**CHAPTER IV**

**RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

1. **Data Description**

In this Chapter, the researcher described the data got from the students of MTs Al-Khairiyah Pipitan and population of this research is the eight grade students in 2018/2019 academic year. In this research, the researcher took 48 students as the sample. The researcher divided them into two groups, 24 students as experimental class, it is from class VII D, and 24 students as control class, it is from class VII E.

To find out how the students’ reading comprehension is, the writer identified some result, they are: the score of students pre-test, the score of students post-test, the differences between pre-test and post-test scores of student and from the differences of students’ condition between the students who are taught by using Collaborative Strategic Reading and the students who are not taught by using Collaborative Strategic Reading in teaching and learning process.

To know the effectiveness of using Content Based Instruction method toward students’ reading comprehension on report text, the writer gave the test to students as the sample both at the experimental class and control class. The test 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. Each of the test consist of 20 multiple choice. Having finished the field research, the writer gets the score as follow:

1. **Experimental Class**
2. **The students pre-test score of Experimental class**

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

**Table 4.1**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Respondents** | **Aspect of Reading** | | | | | **Amount** | **Total Scores** |
| Main Idea | Reference | Inference | Specific Information | Vocabulary |
|
| 1 | AIR | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 11 | 55 |
| 2 | AP | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 45 |
| 3 | F | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 30 |
| 4 | GJPH | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 30 |
| 5 | H | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 45 |
| 6 | IS | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 13 | 65 |
| 7 | IA | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 45 |
| 8 | IF | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 45 |
| 9 | INA | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 45 |
| 10 | J | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 30 |
| 11 | JA | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 12 | 60 |
| 12 | LDAR | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 13 | 65 |
| 13 | M | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 12 | 60 |
| 14 | NJ | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 11 | 55 |
| 15 | NA | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 50 |
| 16 | NE | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 45 |
| 17 | NH | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 45 |
| 18 | RM | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 50 |
| 19 | SM | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 11 | 55 |
| 20 | S | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 10 | 50 |
| 21 | SA | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 14 | 70 |
| 22 | SK | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 10 | 50 |
| 23 | TRS | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 45 |
| 24 | WL | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 45 |
| **N= 24** | **Total Score** | | | | | | | **1180** |
| **Average** | | | | | | | **49,16** |

The table 4.1 above shows the result of students’ pre-test score in reading comprehension in the experimental class. The data shows that the maximum score is 70 and the minimum score is 30. There are one students who got the maximum score and three student who got the minimum score. The average score of the pre-test is 49.16.

**Table 4.2**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Respondents** | **Aspect of Reading** | | | | | **Amount** | **Scores** |
| Main Idea | Reference | Inference | Specific Information | Vocabulary |
|
| 1 | AIR | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 13 | 65 |
| 2 | AP | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 13 | 65 |
| 3 | F | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 14 | 70 |
| 4 | GJPH | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 14 | 70 |
| 5 | H | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 13 | 65 |
| 6 | IS | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 14 | 70 |
| 7 | IA | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 13 | 65 |
| 8 | IF | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 13 | 65 |
| 9 | INA | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 13 | 65 |
| 10 | J | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 14 | 70 |
| 11 | JA | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 16 | 80 |
| 12 | LDAR | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 17 | 85 |
| 13 | M | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 14 | 70 |
| 14 | NJ | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 13 | 65 |
| 15 | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 12 | 60 |
| 16 | NE | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 14 | 70 |
| 17 | NH | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 12 | 60 |
| 18 | RM | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 15 | 75 |
| 19 | SM | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 14 | 70 |
| 20 | S | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 13 | 65 |
| 21 | SA | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 16 | 80 |
| 22 | SK | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 13 | 65 |
| 23 | TRS | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 15 | 75 |
| 24 | WL | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 13 | 65 |
| **N= 24** | **Total Score** | | | | | | | **1655** |
| **Average** | | | | | | | **68.95** |

The table 4.2 above shows the result of students’ post-test score in reading comprehension in the experimental class. The data shows that the maximum score is 85 and the minimum score is 60. There are one students who got the maximum score and two student who got the minimum score. The average score of the pre-test is 68.95.

Based on the explanation above, the result of experimental class get the significance improvement after given treatment. It can be seen from the average score of post-test is better than the average scores of pre-test that 68.95 > 49,16. It means that using Collaborative Strategic Reading was success to improve students’ reading comprehension.

**Table 4.3**

**The Result of Experiment Class**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Experiment Class** | | |
| **Respondent** | **pre-test** | **post-test** |
| 1 | AIR | 55 | 65 |
| 2 | AP | 45 | 65 |
| 3 | F | 30 | 70 |
| 4 | GJPH | 30 | 70 |
| 5 | H | 45 | 65 |
| 6 | IS | 65 | 70 |
| 7 | IA | 45 | 65 |
| 8 | IF | 45 | 65 |
| 9 | INA | 45 | 65 |
| 10 | J | 30 | 70 |
| 11 | JA | 60 | 80 |
| 12 | LDAR | 65 | 85 |
| 13 | M | 60 | 70 |
| 14 | NJ | 55 | 65 |
| 15 | NA | 50 | 60 |
| 16 | NE | 45 | 70 |
| 17 | NH | 45 | 60 |
| 18 | RM | 50 | 75 |
| 19 | SM | 55 | 70 |
| 20 | S | 50 | 65 |
| 21 | SA | 70 | 80 |
| 22 | SK | 50 | 65 |
| 23 | TRS | 45 | 75 |
| 24 | WL | 45 | 65 |
| N= 24 |  | **∑X= 1180** | **∑X= 1655** |
| **M= 49,16** | **M= 68.95** |

The Table 4.3 shows that students’ score result before and after treatment in experimental class. The data shows that the lowest score of pre-test score is 30 and highest score is 70. The lowest score of post-test score is 60 and highest score is 85. The mean score of pre-test is 49,16 and the mean score of post-test is 68,95. In this case the researcher comparing pre-test score and post-test score students. The result of comparison was students improvement score that after the researcher do treatment using Collaborative Strategic Reading in reading comprehension. It means that using CSR was success to improve students’ reading comprehension.

**Graphic 4.1**

**The Different of Students’ Scores Pre-test and Post-test at Experimental Class**

The graphic above showed those students’ score before and after treatment by using Collaborative Strategic Reading. After had given treatment in experimental class, all of students realized improvement score. It could be seen from the modus on pre-test 45 , while the modus on post-test are 65. It means that many students’ on pre-test got score 45, and on post-test got score 65. The highest score on pre-test only 70, it was gotten by one student and the highest score on post-test only 85, it was gotten by one student. The lowest score on pre-test was 30, it was gotten by three students and post-test was 60, it was gotten by two students.

1. **Control Class**

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

**Table 4.4**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Respondents** | **Aspect of Reading** | | | | | **Amount** | **Total Scores** |
| Main Idea | Reference | Inference | Specific Information | Vocabulary |
|
| 1 | ASH | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 12 | 60 |
| 2 | HHH | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 35 |
| 3 | IA | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 45 |
| 4 | MP | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 30 |
| 5 | MS | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 35 |
| 6 | NP | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 25 |
| 7 | NA | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 40 |
| 8 | PS | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 30 |
| 9 | SE | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 45 |
| 10 | SNA | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 45 |
| 11 | SO | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 55 |
| 12 | SFN | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 40 |
| 13 | SM | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 10 | 50 |
| 14 | SNR | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 25 |
| 15 | SN | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 45 |
| 16 | SRF | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 35 |
| 17 | SR | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 8 | 40 |
| 18 | SZA | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 35 |
| 19 | SUN | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 40 |
| 20 | SA | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 45 |
| 21 | TN | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 10 | 50 |
| 22 | WS | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 12 | 60 |
| 23 | WAR | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 35 |
| 24 | ZRA | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 50 |
| **N= 24** | **Total Score** | | | | | | | **995** |
| **Average** | | | | | | | **41,45** |

The table 4.4 above shows the result of the students’ pre-test score in reading comprehension in the control class. The data shows that the maximum score is 60 and the minimum score is 25. There is two student who got the maximum score and two students who got the minimum scores. The average score of the pre-test is 41,45.

**Table 4.5**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Respondents** | **Aspect of Reading** | | | | | **Amount** | **Total Scores** |
| Main Idea | Reference | Inference | Specific Information | Vocabulary |
|
| 1 | ASH | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 14 | 70 |
| 2 | HHH | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 45 |
| 3 | IA | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 11 | 55 |
| 4 | MP | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 12 | 60 |
| 5 | MS | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 11 | 55 |
| 6 | NP | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 11 | 55 |
| 7 | NA | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 12 | 60 |
| 8 | PS | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 12 | 60 |
| 9 | SE | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 11 | 55 |
| 10 | SNA | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 11 | 55 |
| 11 | SO | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 12 | 60 |
| 12 | SFN | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 11 | 55 |
| 13 | SM | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 55 |
| 14 | SNR | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 11 | 55 |
| 15 | SN | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 12 | 60 |
| 16 | SRF | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 40 |
| 17 | SR | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 50 |
| 18 | SZA | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 11 | 55 |
| 19 | SUN | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 45 |
| 20 | SA | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 13 | 65 |
| 21 | TN | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 14 | 70 |
| 22 | WS | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 15 | 75 |
| 23 | WAR | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 11 | 55 |
| 24 | ZRA | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 15 | 75 |
| **N= 24** | **Total Score** | | | | | | | **1385** |
| **Average** | | | | | | | **57,70** |

The table 4.5 above shows the results of the students’ post-test scores of control class in reading comprehension. The data shows that the maximum score is 75 and the minimum score is 40. There is two students who got the maximum score and one student who got the minimum scores.The average score of the post test is 57,70.

Based on the explanation above, the result of control class doesn’t have significance improvement after given treatment. It can be seen from the average score of post test that is 57,70>41,45. The post-test in control class also better than pre-test, but lower than experimental class.

**Table 4.6**

**The Result of Control Class**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Control Class** | | |
| **Respondent** | **pre-test** | **post-test** |
| 1 | ASH | 60 | 70 |
| 2 | HHH | 35 | 45 |
| 3 | IA | 45 | 55 |
| 4 | MP | 30 | 60 |
| 5 | MS | 35 | 55 |
| 6 | NP | 25 | 55 |
| 7 | NA | 40 | 60 |
| 8 | PS | 30 | 60 |
| 9 | SE | 45 | 55 |
| 10 | SNA | 45 | 55 |
| 11 | SO | 55 | 60 |
| 12 | SFN | 40 | 55 |
| 13 | SM | 50 | 55 |
| 14 | SNR | 25 | 55 |
| 15 | SN | 45 | 60 |
| 16 | SRF | 35 | 40 |
| 17 | SR | 40 | 50 |
| 18 | SZA | 35 | 55 |
| 19 | SUN | 40 | 45 |
| 20 | SA | 45 | 65 |
| 21 | TN | 50 | 70 |
| 22 | WS | 60 | 75 |
| 23 | WAR | 35 | 55 |
| 24 | ZRA | 50 | 75 |
| N= 24 |  | **∑X= 995** | **∑X= 1385** |
| **M= 41,45** | **M= 57,70** |

The Table 4.6 shows that students’ score result before and after treatment in control class by using conventional method. The data shows that the lowest score of pre-test score is 25 and highest score is 60. The lowest score of post-test score is 45 and highest score is 75. The mean score of pre-test is 41,45 and the mean score of post-test is 57,70. The researcher comparing pre-test score and post-test score students. The result is shows different score between pre-test and post-test score at control class.

**Graphic 4.2**

**The Different of Students’ Scores Pre-test and Post-test at Control Class**

The graphic above showed those students’ pre-test and post-test score on control class. The improvement score can be seen from the highest score on pre-test was 60, it was gotten by two students and the post-test was 75, it was gotten by two students. The lowest score on pre-test was 25, it was gotten by two students’ and post-test was 45, it was gotten by two students. The modus on pre-test was 45 and post-test 55 . It means that many of students’ on pre-test got score 45 and on post-test got score 55 .

1. **Data Analysis**

After getting the data from the post test score of two classes, then the writer analyzed it by using *t*-test. The formula as follow:

= Mean score of the experiment class

= Mean score of the control class

= Sum of square deviation score in experiment class

= Sum of square deviation score in control class

= Number of students of experiment class

= Number of students of control class

= Constant number

df = Degree of Freedom (df = )

= -

= -

**Table 4.7**

**The Result Calculation of Post-Test at the Experiment Class (X12) and the Control Class (X22)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | Score | | **x1** | **x2** | **x12** | **x22** |
| X1 | X2 |
| 1 | 65 | 70 | -3.95 | 12.3 | 15.60 | 151.29 |
| 2 | 65 | 45 | -3.95 | -12.7 | 15.60 | 161.29 |
| 3 | 70 | 55 | 1.05 | -2.7 | 1.10 | 7.29 |
| 4 | 70 | 60 | 1.05 | 2.3 | 1.10 | 5.29 |
| 5 | 65 | 55 | -3.95 | -2.7 | 15.60 | 7.29 |
| 6 | 70 | 55 | 1.05 | -2.7 | 1.10 | 7.29 |
| 7 | 65 | 60 | -3.95 | 2.3 | 15.60 | 5.29 |
| 8 | 65 | 60 | -3.95 | 2.3 | 15.50 | 5.29 |
| 9 | 65 | 55 | -3.95 | -2.7 | 15.60 | 7.29 |
| 10 | 70 | 55 | 1.05 | -2.7 | 1.10 | 7.29 |
| 11 | 80 | 60 | 11.05 | 2.3 | 122.10 | 5.29 |
| 12 | 85 | 55 | 16.05 | -2.7 | 257.60 | 7.29 |
| 13 | 70 | 55 | 1.05 | -2.7 | 1.10 | 7.29 |
| 14 | 65 | 55 | -3.95 | -2.7 | 15.60 | 7.29 |
| 15 | 60 | 60 | -8.95 | 2.3 | 80.10 | 5.29 |
| 16 | 70 | 40 | 1.05 | -17.7 | 1.10 | 313.29 |
| 17 | 60 | 50 | -8.95 | -7.7 | 80.10 | 59.29 |
| 18 | 75 | 55 | 6.05 | -2.7 | 36.60 | 7.29 |
| 19 | 70 | 45 | 1.05 | -12.7 | 1.10 | 161.29 |
| 20 | 65 | 65 | -3.95 | 7.3 | 15.60 | 53.29 |
| 21 | 80 | 70 | 11.05 | 12.3 | 122.10 | 151.29 |
| 22 | 65 | 75 | -3.95 | 17.3 | 15.60 | 299.29 |
| 23 | 75 | 55 | 6.05 | -2.7 | 36.60 | 7.29 |
| 24 | 65 | 75 | -3.95 | 17.3 | 15.60 | 299.29 |
| ∑ | 1655 | 1385 |  | | 898.4 | 1748.96 |

1. The writer calculated mean of post-test score on experimental and control class

Mean of post-test on experimental class

M1= = = 68.95

Mean of post-test on control class

M2= = = 57.70

1. The writer calculated the number of square deviation on experimental and control class

The number of square deviation on experimental class

= 898,4

The number of square deviation on control class

= 1748,96

1. The writer would calculated t-test with used formula by Fisher bellow:
2. The writer calculated degree of freedom (df)

df = N1 + N2 -2

= 24 + 24 -2

= 46

Based on t table, there is not df containing 46, so the writer uses the nearest df 46. With df as number 46 is got t table as follow:

At significance level 5% ; tt = 2,01

At significant level 1% ; tt = 2,68

1. **Hypothesis Testing**

To prove it, the data obtained from experiment class and control class are calculated with the assumption as follow:

If to>tt : The alternative hypothesis is accepted. It means that there is significant influence of teaching reading comprehension between using Collaborative Strategic Reading and without Collaborative Strategic Reading.

If to<tt : null hypothesis is rejected. It means that there is no significant influence of teaching reading comprehension between using Collaborative Strategic Reading and without using Collaborative Strategic Reading.

From the result of the calculation above, it is obtained that the value of to( t observation) is 5.25, degree freedom (*df*) is 46. In degree of significance 5% from 46 (t table) =2.01, in degree of significance 1% from 46 (t table) = 2.68.

After getting the data, the writer compared it with tt (t table) both in degree significance 5% and 1%. Therefore, to:tt = 5.25>2.01 in degree of significance 5% and to:tt = 5.25>2.68 in degree of significance 1%.

The statistic hypothesis states that if to is higher than tt, it show that *Ha* (alternative hypothesis) of the result is accepted and *Ho* (null hypothesis) is rejected. It means that there is influence of teaching reading comprehension on narrative teks between using Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR) and without Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR).

1. **Interpretation data**

In the class VII D as experimental class, the highest score of pre-test is 70 and the lowest score is 30. The highest score of post-test is 85 and the lowest score is 60. The mean of pre-test score obtained by students in this class is 49,16 and the mean of post-test is 68,95. The mean of pre-test and post-test score has good enough improvement it seen by 68,95>49,16. The improvement caused by the experimental class have learned reading comprehension on narrative text by using Collaborative Strategic Reading that not used by teacher before. Because in this research writer using theme based model so that the students focus on topic in learning English subject. The text topic in every meeting is different.

In the class VIII E as a control class, the highest score of pre-test is 60 and the lowest score is 25. Meanwhile, the highest score in post test is 75 and the lowest score is 45. The mean of pre test is 41,45 and the post test is 57,70. In this class also realized improvement but lower than experimental class. It caused by the control class did not learn using Colaborative Strategic Reading on reading comprehension on narrative text. In control class the students’ still can’t active learning. It also could be seen from the mean of post test on experimental class and control class, there was 68,95 on experimental class and 57,70 on control class. It means the experimental class got significant improvement than control class, there was 68,95>57,70.

And then, the writer analysis using t-test, the result obtained that score of to (t observation) is 5,25, degree of freedom (df) is 46. In level significance 5% from 46 on the table 2,01 and in significance 1% is 2,68. After got the data, the writer compared it with tt (ttable) both in level significance 5% and 1% . Therefore, to comparison tt= 5,25>2,01 in significance 5% and to  comparison tt = 5,25> 2,68 in significance 1%.

The statistic hypothesis states that to higher than tt, it shows tha that Ha (alternative The statistic hypothesis states that if t0 be higher than tt, it showed that Ha (alternative hypothesis) of the result is accepted and H0 (null hypothesis) is rejected. It means that there is significance effectiveness of Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR) on students reading narrative text at the second grade of MTs. Al-Khairiyah Pipitan.