is 28. While the result post-test of the experimental class are better after given treatment. It can be describe as follow :

*Table 4.2*

*The students’ score of post-test at the experimental class*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **NO** | **NAME** | **SCORES** |
| 1. | ARJ | 65 |
| 2. | AAT | 70 |
| 3. | AS | 40 |
| 4. | AR | 50 |
| 5. | ATK | 60 |
| 6. | AP | 50 |
| 7. | BYM | 70 |
| 8. | EM | 50 |
| 9. | FMT | 55 |
| 10. | HP | 70 |
| 11. | IS | 65 |
| 12. | JML | 50 |
| 13. | MD | 60 |
| 14. | MSH | 65 |
| 15. | MK | 70 |
| 16. | MM | 55 |
| 17. | NAM | 65 |
| 18. | NHF | 45 |
| 19. | OV | 70 |
| 20. | NYF | 45 |
| 21. | RA | 70 |
| 22. | RH | 65 |
| 23. | RHT | 40 |
| 24. | SM | 55 |
| 25. | STH | 55 |
| 26. | SRH | 60 |
| 27. | SA | 70 |
| 28. | SPL | 50 |
| 29. | SR | 55 |
| 30. | UH | 70 |
| N=30 | **Total** | **1760** |
| **Average** | **58,66** |

Table 4.2 above shows the result of the students’ post-test scores in reading comprehension of experimental class. The data above shows that maximum score is 70 and the minimum score is 40. There is four who get the maximum score and two students who get the minimum score. The average score of post-testis 58,66.

Based on the explanation above, it shows that the result of experimental class get significant improvement after given treatment. It can be seen from the average score of post-test is better than the average score of pre-test that 58,66>28. It means that using the listen-read-discuss strategy was success to effectiveness students’ reading comprehension.

1. **The Control Class**

The writer describes the result of pre-test of the control class on the table bellows:

*Table 4.3*

*The students’ score of pre-test at the control class*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Name** | **Score** |
| 1. | AR | 20 |
| 2. | AL | 40 |
| 3. | AD | 35 |
| 4. | AMS | 15 |
| 5. | AN | 40 |
| 6. | AT | 40 |
| 7. | AST | 25 |
| 8. | AL | 15 |
| 9. | BP | 45 |
| 10. | FRZ | 40 |
| 11. | FF | 25 |
| 12. | FFT | 25 |
| 13. | HJN | 20 |
| 14. | IM | 30 |
| 15. | KA | 15 |
| 16. | MSL | 20 |
| 17. | MA | 35 |
| 18. | MH | 50 |
| 19. | MF | 50 |
| 20. | MND | 50 |
| 21. | NN | 25 |
| 22. | NMH | 30 |
| 23. | RJK | 30 |
| 24. | RKR | 20 |
| 25. | SHI | 40 |
| 26. | SRH | 20 |
| 27. | TI | 50 |
| 28. | TH | 25 |
| 29. | US | 50 |
| 30. | YTI | 40 |
| **N=30** | **Total** | **955** |
| **Average** | **31.83** |

Table 4.3 above shows the result of the students’ pre-test scores in reading comprehension. The data shows that maximum score is 50 and the minimum score is 15. There is four students’ who got the maximum score and three students’ who got the minimum scores. The average score of the pre-test is 31,83. While,the result of post-test of the control class is better, it can be described as follow :

*Table 4.4*

*The students’ score of post-test at the control class*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Name** | **Score** |
| 1. | AR | 35 |
| 2. | AL | 30 |
| 3. | AD | 45 |
| 4. | AMS | 35 |
| 5. | AN | 45 |
| 6. | AT | 45 |
| 7. | AST | 30 |
| 8. | AL | 35 |
| 9. | BP | 50 |
| 10. | FRZ | 55 |
| 11. | FF | 50 |
| 12. | FFT | 40 |
| 13. | HJN | 35 |
| 14. | IM | 40 |
| 15. | KA | 40 |
| 16. | MSL | 40 |
| 17. | MA | 40 |
| 18. | MH | 50 |
| 19. | MF | 50 |
| 20. | MND | 50 |
| 21. | NN | 35 |
| 22. | NMH | 45 |
| 23. | RJK | 35 |
| 24. | RKR | 30 |
| 25. | SHI | 40 |
| 26. | SRH | 25 |
| 27. | TI | 40 |
| 28. | TH | 45 |
| 29. | US | 50 |
| 30. | YTI | 40 |
| **N=30** | **Total** | **1225** |
| **Average** | **40,83** |

The table 4.4 above shows the result of the students’ post-test scores of control class in reading comprehension. The data shows that the maximum score is 55 and the minimum score is 25. There is one student who get the maximum score and there is one student who get the minimum score. The average score of the post-test is 38,33.

Based on the explanation above, it shows that the result of control class doesn’t have the significance improvement after given treatment. It can be seen from the average score of post-test 40,83>32,16. This class also experienced effectiveness but lower than experimental class.

1. **Data Analysis**
2. **Experimental Class**

The writer analysis the data by comparing the students’ score in pre-test and post-test. It can be seen on the table bellow :

*Table 4.5*

*The difference score between pre-test and post-test experimental class*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Name** | **Test** | | **Deviation** | **Squarred Deviation** |
| **X1** | **X2** | **(X=X2-X1)** | **(X2)** |
| 1. | ARJ | 35 | 65 | 40 | 1600 |
| 2. | AAT | 25 | 70 | 45 | 2025 |
| 3. | AS | 20 | 40 | 20 | 400 |
| 4. | AR | 30 | 50 | 20 | 400 |
| 5. | ATK | 35 | 60 | 25 | 625 |
| 6. | AP | 40 | 50 | 10 | 100 |
| 7. | BYM | 35 | 70 | 35 | 1225 |
| 8. | EM | 25 | 50 | 25 | 625 |
| 9. | FMT | 20 | 55 | 35 | 1225 |
| 10. | HP | 25 | 70 | 45 | 2025 |
| 11. | IS | 25 | 65 | 40 | 1600 |
| 12. | JML | 30 | 50 | 20 | 400 |
| 13. | MD | 35 | 60 | 25 | 625 |
| 14. | MSH | 15 | 65 | 50 | 2500 |
| 15. | MK | 30 | 70 | 40 | 1600 |
| 16. | MM | 20 | 55 | 35 | 1225 |
| 17. | NAM | 25 | 65 | 40 | 1600 |
| 18. | NHF | 30 | 45 | 15 | 225 |
| 19. | OV | 15 | 70 | 55 | 3025 |
| 20. | NYF | 30 | 45 | 15 | 225 |
| 21. | RA | 20 | 70 | 50 | 2500 |
| 22. | RH | 20 | 65 | 45 | 2025 |
| 23. | RHT | 35 | 40 | 5 | 25 |
| 24. | SM | 25 | 55 | 25 | 625 |
| 25. | STH | 35 | 55 | 20 | 400 |
| 26. | SRH | 55 | 60 | 5 | 25 |
| 27. | SA | 25 | 70 | 45 | 2025 |
| 28. | SPL | 20 | 50 | 30 | 900 |
| 29. | SR | 25 | 55 | 30 | 900 |
| 30. | UH | 35 | 70 | 35 | 1225 |
| **Total** | | 850 | 1760 | 925 | **33925** |

The table 4.5 above shows that there are the differences between pre-test and post test score of the experimental class. The different score is the result of the post-test score is subtracted by pre-test score. So, there are significant differences between pre-test and post-test score of the experimental class, the highest difference score is 70 and the lowest is 15. It can be seen on the graphic bellows :

*Graphic 4.1*

*The different score between pre-test and post-test of experimental class*

The graphic 4.1 above shows the result of students’pre-test and post-test scores of experimental class. In the pre-test score, there is one student who get the maximum scores namely 55 and there are six students who got the minimum scores namely 15. While in the post-test, there are eight students who get the maximum scores namely 70 and two students who get the minimum score namely 40.

**2. The Control Class**

The writer analysis the data by comparing the students’ score in pre-test and post-test. It can be seen on the table bellows:

*Table 4.6*

*The difference score between pre-test and post-test control class*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Name** | **Test** | | **Deviation** | **Squarred Deviation** |
| **X1** | **X2** | **(X=X2-X1)** | **(X2)** |
| 1. | AR | 20 | 32 | 15 | 225 |
| 2. | AL | 40 | 30 | -10 | 100 |
| 3. | AD | 35 | 45 | 10 | 100 |
| 4. | AMS | 15 | 35 | 20 | 400 |
| 5. | AN | 40 | 45 | 5 | 25 |
| 6. | AT | 40 | 45 | 5 | 25 |
| 7. | AST | 25 | 30 | 5 | 25 |
| 8. | AL | 15 | 35 | 20 | 400 |
| 9. | BP | 45 | 50 | 5 | 25 |
| 10. | FRZ | 40 | 55 | 10 | 100 |
| 11. | FF | 25 | 50 | 25 | 625 |
| 12. | FFT | 25 | 40 | 15 | 225 |
| 13. | HJN | 20 | 35 | 15 | 225 |
| 14. | IM | 30 | 40 | 10 | 100 |
| 15. | KA | 15 | 40 | 25 | 625 |
| 16. | MSL | 20 | 40 | 20 | 400 |
| 17. | MA | 35 | 40 | 5 | 25 |
| 18. | MH | 50 | 50 | 0 | 0 |
| 19. | MF | 50 | 50 | 0 | 0 |
| 20. | MND | 50 | 50 | 0 | 0 |
| 21. | NN | 25 | 35 | 10 | 100 |
| 22. | NMH | 30 | 45 | 15 | 225 |
| 23. | RJK | 30 | 35 | 5 | 25 |
| 24. | RKR | 20 | 30 | 10 | 100 |
| 25. | SHI | 40 | 40 | 0 | 0 |
| 26. | SRH | 20 | 25 | 5 | 25 |
| 27. | TI | 50 | 40 | 10 | 100 |
| 28. | TH | 25 | 45 | -20 | 400 |
| 29. | US | 50 | 50 | 0 | 0 |
| 30. | YTI | 30 | 40 | 10 | 100 |
| **Total** | | 965 | 1225 | 255 | **4725** |

The table 4.6 above shows that there are the differences between pre-test and post-test score of the controlled class. The differents score is the result of the post-test score is subtracted by pre-test score. So, there is no significant difference between pre-test and post-test score of the control class, the highest different score is 55 and the lowest is 15. There are some students who do not experienced improvement.

Graphic 4.2

*The different score between pre and post-test of control class*

The graphic 4.2 above shows the result of the students’ score in pre-test and post-test of the control class. In the pre-test score, there is one student who get the maximum score namely 55 and the three students who get the minimum score namely 15. While in the post-test, there is one student who get the maximum score namely 55 and two student who get the minimum score namely 25.

From the data obtained above, the writer uses t-test formula the following steps as follow :

1. Determine mean of score experimental class (MX), with formula :

MX =

=

= 30,83

The result above showed about the average score (mean) at the experimental class. The writer got the data from 1, 2, and . Afterword the researcher calculated the data based on the formula above.

1. Determine mean of control class (MY), with fotmula :

MY =

=

= 8.16

The result above showed about the average score (mean) at the control class. The writer got the data from 1, 2, and . Afterword the researcher calculated the data based on the formula above.

1. Determine the total square of error in control class (X), with formula :

= -

= 33925 -

= 33925 -

= 33925 – 28,520

= 33,896.48

The result above showed about the score quadrates at the experimental class. The writer got the data from from 1, 2, and . Afterword the researcher cal;culated the data based on the formula above.

1. Determine the total square of error in control class (Y), with formula:

2 -

= 4725 –

= 4725 -

= 4725- 2.000

= 2.72

The result above showed about the score quadrates at the experimental class. The writer got the data from from 1, 2, and . Afterword the researcher calculated the data based on the formula above.

1. Calculation T-Test

t =

t =

t = 3.44

The result above showed about the calculating t-test after the writer got the data from MX, MY, 2 and 2. Afterword the researcher calculated the data based on the formula above.

1. Determine the degree of freedom, with formula :

Df = Nx + Ny – 2

= 30 + 30 – 2

= 58

The result above showed about the score of sample both experiment and control class. The writer used 60 students as a sample for the research. 30 students are from VIII B as experimental class and 30 students are from VIII A as control class.

Comparing “t” has been tested in calculating (to = 3.44) and the degree of freedom (df) for 58, the writer used closest “df” from 60-2= 58. So, the degree of freedom is 58. It has been tested on the t-table (tt = 5% = 2.00 and tt = 1 % = 1.67 It can be known that to>tt 5% and to>tt 1%. It means 2.00% < 3.44 > 1.67.

1. **The interpretation of Data**

Based on the finding data of research, the implementation of teaching reading comprehension by using liten-read-discuss strategy was found the students tought by this strategy have been effective in reading skill than the students who taught by this strategy can fast perceptective when listen the other readers, with easy discuss above the reading text with the other friends and then students can to read the text in front of their friends.

From the result of the research that the mean of pre-test score obtained by students of MTs Al-Khairiyah Pontang Kabupaten Serang in the class VIII B as experimental class was 28 and pre-test scores obtained by student’s of VIII A as a control class was 31.83. The highest score of both classes were same in class VIII B as experimental class got 55 and in the class VIII A as control class got 50. For the lowest score of pre-test of both classes were 15 for experimental class and 15 for control class.

Besides the data also shows that the students’ reading comprehension ability at the Second Grade of Junior High School Al-Khairiyah Ponmtang after conducted by experiment to apply listen-read-discuss strategy between VIII B as an experimental class and VIII A as control class is different significantly. The mean score of post-test obtained by the students of VIII B as experimental class was 58,66. It is higher than VIII A as control class namely 40,83. The highest post-test scores of VIII B as experimental class were 70. While, the highest scores achieved by control class were 40. While, the lowest post-test scores achieved by experimental class 40 and the lowest control class were 25. The distribution scores of experimental class was 58,66-40 = 18.66. while in the control class was 40,83-25 = 15,83.

By the degree of freedom (df) = 58 and analyzed by using t-test, the writer tested that there is an effecteveness of using listen-read-discuss strategy in teaching reading comprehension, because t-count is higher than t-table in level significance 5 % and 1 %. The table with the level significance of 5% is 2.00 and the level significance of 1 % is 1.67.

Based on the interpretation above t-count>t-table. It means there is signifance of listen-read-discuss strategy on students’ reading comprehension ability.

Hypothesis testing is used to know the significance of both variables. And tested as follow :

Ha = to>tt

Ho= to<tt

Notes :

Ha = Alternative Hypothesis

HO = Null Hypothesis

to  = The value of t-observation

tt  = The value t-table

After appliying Listen-read-discuss strategy in the experimental classes can get the higerscore from control class, because the students’ understanding because the students’ understanding becomes more increased which in turn effects, the students’ value by using Listen-read-discuss strategy. Different from control class who do not use the Listen-read-discuss strategy. Therefore the use of Listen-read-discuss strategy can be said to be effective for learning reading comprehension in the classes.