## CHAPTER IV

## THE RESULT OF THE STUDY

## A. Description of Data

In this chapter, the writer would like to present the description of data obtained. As the writer stated at the previous chapter that the population of the student MTS AL-FATH Cilegon and the subject of this research are the second grade students. In this research, the writer divided them into two classes, 20 students are experiment class, its from class VIII B , and 20 students as control class, it is from class VIII C.

To find the effectiveness of story mapping strategy, the writer identified some result, they afre : the score of students before treatment, the score students after treatment.

To know the effectivness of story mapping strategy (SMS) in teaching reading comprehension on narrative text, the writer gave the test to students as the sample both at the experimental class and at the control class. The test used in this research divided in 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. The maximum score of main idea was 25 , thw maximum score of vocabulary was 5, the maximum score of purpose was 20 , the maximum score of explicit question was 25 and the maximum score of implicit question was 25 . The highest of total score all criteria was 100 .

The writer described the result of pre-test and post-test at experimental class by the table bellows:

Table 4.1
The students score of pre test at experimental class

| NO | NAME | ASPECT |  |  |  |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | MI | V | P | EQ | IQ |  |
| 1. | AW | 10 | 3 | 10 | 10 | 17 | 50 |
| 2. | ANA | 5 | 4 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 40 |
| 3. | DAH | 10 | 4 | 16 | 10 | 10 | 50 |
| 4. | DF | 10 | 4 | 10 | 10 | 16 | 50 |
| 5. | ESK | 10 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 30 |
| 6. | FJ | 5 | 4 | 5 | 11 | 5 | 30 |
| 7. | IY | 16 | 4 | 15 | 10 | 15 | 60 |
| 8. | IS | 10 | 5 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 65 |
| 9. | KR | 10 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 40 |
| 10. | MNP | 10 | 4 | 16 | 10 | 10 | 50 |
| 11. | MNM | 10 | 5 | 15 | 20 | 10 | 60 |
| 12. | MM | 16 | 4 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 70 |
| 13. | MJ | 6 | 4 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 30 |
| 14. | MJP | 15 | 5 | 15 | 20 | 15 | 70 |
| 15. | NA | 10 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 40 |
| 16. | NH | 7 | 3 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 40 |
| 17. | RA | 12 | 3 | 10 | 10 | 15 | 50 |
| 18. | SQA | 10 | 4 | 10 | 16 | 10 | 50 |
| 19. | SHP | 10 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 30 |
| 20. | TSL | 5 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 10 | 30 |
|  | N=20 |  |  |  |  |  | $\sum=915$ |
| Average |  |  |  |  |  |  | 45,75 |

The table 4.1 above showed that the result of the students pre-test score on the criteria reading narrative text at the experimental class. That the data showed the maximum score was 70 , and the minimum score was 30 . Two students who got the maximum and five students who got the minimum score. The average pre test was 45,75.

Table 4.2
The students score of post test at experimental class

| NO |  | NAME | ASPECT |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | P | EQ | IQ | TOTAL |  |
| 1. |  |  | 3 | 10 | 12 | 18 | 60 |
| 2. |  |  | 5 | 15 | 10 | 15 | 65 |
| 3. |  |  | 5 | 15 | 23 | 25 | 88 |
| 4. |  | 11 | 4 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 65 |
| 5. |  | 10 | 5 | 15 | 10 | 20 | 60 |
| 6. | FJ | 13 | 5 | 12 | 20 | 10 | 60 |
| 7. | IY | 15 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 50 |
| 8. | IS | 17 | 5 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 82 |
| 9. | KR | 10 | 5 | 15 | 15 | 12 | 57 |
| 10. | MNP | 15 | 5 | 15 | 10 | 15 | 60 |
| 11. | MNM | 20 | 5 | 15 | 10 | 20 | 70 |
| 12. | MM | 15 | 5 | 20 | 15 | 20 | 75 |
| 13. | MJ | 20 | 5 | 10 | 25 | 25 | 85 |
| 14. | MJP | 20 | 5 | 20 | 23 | 15 | 83 |
| 15. | NA | 15 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 15 | 60 |
| 16. | NH | 10 | 4 | 16 | 18 | 20 | 68 |
| 17. | RA | 20 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 17 | 67 |
| 18. | SQA | 10 | 5 | 15 | 20 | 15 | 65 |
| 19. | SHP | 15 | 5 | 15 | 15 | 16 | 66 |
| 20. | TSL | 20 | 4 | 16 | 15 | 15 | 70 |
|  | N=20 |  |  |  |  |  | $\sum=\mathbf{1 3 5 6}$ |
|  |  |  | Average |  |  | $\mathbf{6 7 , 8}$ |  |

The table 4.2 above showed that the result of the students post test score on the criteria reading narrative text at the experimental class. That the data showed the maximum score was 88 , and the minimum score was 50 . One student who got the maximum and one student who got the minimum score. The average pre test was 67,8 .

Based on the explanation above, it showed the result of post test at experimental class got the significant improvement after giving treatment, it seen from the average of post test was better than the average of pree test, that $45,75<67,8$.

Graphic 4.1
The comparison of main idea in pre test and post test at the experimental class


From the graphic above, the writer concluded that the students score in main idea of reading assessment was lack in pretest. Most of students had can identify Sentence but does not tell the main idea, but does have some detail from the passage. But in post
test, there was improvement in the main idea of narrative text. Most of the main idea was can identify Sentence tells the main idea,but uses no detail from passage.

The maximum score in main idea of reading assessment was 25 and the inimum score in main ide of reading assessment was 1. The maximum score have gotten by students in pre test was 16 with criteria in perfect very good and the maximum sore have gotten by students in post test was 20 with the criteria in perfect very good. The minimum score have gotten by students in the pre test was 5 with the criteria lack and the minimum score in post test was 10 with the criteria good enough.

## Graphic 4.2

The comparison of vocabularie in pre-test and post test in experimental class


From the graphic above, the writer concluded that the students score in main idea of reading assessment was lack in pretest. Most of students had unable to identify the meaning of words and its used based on the context. But in post test, there was
improvement in the vocabulary of narrative text. Most of students had can identify the meaning of words and its use according to the context with fairly precise and accurate.

The maximum score in vocabulary of reading assessment was 5 and the inimum score in main ide of reading assessment was 3. The maximum score have gotten by students in pre test was 5 with criteria in perfect very good and the maximum sore have gotten by students in post test was 5 with the criteria in perfect very good. The minimum score have gotten by students in the pre test was 3 with the criteria lack and the minimum score in post test was 4 with the criteria good enough.

## Graphic 4.3

The comparison of purpose in pre-test and post test at experimental class


From the graphic above, the writer concluded that the students score in main idea of reading assessment was lack in pretest. Most of students had can't identify the style and the author's
intent in presenting ideas in written discourse. But in post test, there was improvement in the purpose of narrative text.Most of students had can identify the style and the author's intent in presenting ideas in written discourse with precise and accurate enough.

The maximum score in vocabulary of reading assessment was 20 and the inimum score in main ide of reading assessment was 5. The maximum score have gotten by students in pre test was 16 with criteria in perfect very good and the maximum sore have gotten by students in post test was 20 with the criteria in perfect very good. The minimum score have gotten by students in the pre test was 5 with the criteria lack and the minimum score in post test was 10 with the criteria good enough.

Craphic 4.4
The comparison of Explicit Question in pre-test and post test at experimental class


From the graphic above, the writer concluded that the students score in explicit question of reading assessment was lack
in pre-test. Most of students had can't identify the spesific information that is stated in the passage. But in post test, there was improvement in the purpose of narrative text. Most of students had can identify the specific information that is stated in the passage with very precise and accurate

The maximum score in explicit question of reading assessment was 25 and the inimum score in main ide of reading assessment was 5 . The maximum score have gotten by students in pre test was 20 with criteria in perfect very good and the maximum sore have gotten by students in post test was 22 with the criteria in perfect very good. The minimum score have gotten by students in the pre test was 5 with the criteria lack and the minimum score in post test was 10 with the criteria lack.

## Craphic 4.5

The comparison of Implicit Question in pre-test and post test at experimental class


From the graphic above, the writer concluded that the students score in implicit question of reading assessment was lack in pre-test. Most of students had can't identify the implicit information in the passage. But in post test, there was improvement in the implicit questionof narrative text. Most of students had can identify the implicit information in the passage with very precise and accurate.

The maximum score in explicit question of reading assessment was 25 and the inimum score in main ide of reading assessment was 5 . The maximum score have gotten by students in pre test was 20 with criteria in perfect very good and the maximum sore have gotten by students in post test was 23 with the criteria in perfect very good. The minimum score have gotten by students in the pre test was 5 with the criteria lack and the minimum score in post test was 10 with the criteria lack.

Tabel 4.3
The student score of pre test at the control class

|  |  | ASPECT |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NO | NAME |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | V | P | EQ | IQ | TOTAL |  |
| 1. | APS | 10 | 5 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 50 |
| 2. | AAA | 5 | 4 | 10 | 16 | 5 | 40 |
| 3. | AFS | 10 | 5 | 15 | 20 | 20 | 70 |
| 4. | BW | 11 | 4 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 50 |
| 5. | FR | 20 | 4 | 5 | 15 | 11 | 53 |
| 6. | HF | 10 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 15 | 40 |
| 7. | HH | 15 | 4 | 15 | 6 | 10 | 50 |
| 8. | HD | 16 | 4 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 40 |
| 9. | IK | 10 | 4 | 10 | 10 | 16 | 50 |
| 10. | IV | 15 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 15 | 50 |


| 11. | MP | 15 | 4 | 10 | 6 | 15 | 50 |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12. | MH | 15 | 4 | 15 | 6 | 15 | 55 |
| 13. | NHN | 20 | 5 | 15 | 20 | 10 | 70 |
| 14. | NS | 7 | 3 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 30 |
| 15. | NN | 10 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 10 | 40 |
| 16. | RSP | 6 | 4 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 40 |
| 17. | RA | 16 | 4 | 10 | 20 | 10 | 60 |
| 18. | SHF | 10 | 4 | 16 | 10 | 10 | 50 |
| 19. | SF | 16 | 4 | 10 | 15 | 15 | 50 |
| 20. | SA | 10 | 5 | 15 | 20 | 20 | 70 |
|  | N=20 | Average |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\sum=\mathbf{1 0 0 8}$ |  |  |

The table 4.3 above showed that the result of the students pre test score on the criteria reading narrative text at the control class. That the data showed the maximum score was 75 , and the minimum score was 30.1 students who got the maximum and 2 students who got the minimum score.

The resut above showed about the average score pre-test at the control class was 50,4.

Table 4.4
The students score of post test at conrol class

|  |  | ASPECT |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NO | NAME | MI | V | P | EQ | IQ | TOTAL |
| 1. | APS | 15 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 60 |
| 2. | AAA | 10 | 4 | 10 | 16 | 10 | 50 |
| 3. | AFS | 12 | 5 | 15 | 20 | 20 | 72 |
| 4. | BW | 11 | 4 | 15 | 13 | 12 | 55 |
| 5. | FR | 20 | 5 | 15 | 5 | 15 | 60 |
| 6. | HF | 10 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 60 |
| 7. | HH | 15 | 5 | 15 | 20 | 10 | 65 |


| 8. | HD | 15 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 15 | 60 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9. | IK | 10 | 4 | 10 | 12 | 16 | 52 |
| 10. | IV | 15 | 4 | 15 | 10 | 14 | 58 |
| 11. | MP | 15 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 15 | 60 |
| 12. | MH | 15 | 5 | 15 | 10 | 15 | 60 |
| 13. | NHN | 20 | 5 | 15 | 22 | 23 | 85 |
| 14. | NS | 10 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 15 | 55 |
| 15. | NN | 10 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 20 | 60 |
| 16. | RSP | 12 | 4 | 10 | 16 | 15 | 57 |
| 17. | RA | 20 | 5 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 75 |
| 18. | SHF | 15 | 5 | 15 | 21 | 10 | 66 |
| 19. | SF | 16 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 21 | 67 |
| 20. | SA | 20 | 5 | 15 | 20 | 20 | 80 |
|  | N=20 | Average |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

The table 4.2 above showed that the result of the students Post test score on the criteria reading narrative text at the experimental class. That the data showed the maximum score was 85 , and the minimum score was 50.1 students who got the maximum and 1 students who got the minimum score.

The resut above showed about the average score post-test at the control class was 50,4.

Based on the explanation above, it showed the result of post test at experimental class got the significant improvement after giving treatment, it seen from the average of post test was better than the average of pree test, that $50,4<62,85$.

## B. Data Analysis

Tabel 4.5
Showed about that the difference score between pre test and post test at experimental class.

| NO | NAME | Pre test $\left(\mathbf{X}_{1}\right)$ | Post test $\left(\mathbf{X}_{2}\right)$ | Deviation $\left(\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{X}_{2}-\mathbf{X}_{1}\right)$ | Squars deviation $\left(\mathbf{X}^{2}\right)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | AW | 50 | 60 | 10 | 100 |
| 2. | ANA | 40 | 65 | 25 | 225 |
| 3. | DAH | 50 | 88 | 38 | 1444 |
| 4. | DF | 50 | 65 | 15 | 225 |
| 5. | ESK | 30 | 60 | 30 | 900 |
| 6. | FJ | 30 | 60 | 30 | 900 |
| 7. | IY | 60 | 70 | 10 | 100 |
| 8. | IS | 65 | 80 | 15 | 225 |
| 9. | KR | 40 | 57 | 17 | 289 |
| 10. | MNP | 50 | 60 | 10 | 100 |
| 11. | MNM | 60 | 70 | 10 | 100 |
| 12. | MM | 70 | 75 | 5 | 25 |
| 13. | MJ | 30 | 85 | 55 | 3025 |
| 14. | MJP | 70 | 80 | 10 | 100 |
| 15. | NA | 40 | 60 | 20 | 400 |
| 16. | NH | 40 | 68 | 24 | 576 |
| 17. | RA | 60 | 67 | 17 | 289 |
| 18. | SQA | 50 | 65 | 15 | 225 |
| 19. | SHP | 30 | 66 | 36 | 1296 |
| 20. | TSL | 30 | 50 | 20 | 400 |
|  | N=20 | $\sum=945$ | $\sum=1356$ | 417 | 11077 |

The difference score was the result from post-test score substract pre-test score. There was significant difference score between pre-test and post-test at the experimental class, the biggest different score was 55 and the lowest difference was five. All of students increased in their scores.

## Graphic 4.6

The difference score between pre-test and post-test of reading test at the experimental class


Graphic 4.1 above showed that the result of the student pretest and post test score on criteria in reading on narrative text at the experimental class. That the data showed pre-test score, the maximum score was 70 , and the minimum score was 30 . Two students who got the maximum and five students who got minimum score, and post test score, the maximum score was 88 ,
and the minimum score was 50 . One student who got the maximum score and one student who gote the minimum score.

Table 4.6
The difference score between pre-test and post test of control class

| NO | NAME | Pre test $\left(\mathbf{Y}_{1}\right)$ | Post test $\left(\mathbf{Y}_{2}\right)$ | Deviation $\left(\mathbf{Y}=\mathbf{Y}_{2}-\mathbf{Y}_{1}\right)$ | Squars deviation $\left(\mathbf{Y}^{2}\right)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | APS | 50 | 60 | 10 | 100 |
| 2. | AAA | 40 | 50 | 10 | 100 |
| 3. | AFS | 70 | 72 | 2 | 4 |
| 4. | BW | 50 | 55 | 5 | 25 |
| 5. | FR | 53 | 60 | 7 | 49 |
| 6. | HF | 40 | 60 | 20 | 400 |
| 7. | HH | 50 | 65 | 15 | 225 |
| 8. | HD | 40 | 60 | 20 | 400 |
| 9. | IK | 50 | 52 | 2 | 4 |
| 10. | IV | 50 | 58 | 8 | 64 |
| 11. | MP | 50 | 60 | 10 | 100 |
| 12. | MH | 55 | 60 | 5 | 25 |
| 13. | NHN | 70 | 85 | 15 | 225 |
| 14. | NS | 30 | 55 | 25 | 625 |
| 15. | NN | 40 | 60 | 20 | 400 |
| 16. | RSP | 40 | 57 | 17 | 289 |
| 17. | RA | 60 | 75 | 15 | 225 |
| 18. | SHF | 50 | 66 | 16 | 256 |
| 19. | SF | 50 | 67 | 17 | 289 |
| 20. | SA | 70 | 80 | 10 | 100 |
|  | N=20 | $\sum=1008$ | $\Sigma=1257$ | 249 | 3905 |

The difference score was the result from post-test score substract pre-test score. There was significant difference score between pre-test and post-test at the control class, the biggest different score was 25 and the lowest difference was two. All of students increased in their scores

## Graphic 4.7

The difference score between pre-test and post-test of reading test at The control class


Graphic 4.2 above showed that the result of the student pretest and post test score on criteria in reading on narrative text at the control class. That the data showed pre-test score, the maximum score was 70 , and the minimum score was 30 . Three students who got the maximum and one student who got minimum score, and post test score, the maximum score was 85 , and the minimum score was 50 . One student who got the maximum score and one student who gote the minimum score.

From the data gotten above, the writer calculated $t$-test using the step as follow:

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

$$
\begin{aligned}
M x & =\frac{\sum X}{N} \\
& =\frac{417}{20} \\
& =20,85
\end{aligned}
$$

The resut above showed about the average score (mean) at the experimental class was 20,85 . Afterwords she calculated the data based on the formula above.
2. Determine mean of score control class (MY) with formula :

$$
\begin{aligned}
& M y=\frac{\sum Y}{N} \\
& =\frac{249}{20} \\
& =12,45
\end{aligned}
$$

The resut above showed about the average score (mean) at the experimental class was 12,45 . Afterwords she calculated the data based on the formula above.
3. Determine the total square of eror experimental class ( X ), with formula :

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sum x^{2}=\sum x^{2}-\frac{\left(\sum x\right)^{2}}{N} \\
& =11077-\frac{(417)^{2}}{20} \\
& =11077-8694,45 \\
& =2382.55
\end{aligned}
$$

The resut above showed about the total square of eror experimental class was 2382,55 . Afterwords she calculated the data based on the formula above.
4. Determine the total square of eror control class (Y), with formula :

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum y^{2} & =\sum y^{2}-\frac{(\Sigma y)^{2}}{N} \\
& =3905-\frac{(249)^{2}}{20} \\
& =3905-3100,05 \\
& =804,95
\end{aligned}
$$

The resut above showed about the total square of eror control class. Afterwords she calculated the data based on the formula above.
5. Calculation t-test

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{t}=\frac{\mathrm{Mx}-\mathrm{My}}{\sqrt{\left\{\frac{\sum \mathrm{x}^{2}+\sum \mathrm{y}^{2}}{\mathrm{~N}^{1}+\mathrm{N}^{2}-2}\right\}\left(\frac{1}{\mathrm{Nx}}+\frac{1}{\mathrm{Ny}}\right\}}} \\
&=\frac{20,85-12,45}{\sqrt{\left\{\frac{2382,55+804,95}{20+20-2}\right\}\left\{\frac{1}{20}+\frac{1}{20}\right\}}} \\
&=\frac{8,4}{\sqrt{\left\{\frac{3187,5}{38}\right\}\left\{\frac{2}{20}\right\}}} \\
&=\frac{8,4}{\sqrt{8,38}} \\
&=\frac{8,4}{2,89} \\
&=2,90
\end{aligned}
$$

The resut above showed about the t -test score was 2,90 . Afterwords she calculated the data based on the formula above.

Notes:
MX : mean of score experimental class
MY : mean of score control class
$\sum X^{2}$ : total square of eror experimental class
$\sum \mathrm{Y}^{2}$ : total square of eror control class
6. Determine the degree of freedom, with formula
$\mathrm{Df}=\mathrm{Nx}+\mathrm{Ny}-2$
Df $=20+20-2$
$\mathrm{Df}=38$

## Notes:

Df : the score of sample both experimental and control class
Nx : the number students of experimental class
Ny : the number students of control class
2 : constant number
The result above showed about the score of sample both experimental and control class. The writer used 40 students as sample for research. $20 \mathrm{sti}=\mathrm{udents}$ from VIII B as experimental class and 20 students from VIII C as control class.

Comparing " $t$ " has been tested in calculating ( $\mathrm{t}_{0}=2.90$ ), and $\mathrm{Df}=38$, there is no Df for 38 , the writer used the closer "Df" from 40. So, Df $=38$ which has been teasted on $t$-table $\left(\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{t}}\right.$ $5 \%=2,02$ and $\left.\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{t}} 1 \%=2,75\right)$ it can be knowen that $\mathrm{t}_{0}>\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{t}} 5 \%$ and $\mathrm{t}_{0}>\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{t}} 1 \%$, it means $2,02<2,57>2,72$.

## C. Interpretation of Data

The data showed that the mean of pre-test score obtained by students of VIII B as experimental class was 45,75 and pre-test scores obtained by students of VIII C as control class was 50,4 . The highest in the two clasess that was class VIII B as experimental class got 70 and VIII C as control class got 75. The the lowest score of pre-test in both clasess was 30 for experimental class and 30 for control class.

The data showed that the mean of post test score obtained by students of VIII B as experimental class was 67,8 while VIII C as a control class was 62,85 . The higest score post-test of VIII B as experimental class got 88, and VIII C as a control class got 85 . The lowest post-test of experimental class 50 and the lowest post test of control class 50 . The distribution scores of experimental class was $88-50=38$, while in control class was $85-50=30$.

By $\mathrm{Df}=40$ and analyzed by using t -test, the writer tasted there was an effect in using story mapping strategy in teaching reading because t -count was higer that t -table in significant $5 \%$ was 2,02 and significan level $1 \%$ was 2,72 .

From the interpretation above t -count $>\mathrm{t}$-table there was significant effect using story mapping strategy to increase reading comprehension.

Testing hypothesis was to know the significant of both variables, and tested as follow :
$\mathrm{Ha}=\mathrm{t}_{0}>\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{t}}$
$\mathrm{H} 0=\mathrm{t}_{0}<\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{t}}$
Notes:
$\mathrm{Ha}=$ Alternative Hypothesis
$\mathrm{H}_{0}=$ Null Hypothesis
$\mathrm{t}_{0}=$ The value of t -observation
$\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{t}}=$ 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 $t_{0}>t_{t}$ : the alternative hypothesisi is accepted it means there was significant effect by using story mapping strategy in teaching reading comprehension at VIII B as experimental class and VIII C as control class.

If $t_{0}<t_{t}$ : the alternative hypotesis is rejected it means there was no significant effect by using story mapping strategy in teaching reading comprehension at VIII B as experimental class and VIII C as control class.

From thr result calculation above, the value of $\mathrm{t}_{0}=2,90$ the degree of freedom $(\mathrm{df})=40$. The writer use degree of significant $5 \%=2,02$ and $1 \%=2,72$. It means that Ha (Alternative Hypothesis) of the research is accepted and H 0 (Null Hypothesis) is rejected.

After getting the data, the writer compared it $t_{t}$ both degree of significant $5 \%$ and $1 \% t_{0}>2,02<2,90>2,72$. It means (Alternative Hypothesis) of the research is accepted.

The result based on research about story mapping strategy (SMS) has positive effect and accepted in teaching reading comprehension.

