## CHAPTER IV

## RESEARCH FINDING

## A. FINDINGS

## 1. The Description of Data

To find out the improving of webbing strategy between the students who were taught by using webbing strategy and the students who were not taught by using webbing strategy on reading comprehension, especially in MTs. Al-Raudlah Mojosari Mojokerto, the researcher did an analysis of quantitative data. The data was obtained by giving test to the experimental class and control class after giving a different learning both of class. The subject of this research was divided into two classes. They are class VIII A as an experimental class and class VIII B as a control class.

In the processing of giving treatment of this study, the researcher divided the students into four groups. Each group consists of six until seven students. Each group assigns a writer to write on the paper. The writer makes a chart on the paper. The teacher says a letter, for example the letter B. The other students in each group have to mention and dictate the word of the letter and writer will writes word that appropriate of the material on the paper. Then, each group must be writing as possible as words in their paper. Groups get 10 points for each answer. The group with the most points wins. During
processing of giving treatment of this study, students looking interesting and enjoying to learning English subject.

When the experimental class gets the treatment, the control class only taught by their teacher own which use conventional method without using webbing strategy. Then, the researcher conducted a post-test of both classes. And the result, the score of the experiment class higher than control class. So the calculate of the data will be showed on form of the table of appendix.

## 2. The Result of Quantitative Data

In this section the researcher discussed the quantitative data and included the tables of the pre-test and post-test score and the calculation of using paired sample t-test.
a. Normality test

In table 4.1 of appendix 1 which showed the student's score of pretest. The pre-test was administered for 24 students of class VIII A as an experiment class and 24 students of class VIII B as a control class. The names of the students are coded into initial E for experiment class and initial C for control class.

Based on the data of table 4.2 (appendix 2), there is no one student of experiment class get excellent and good score, 10 students get average score and 14 students get poor score. In other words, it is known that
$41,67 \%$ students get average score and $58,33 \%$ students get poor score. And for control class, there is also no one student 0f control class get excellent and good score, 8 students get average score and 16 students get poor score. In other words, it is known that $33,33 \%$ students get average score and $66,67 \%$ students get poor score. Thus, it can be concluded that the result of pre-test cannot be classified yet to be the good ones.

From table 4.3 (appendix 3), obtained $\sum \mathrm{X}=1296, \quad \sum \mathrm{Y}=1252$, $\sum \mathrm{x}^{2}=1888, \sum \mathrm{y}^{2}=1560$, and $\mathrm{N}=24$.

1) Determine the mean of variable $I(X)$, with formula:

$$
\begin{aligned}
M_{x} \text { or } M_{l} & =\frac{\sum X}{N_{1}} \\
& =\frac{1296}{24} \\
& =54
\end{aligned}
$$

2) Determine the mean of variable $\mathrm{II}(\mathrm{Y})$, with formula:

$$
\begin{aligned}
M_{y} \text { or } M_{2} & =\frac{\sum Y}{N_{z}} \\
& =\frac{1252}{24} \\
& =52,17
\end{aligned}
$$

3) Determine the standard deviation of variable $X$, with formula:

$$
S D_{x} \text { or } S D_{l}=\sqrt{\frac{\sum x^{2}}{N_{1}}}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =\sqrt{\frac{1888}{24}} \\
& =\sqrt{78,67} \\
& =8,87
\end{aligned}
$$

4) Determine the standard deviation of variable Y , with formula:

$$
\begin{aligned}
S D_{y} \text { or } S D_{2} & =\sqrt{\frac{\Sigma y^{2}}{N_{2}}} \\
& =\sqrt{\frac{1560}{24}} \\
& =\sqrt{65} \\
& =8,06
\end{aligned}
$$

5) Determine the standard error of variable $X$, with formula:

$$
\begin{aligned}
S D_{N_{X}} \text { or } S E_{M_{1}} & =\frac{S D_{1}}{\sqrt{N_{1}-1}} \\
& =\frac{8,87}{\sqrt{24-1}} \\
& =\frac{8,87}{\sqrt{23}} \\
& =\frac{8,87}{4,80} \\
& =1,85
\end{aligned}
$$

6) Determine the standard error of variable Y , with formula:

$$
\begin{aligned}
S D_{y} \text { or } S E_{2} & =\frac{S D_{z}}{\sqrt{N_{2}-1}} \\
& =\frac{8,06}{\sqrt{24-1}}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =\frac{8,06}{\sqrt{23}} \\
& =\frac{8,06}{4,80} \\
& =1,70
\end{aligned}
$$

7) Determine the difference of standard error between mean variable I and mean variable II, with formula:

$$
\begin{aligned}
S E_{\mathrm{M}_{1}-\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{z}}} & =\sqrt{S E_{\mathrm{M}_{1}}^{2}+S E_{\mathrm{M}_{2}}^{2}} \\
& =\sqrt{1,85^{2}+1,70^{2}} \\
& =\sqrt{3,42+2,89} \\
& =\sqrt{6,31} \\
& =2,51
\end{aligned}
$$

8) Determine $t_{0}$ by using the formula:

$$
\begin{aligned}
t_{o} & =\frac{M_{1}-M_{8}}{S E_{M_{1}}-M_{3}} \\
& =\frac{54-52,17}{2,51} \\
& =0,73
\end{aligned}
$$

Then, Provide interpretation $t_{0}$ significansi test, by comparing the magnitude $t_{0}$, with the first set degrees of freedom ( $d f$ ), which can be obtained by the formula:

$$
d f=\left(N_{l}+N_{2}\right)-2
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =(24+24)-2 \\
& =46
\end{aligned}
$$

At $d f=46$, obtained 5\% significant $t_{\text {tablse }}=2,02$ and $1 \%$ significant $t_{\text {table }}$ $=2,69$.

By comparing the amount of " $t$ " we obtain the calculation $\left(t_{0}=0,73\right)$
and $t_{\text {table }} 5 \%=2,02$ and $t_{\text {table }}{ }^{2}=2,69$, then we know that $t_{0}$ is lower than $t_{t}$, it is:

$$
2,02>0,73<2,69
$$

Because $t_{0}$ lower than $t_{t}$, then the null hypothesis is accepted proposed.

This means that there are not differences scores in students' reading of eight grade of MTs. Al-Raudlah between experiment and control class.

The conclusion that we can based on the results of these test is not significant difference score between experiment and control class. It's mean that both of classes are normal.

## b. Hypothesis test

The table 4.4 (appendix 4) which showed the student's score after getting the treatment in the form of post-test. The post test was administered for 24 students of class VIII A as an experiment class and 24
students of class VIII B as a control class. The names of the students are coded into initial E for experiment class and initial C for control class.

Based on the data of table 4.5 (appendix 5), for experiment class, there 3 students get excellent, 14 students get good score, 7 students get average score and no one of students get poor and very poor score. In other words, it is known that $12,5 \%$ students get excellent, $58,33 \%$ students get good, and $29,17 \%$ students get average. And for control class, there is also no one student gets excellent, 3 students get good, 14 students get average score and 8 students get poor score. In other words, it is known that $8,33 \%$ students get good, $58,33 \%$ students get average score and $33,34 \%$ students get poor score. Thus, it can be concluded that no one students of experiment class get poor and very poor score of result the post-test.

The main issue we have to solve is whether the null hypothesis which states that there are no significant differences in MTs. Al-Raudlah before and after the implementation of the method webbing strategy was unacceptable because it proved to be true, or whether it should be rejected as unsubstantiated. Accept or approve the null hypothesis would be to reject the alternative hypothesis. To test which is true, we will examine the steps that have been mentioned.

From table 4.6 (appendix 63), obtained $\sum \mathrm{X}=1780, \sum \mathrm{Y}=1428$, $\sum \mathrm{x}^{2}=1644, \sum \mathrm{y}^{2}=1674,25$, and $\mathrm{N}=24$.

1) Determine the mean of variable $I(X)$, with formula:

$$
\begin{aligned}
M_{x} \text { or } M_{l} & =\frac{\sum X}{N_{1}} \\
& =\frac{1780}{24} \\
& =74,17
\end{aligned}
$$

2) Determine the mean of variable $\mathrm{II}(\mathrm{Y})$, with formula:

$$
\begin{aligned}
M_{y} \text { or } M_{2} & =\frac{\Sigma Y}{N_{z}} \\
& =\frac{1428}{24} \\
& =59,50
\end{aligned}
$$

3) Determine the standard deviation of variable $X$, with formula:

$$
\begin{aligned}
S D_{x} \text { or } S D_{l} & =\sqrt{\frac{\sum x^{2}}{\mathbb{N}_{1}}} \\
& =\sqrt{\frac{1644}{24}} \\
& =\sqrt{68,5} \\
& =8,28
\end{aligned}
$$

4) Determine the standard deviation of variable Y , with formula:

$$
\begin{aligned}
S D_{y} \text { or } S D_{2} & =\sqrt{\frac{\sum y^{2}}{N_{2}}} \\
& =\sqrt{\frac{1674,25}{24}}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =\sqrt{69,77} \\
& =8,36
\end{aligned}
$$

5) Determine the standard error of variable $X$, with formula:

$$
\begin{aligned}
S D_{M_{w}} \text { or } S E_{M_{1}} & =\frac{S D_{1}}{\sqrt{N_{1}-1}} \\
& =\frac{8,28}{\sqrt{24-1}} \\
& =\frac{8,28}{\sqrt{28}} \\
& =\frac{8,28}{4,80} \\
& =1,72
\end{aligned}
$$

6) Determine the standard error of variable Y , with formula:

$$
\begin{aligned}
S D_{y} \text { or } S E_{2} & =\frac{S D_{z}}{\sqrt{N_{2}-1}} \\
& =\frac{8,36}{\sqrt{24-1}} \\
& =\frac{8,36}{\sqrt{28}} \\
& =\frac{8,36}{4,80} \\
& =1,75
\end{aligned}
$$

7) Determine the difference of standard error between mean variable I and mean variable II, with formula:

$$
\begin{aligned}
S E_{M_{1}-M_{2}} & =\sqrt{S E_{M_{1}}^{2}+S E_{M_{2}}^{2}} \\
& =\sqrt{1,72^{2}+1,75^{2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =\sqrt{2,96+3,06} \\
& =\sqrt{6,02} \\
& =2,45
\end{aligned}
$$

8) Determine $t_{o}$ by using the formula:

$$
\begin{aligned}
t_{o} & =\frac{M_{1}-M_{2}}{S E_{M_{1}-M_{2}}} \\
& =\frac{74,17-59,50}{2,45} \\
& =\frac{14,67}{2,45} \\
& =5,99
\end{aligned}
$$

Then, Provide interpretation $t_{0}$ significance test, by comparing the magnitude of $t_{0}$, with the first set degrees of freedom (df), which can be obtained by the formula:

$$
\begin{aligned}
d f & =N-1 \\
& =24-1 \\
& =23
\end{aligned}
$$

At $d f=23$, obtained 5\% significant $t_{\text {tablse }}=2,07$ and $1 \%$ significant $t_{\text {table }}$ $=2,81$.

By comparing the amount of " $t$ " we obtain the calculation $\left(t_{0}=5,99\right)$
and $t_{\text {table } 5 \%}=2,07$ and $t_{\text {table } 1 \%}=2,81$, then we know that $t_{0}$ is higher than $t_{t}$,
it is:

$$
2,07<5,99>2,86
$$

The null hypothesis of post-test is rejected proposed because $t_{o}$ higher
than $t_{t}$. This means that there were differences scores in students' reading comprehension of eight grade of MTs. Al-Raudlah between before and after taught by using webbing strategy and it is a significant difference.

The conclusion that we can base on the results of these trials that webbing strategy has demonstrated is improve enough. It means reliable as a good method to teach reading in Islamic junior high school.

## B. DISCUSSION

As stated previously, the objectives of this research are to know eight grade students' reading of MTs. Al-Raudlah Mojosari in academic year 2015/2016 before and after being taught by using webbing strategy and to find out whether there is any significant difference between two of them.

In order to achieve the objectives of the research, the researcher did some steps to collect the data. The first step was administering pre-test to know students' reading before using webbing strategy. Then the researcher
gave treatment to the students by teaching English reading using webbing strategy.

Webbing strategy here was as possible as a way of their exploration to understand sentences. When treatment be done in some steps. The first step was pre reading by answering the text, this activity to determine how the initial ability of students prior to treatment.

The second step is main activity, starting with divided students into several groups and each group consist of four students. Grouping based on the same text in paragraph, every group digs and discusses the information from the text which every group get different texts. After discussing, every group is distributed the members and form new groups in different texts, the representative of every group in group presents the result of the previous discussion in a series based on sequenced-paragraph. After finishing presentation, every group discusses and concludes the information from the whole texts and answers from the questions prepared.

Last step of data collection strategy was administering post-test, it was intended to measure students' reading comprehension before treatment given. The researcher whether or not there is any improvement on their achievement in reading comprehension ability.

Based on the result of the pre-test before webbing strategy was implemented, the ability of students to comprehend the text was lower than after webbing strategy was implemented.

After getting treatment and pre-test was conducted, it was found that there was no significant difference between experimental group and control group. On the post-test the improvement of the students who taught using webbing strategy is higher than the improvement of students who taught without webbing strategy. It can be seen the mean pre-test score of control class was 52,17 and in the post test was 59,50 while the mean of pre-test score of experimental class was 54 and in the post-test was 74,17 . It means that the most improvement is in experiment class.

The result of the data analysis showed that the strategy of using webbing strategy in teaching reading comprehension seemed to be applicable for the eighth grade students of MTs. Al-Raudlah Mojosari. The strategy encouraged the students to be more active and motivated in teaching reading, especially in text type and also can be used in teaching variety of language.

After the post test was administered, the researcher got the data in form of pre-test and post-test score. Then the data were analysed by using paired sample related. The result obtained that analyse the mean of pre-test was 54 for experiment class and 52,17 for control class. The value of $\mathrm{t}_{\text {count }}=0,73$; with $\mathrm{df}=46$, the value of $5 \%$ significant $t_{\text {table }}=2,02$ and $1 \%$
significant $t_{\text {table }}=2,69(2,02>0,73<2,69)$. It means that there was no significant difference on pre-test between experiment and control classes. So, the condition of both classes was normal.

And the result of post-test showed that the mean of experiment class was 74,17 and 59,50 for control class. The value of $\mathrm{t}_{\text {count }}=5,99$; with $\mathrm{df}=23$, the value of $5 \%$ significant $t_{\text {table }}=2,07$ and $1 \%$ significant $t_{\text {table }}=2,86$ $(2,07<5,99>2,86)$. It means that there was significant difference on post-test between experiment and control classes before and after taught by using Webbing strategy.

There are differences the students atmosphere that were taught using webbing strategy between who were taught without webbing strategy, it can be seen in teaching learning process, they are as follow:
a. In the experimental class

When the teacher taught using webbing strategy, it makes the students more interested in learning. When the teacher asked students to comprehend the text, most of them can comprehend it by showing the webbing, when teacher gave them assignment; the students did it with fun.
b. In the control class

When the teacher were using conventional method, just explain the material and gave them assignment, the students not give attention on the lesson. Students get bored; it made them difficult to absorb the material.

Students were also lazy when teacher gave them some assignments. And the last they cannot improve their comprehension about news item.

Based on the statement above, it is proven that there was a significant different achievement between the students who were taught by using webbing strategy as a medium of teaching reading news item and the students who were taught by using conventional method.

After the post test was administered, the researcher got the data in form of pre-test and post-test score. Then the data were analysed by using paired sample related. The result of that analyse obtained that the mean of pretest was 54 for experiment class and 52,17 for control class. The value of $\mathrm{t}_{\text {count }}=0,73$; with $\mathrm{df}=46$, the value of $5 \%$ significant $t_{\text {table }}=2,02$ and $1 \%$ significant $t_{\text {table }}=2,69 \quad(2,02>0,73<2,69)$. It means that there was no significant difference on pre-test between experiment and control classes. So, the condition of both classes was normal.

And the result of post test showed that the mean of experiment class was 74,17 and 59,50 for control class. The value of $\mathrm{t}_{\text {count }}=5,99$; with $\mathrm{df}=23$, the value of $5 \%$ significant $t_{\text {table }}=2,07$ and $1 \%$ significant $t_{\text {table }}=2,86$ $(2,07<5,99>2,86)$. It means that there was significant difference on the posttest between experiment and control classes before and after taught by using Webbing strategy.

Regarding on the result of data analysis above, it is strongly related to some advantages served by using webbing strategy. Webbing gives an advantage that can be motivate and challenging, help students to make and sustain the effort of language. Teacher can provides language practice in the various skills and encourage students to interact and communicate by using webbing strategy.

Then, the analysis showed that webbing strategy can improve the students' reading eight grade of MTs. Al-Raudlah. It meant that these methods can be implemented to taught reading English in junior high school, because the best way to avoid chance of failure is the teacher as a designer of course who have guiding principles that can be applied in a variety of teaching learning situation. ${ }^{58}$ The strategy proved that learning can improve students' reading comprehension by apply webbing strategy into the learning process.
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[^0]:    ${ }^{58}$ David Nunan, Practical English Language Teaching, Firts Edition (America: McGraw-Hill Companies, 2003), 135

