CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

This chapter discusses The Finding of the Research and Discussion.

4.1 Finding of the Research

Based on the result of the test, the researcher gets the data that will be analyzed in this chapter. In this research uses experimental method, this method has a purpose to give the comparison of a treatment groups with a non-treatment groups, it is the best method about cause-and-effect relationships (Fraenkel and Wallen, 1932:267). As well as, the researcher tries to ensure that it is the experimental treatment that causes the changes in the achievement. The researcher has two classes of eleventh grades; they are IPA and IPS one class has a treatment and the other classes are not. With this treatment, it is expected to increase their achievement in reading ability. This chapter shows up the results in table: the table of assessment from all students' ability.The consequence is that the results will indicate the percentage of the students' achievement.

Process of research have done at about two months from 20th march2014- 19th may 2014, before starting the lesson, the researcher gave the pre-test. After that, all of the materials which were given to the class are proceeded in order to get an achievement in reading skill. The quantitative data was gotten from pre-test and post-test, the researcher gave the test towards 64 students who have been taken selection, those students are divided into two classes randomly into two groups which are

exprimental group and controlled group. They were given 40 questions about the short story of Rapunzel that will be done in duration of 45 minutes. After giving the test, the researcher will analyze the result as the data. To count the quantitative data, it is done by usingMicrosoft office excels 2010, that has been explained in the previous chapter

4.1.1 The Pretest Score of both Classes

The researcher inputs the name of students to be listed. This time the researcher will discuss about this chapter. At present, the researcher has been prepared the data of pre-test and post-test which were taken from eleventh grade of the students from IPA and IPS in SMA Muhammdiyah 1 Surabaya as can be seen in the table bellows:

Table 2
Pretest's score of Experimental class and Cotrolled class

No	Passing grade	Score of pre-test	
		Exp.*	Cntrl*
1	80	72	82
2	80	66	48
3	80	66	60
4	80	68	82
5	80	80	48
6	80	72	60
7	80	66	60
8	80	68	66
9	80	66	54
10	80	74	62
11	80	72	66
12	80	84	96
13	80	68	54

14	80	66	90
15	80	72	60
16	80	60	54
17	80	72	64
18	80	84	54
19	80	78	54
20	80	66	54
21	80	66	70
22	80	76	50
23	80	76	48
24	80	60	54
25	80	66	60
26	80	84	80
27	80	74	48
28	80	64	80
29	80	78	80
30	80	64	48
31	80	66	54
32	80	82	64
Average score		**72.33**	**60.28**

Explanation: exp* = Experimental class

Contr* = Controlled class

The table 2 above shows that, 40 pretest questions were given to the students in experimental and controlled class before the researcher explains the material. The scores of the students are shown in table 2. From the counting the real score results which is got in pretest, shows that the minimum score of experimental class is 64 and the maximum score are 84. Meanwhile, in cotrolled class the minimum score is 48 and the maximum score is 96, whereas, the maximum score in that test must reach 100 score.

4.1.2. The Post-test Score of both classes

After doing the learning teaching process of experiment and free class, the student was given post-test for to measure the student's achievement in reading skill. At present, the post-test score is data of student, especially in reading at XI SMA Muhamadiyah 1 Surabaya, is in the table below:

Table 3
Post-test's Score of Experimental class and Cotrolled class

No	Passing grade	Score of post-test	
		Exp.*	Contr*
1	80	98	94
2	80	96	82
3	80	96	98
4	80	100	94
5	80	92	96
6	80	98	90
7	80	100	94
8	80	98	94
9	80	100	90
10	80	92	90
11	80	96	82
12	80	100	100
13	80	92	78
14	80	96	98
15	80	100	82
16	80	100	82
17	80	100	98
18	80	100	82
19	80	100	98

20	80	92	82
21	80	94	90
22	80	92	82
23	80	96	82
24	80	94	90
25	80	100	100
26	80	100	100
27	80	100	84
28	80	100	100
29	80	100	100
30	80	92	80
31	80	92	90
32	80	94	78
Average score		96.26	88.28

Explanation: exp* = Experimental class

Contr* = Controlled class

The table 3 above shows that, 40 post-test questions were given to the students in experimental and controlled classes after the researcher explains the material. The scores of the students are shown. From the counting, the real score results which are got in post-test, it is shown that the minimum score of experimental class is 92 and the maximum score is 100. Meanwhile, in controlled class the minimum score is 78 and the maximum score is 100.

Based on both of class is result, it is shown that, 40 pre-test and post-test questions were given to the students in experimental class and controlled class before-after giving the explains of material. The scores of the students

show the minimum and maximum of both classes, the students must reach 100 score.

4.1.3 The percentage students' score improvement of passing grade

The next, the researcher will discuss about the percentage of pretest and posttest value.The data are shown as below:

Table 4
The numbers of student exceedding of passing grade
In pre-test and post-test(controlled class)

Passing grade	Students of controlled class		Precentage of test	
	Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-test
Complete (grade ≥ 80)	7	30	18.44	85.12

Based on the presentage in Table 4, the result of the comparison of pre-test and post-test shows that the students' precentage which exceed the passing grade of pre-test is 18.44% and post-test is 85.12% so the increasingis 66.68%.

Table 5
The numbers of student exceeding of passing grade
In pre-test and post-test (experimental class)

Passing grade	Students of experimental class		Precentage of test	
	Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-test
Complete (grade ≥ 80)	5	32	12.94	96.88

Based on the presentage in Table 5, the result of the comparison of pre-test and post-test shows that the students' precentage which exceed the passing grade of pre-test is 12.94% and post-test is 96.88% so the increasing is 85.94%.

Table 6
The comparison percentage of Post-test
for controlled and experimental class

Passing grade	**Both of classes**		**Precentage of test**	
	Controlled	**Experimental**	**controlled**	**experimental**
Complete (grade ≥ 80)	30	32	85.12	96.88

Based on the presentage in Table 6, the result of the comparison of post-test shows that the students' precentage which exceed the passing grade of controlled class is 85.12% and experimental class is 96.88% so the comparison of both classes is 11.76%.

4.2 Data analysis

4.2.1 Test of normality distribution

4.2.1.1 Test of normality distribution of both classes (pre-test)

The researcher gave pre-test to the students to measure whether there is significant difference or not of both classes. Test of normality distribution of both classes in pre-test is used statistics with hypothesis formulate as below:

H_0 : the data is normality distribution

H_1 : the data is not normality distribution

To test the normality distribution, the researcher uses software SPSS 16.0 of Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. It is used terminology *P-value* that means significant (sig.) the standard of significant is called alpha (α) 0.01. In the other hand, H_0 push away if *P-value* <α. That means this research is not normality distribution. The result as below:

Tabel 7
Result of Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S)

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		expre	Cntrpre
N		32	32
Normal Parameters[a]	Mean	71.1250	62.6250
	Std. Deviation	6.88968	13.27075
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.178	.180
	Positive	.178	.180
	Negative	-.103	-.135
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		1.006	1.016
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.264	.253

a. Test distribution is Normal.

Based on the table 7, it can be seen that the result of Kolmogorov-Smirnov is significant because the value of experimental and controlled class are 0,264 and 0,253. The significance of both classes is more than the significant value (0,01). So, H_0 is accepted and the data is normality distribution.

4.2.1.2 Test of normalitas distribution of both classes (post-test)

The score of post-test which students get after following the material will test whether there is difference of normality distribution or not. It is same with previous

normality distribution the data post-test will be tested by using Kolmogorov-Smirnov with the standard is 0,01. The hypothesis formulate as below:

H_0 : the data is normality distribution

H_1 : the data is not normality distribution

Test of normalitas distribution uses software SPSS 16.0 of Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. It is used terminology *P-value* that means significant (sig.) the standard of significant is called alpha (α) 0.01. In the other hand, H_0 is pushed away if *P-value*<α. That means this research is not normality distribution. The result as below:

Tabel 8
Result of Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S)
One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		expost	Cntrpost
N		32	32
Normal Parameters[a]	Mean	96.8750	90.0000
	Std. Deviation	3.28977	7.60306
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.266	.197
	Positive	.171	.197
	Negative	-.266	-.138
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		1.507	1.117
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.021	.165

a. Test distribution is Normal.

Based on the table 8, it can be seen that the result of Kolmogorov-Smirnov is significant because the value of experimental and controlled class are 0,021 and 0,165. The significance of both classes is more than the significant value (0,01). So, H_0 is accepted and the data is normality distribution.

4.2.2 T- Test

The researcher will measure the effectiveness of socio-drama method is used in teaching reading use T-test with software SPSS 16.0. The hypothesis is formulates as below:

H_0 : There is no influence between using socio-drama method in improving students' reading ability

H_1 : There is influence between using socio-drama method in improving students' reading ability

H_0 is pushed away if the significant standard in T-test which is done use SPSS 16.0 < α that means there is influence between using socio-drama method in improving students' reading ability at eleventh grade of experimental class.

Table 9
Table T-test
Group Statistics

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Kelas	Ex	32	96.8750	3.28977	.58155
	Ct	32	90.0000	7.60306	1.34404

Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					
	F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference

									Lower	Upper
kelas	Equal variances assumed	25.175	.000	4.695	62	.000	6.87500	1.46446	3.94758	9.80242
	Equal variances not assumed			4.695	42.215	.000	6.87500	1.46446	3.92004	9.82996

Based on the table 9, the significant (sig.) uses Levene's Test for Equality of Variances test get the value pot-test of both classes is 0.000, the value significant less than 0,01 or *P-value* $>\alpha$,so H_0 is pushed away. Meanwhile, T-test for Equality of Means got the same significant is 0.000, the value significant less than 0,01 or *P-value* $>\alpha$,so H_0 is pushed away. The ability of both classes are the same, so the researcher can conclude that the teaching reading uses socio-drama method is more effective than without using the method because there are differences in result.

4.3 Discussion

Referring the data analysis which is explained at the previous part, the students in this research have the same ability. It has been proven in test of normality distribution in pre-test and post-test which is shown that the data is normal. The ability of students is homogeny the researcher chooses the eleventh grade of IPA and IPS as subject. Pre-test and post-test is done to measure whether there is any increasing or not after using socio-drama method.

The controlled class has an improvement in pre-test and post-test which shows that the increase is 66.86% from the students who exceed the passing grade.

Meanwhile, the experimental class also has the increase in pre-test and post-test, the increase is 85.94%. the percentage comparison of both classes in post-test is 11.76%. Based on the finding above, the main concern is the percentage of both classes in post-test which shows that with socio-drama as the teaching method prove the hypothesis. However, there is note which shows that the students of controlled class while doing the post-test, they work together and cheat each other, although they have been given the instructions by the researcher not to work together but they still do that things, whereas the teacher was there, the students ignore the instruction, different from the others, the experimental class do the test by themselves whereas there are some students still work together. Actually, the student's ability is the same and also always works together. It is explained by the English teacher in this school and also the normality distribution has been proven by using SPSS 16.0.

Based on the comparison of both classes after doing the post-test is 11,76% the researcher concludes that using the socio-drama method is effective between those classes because it reaches the significance. The researcher will measure the effectiveness of socio-drama method which is used in teaching reading use T-test with software SPSS 16.0. The hypothesis is formulated as below:

H_0 : there is no influence between using socio-drama method in improving students' reading ability

H_1 : there is influence between using socio-drama method in improving students' reading ability

H_0 is pushed away if the significant standard in T-test which is done use SPSS 16.0 < α that means there is influence between using socio-drama method in improving students' reading ability at eleventh grade of experimental class.

Table 10
Table T-test
Group Statistics

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Kelas	Ex	32	96.8750	3.28977	.58155
	Ct	32	90.0000	7.60306	1.34404

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Klas	Equal variances assumed	25.175	.000	4.695	62	.000	6.87500	1.46446	3.94758	9.80242
	Equal variances not assumed			4.695	42.215	.000	6.87500	1.46446	3.92004	9.82996

Based on the table 10, the significant (sig.) use Levene's Test for Equality of Variances test get the value pot-test of both classes is 0.000, the significant value is less than 0,01 or *P-value* <*α*,so H_0 is pushed away. Meanwhile, T-test for Equality of Means has the same significance is 0.000, the significant value less than 0,01 or *P-*

value $< \alpha$,so H_0 is pushed away. The ability of both classes is the same so, the researcher can conluded that the teaching reading uses socio-drama method is effective than without the method because they shows any differences in result.

The table10 above supports to prove the reseacher's hypothesis. Based on the analysis which uses microsoft SPSS version 16 get the results $p_{value}(0.000) < \alpha\ (0.01)$ shows H_0 push away it is mean there is an influence. So, the researcher can conluded that the teaching reading uses socio-drama method is effective than without the method because there are differences in result.

Based on the counting of percentage, it shows that the diferrence percentage of experimental and controlled class is 11,76%. Although, the different both of class a litle, the students of experimental more attractive in the process of making the drama script and also they are being more understand about the passage.In other hand, the result of both classes in post-test is almost the same, but there are some causes-effects when doing the test which is explained above. And so, the researcher has already prepared the material. According to Patel's view, silent reading is done to acquire a lot of information. Teaching reading is very important skill because Silent reading concentrates the attention of subject to gain a lot of information (2008:122). The researcher uses this method to measure the student's ability especially in reading. In consequence, the students more focused in passage and also understand the contain.

Actually, there is a way to fix the result from the post-test of controlled class, but because the time is limited, the researcher is unable to teach again and fix the post-test result. Then, the students are unable to do the test again because they have to do another lessons and they do not have enough time to take the test again. Although,

the result of the test is suitable of the researcher's hypothesis it proposes that socio-drama method in reading class will be an improvement to the student's ability in understanding the text. In consequence, the researcher hopes that the next research about application socio-drama in teaching reading will be better than this research.