

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the researcher presents some points related to this research findings including description of data, normality and homogeneity testing, data analysis, hypotheses testing, and discussion.

A. Research Finding

1. The Description of Data

In this study, the researcher presented the data of students' achievement in reading comprehension before and after being taught by using chunking a text strategy in teaching reading recount text. As mentioned before, the researcher used multiple choice for test as an instrument to collect the data. The number of questions are 20 that given by researcher for 30 students in B class of VIII at MTs Mujahidin Ngadiluwih Kediri. There were pre-test and post-test that the researcher used to analyze the data. The topic of test that was used in pre-test and post-test had same level.

The score is divided into five criterias they are, excellent, good, average, poor, and very poor. The students is categorized into excellent if they got 86-100 score which means they are able to understand the recount text and do the test very well. The students is categorized into good if they got 76-85 score which means they are able to understand the recount text and do test well but have a little hesitant. The students is categorized into average

56-75 score which means they are able to understand the recount text in a little and do test well. The students is categorized into poor if they got 46-55 score which means they have poor understanding and just do the test. The last criteria is the students is categorized into very poor if the students got 0-45 score which means they do not have understanding in recount text and do not do the test well. The table criteria of scores can been as follows:

Table 4.1 The Score's Criteria

No.	Score	Criteria
1.	86-100	Excellent
2.	76-85	Good
3.	56-75	Average
4.	46-55	Poor
5.	0-45	Very poor

The score's criteria is needed for students' reading comprehension score before and after being taught by using chunking a text strategy. Then, the students' score of pre-test and post-test can be seen in appendix.

After got the students' achievement of pre-test and post-test, the researcher computed the result of statistic and the frequency by using IBM SPSS 16.0. The table 4.3 below showed the result of statistic:

Table 4.2 The Result of Statistic

		pretest	posttest
N	Valid	30	30
	Missing	0	0

Based on the table above, the pre-test was represented by 30 students. It was same as post-test that 30 students joined the test. It can be concluded that no one student missed the test.

Then, the researcher organized the frequency and the percentage of score in pre-test by using IBM SPSS 16.0. The table 4.3 and 4.4 represent the statistical result. The table can be seen as follows:

Table 4.3 The Calculation of Pre-test

Statistics		
pretest		
N	Valid	30
	Missing	0
Mean		63,50
Median		65,00
Mode		70
Std. Deviation		13,140
Variance		172,672
Range		50
Minimum		35
Maximum		85
Sum		1905

From the calculation result of students' reading comprehension before taught by using chunking a text strategy, the highest score the student achieved is 85 and the lowest one is 35 from the total is 30 students. Mean of pre-test is 63.50. It is categorize as average. Median is 65.00, mode is 70, standard deviation is 13.140, variance is 172.672, and range is 50.

Table 4.4 The Frequency of Score in Pre-test

Pretest					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	35	2	6.7	6.7	6.7
	40	1	3.3	3.3	10.0
	50	2	6.7	6.7	16.7
	55	4	13.3	13.3	30.0
	60	4	13.3	13.3	43.3
	65	4	13.3	13.3	56.7
	70	6	20.0	20.0	76.7
	75	3	10.0	10.0	86.7
	80	2	6.7	6.7	93.3
	85	2	6.7	6.7	100.0
	Total	30	100.0	100.0	

Based on the table, 4.4 above, the frequency of pretest after being distributed there are 3 of 30 students got very poor score (0-45) in reading achievement. Then, the 6 students got poor score (46-55) in reading achievement. There were 17 students got average score (56-75) in reading achievement. Meanwhile, 4 of 30 students got score 76-85 which mean those students' reading achievement is good. And 0 students got score excellent (86-100).

The table 4.5 and 4.6 showed the represent the statistical result. The table can be seen as follows:

Table 4.5 The Calculation oh Post-test

Statistics

postetst

N	Valid	30
	Missing	0
Mean		80,50
Median		82,50
Mode		85
Std. Deviation		10,030
Variance		100,603
Range		45
Minimum		55
Maximum		100
Sum		2415

From the calculation result of students' reading comprehension after taught by using chunking a text strategy the highest score the student achieved is 100 and the lowest one is 55 from the total is 30 students. Mean

of post-test is 80.50. It is categorize as good. Median is 82.50, mode is 85, standard deviation is 10.030, variance is 100.603, and range is 45.

Table 4.6 Frequency of Students' Score in Posttest

		Posttest			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	55	1	3.3	3.3	3.3
	60	1	3.3	3.3	6.7
	65	1	3.3	3.3	10.0
	70	2	6.7	6.7	16.7
	75	6	20.0	20.0	36.7
	80	4	13.3	13.3	50.0
	85	8	26.7	26.7	76.7
	90	5	16.7	16.7	93.3
	95	1	3.3	3.3	96.7
	100	1	3.3	3.3	100.0
	Total	30	100.0	100.0	

Based on the table, 4.6 above, the frequency of pretest after being distributed there are 0 students got very poor score (0-45) in reading achievement. 1 of 30 students got poor score (46-55) in reading achievement. There were 10 students got average score (56-75) in reading achievement. Meanwhile, 12 of 30 students got score 76-85 which mean those students'

reading achievement are good. Then, there are 7 students got score 86-100 which mean those students' reading achievement are excellent.

In sum, there is differences score between pretest and posttest. The students showed the significance progress after getting treatment. It means that using chunking a text strategy is effective to improve students reading ability.

2. Normality and Homogeneity

a. The result of normality testing

Normality testing is conducted to know whether the gotten data is normal distribution or not. In this research, the researcher used IBM SPSS 16.0 *One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov* Test by the significance value (α) 0.05. The hypotheses of normality testing are:

- a. H_0 = the data is normal distribution
- b. H_1 = the data is not normal distribution

The hypotheses above explain that the data is normal distribution if H_0 is accepted. Meanwhile, the data is not normal distribution if H_1 is accepted. The H_0 is rejected if the significance value is lower than 0.05 while the H_0 is not rejected if the significance value is higher than 0.05. The result can be seen as follows:

Table 4.7 Normality Testing

		Pretest	posttest
N		30	30
Normal Parameters ^a	Mean	63.50	80.50
	Std. Deviation	13.140	10.030
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.123	.173
	Positive	.077	.105
	Negative	-.123	-.173
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.673	.948
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.755	.329
a. Test distribution is Normal.			

Based on the table above, the significant value of pretest was 0.673 and the significant value of posttest was 0.948. the value from Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) of pretest was 0.755 and posttest was 0.329. then the value of pretest and posttest were higher than 0.05 ($0.755 > 0.05$) and ($0.329 > 0.05$). It means that H_0 is not rejected and H_1 is rejected. Thus, the data of pretest and posttest are normal distribution.

b. The result of homogeneity testing

Homogeneity testing is conducted to know to know the data has homogenous variance or not. . In this research, the researcher used

IBM SPSS 16.0 *Levene* by the significance value (α) 0.05. The hypotheses of homogeneity testing are:

- c. H_0 = the data is homogeneous
- d. H_1 = the data is not homogeneous

The hypotheses above explain that the data is homogeneous if H_0 is accepted. Meanwhile, the data is not homogeneous if H_1 is accepted. The H_0 is rejected if the significance value is lower than 0.05 while the H_0 is not rejected if the significance value is higher than 0.05. The result can be seen as follows:

Table 4.8 Homogeneity Testing using *Levene*

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Score

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
1.952	1	58	.168

Based on the table above, sig. value is 0.168. Then, the value is higher than 0.05 ($0.168 > 0.05$). It means that H_0 is not rejected and H_1 is rejected. Thus, the data has homogeneity.

3. Data Analysis

Data analysis was done to know the difference score of the students in reading comprehension before and after being taught by using chunking a text

strategy. After computing the data of pretest and posttest, the researcher analyzed those data by using SPSS IMB 16.0 paired sample T-test. The researcher used T-test because the data distribution was normal.

Table 4.9 Paired Sample Correlation

Paired Samples Correlations

	N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1 pretest & posttest	30	.608	.000

Based on the table above, it showed that the correlation between pretest and posttest were 0.608 and the Sig. was 0.000. Thus, if the Sig. value is higher than 0.05, it means that h_0 is not rejected. On the contrary, if Sig. value is lower than 0.05, it means that h_0 is rejected. The table above showed that 0.000 is lower than 0,05 ($0.000 < 0.05$). It means that h_0 is rejected and h_a is not rejected. It can be concluded that there were significant different score of the students in reading comprehension between pretest and posttest.

Table 4.10 Paired Sample T-Test

		Paired Differences							
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	pretest - posttest	-17.000	10.635	1.942	-20.971	-13.029	-8.755	29	.000

Based on the table above, it showed clearly the mean score of students pretest and posttest was 17.000. Standard deviation was 10.635. Meanwhile, the standard error mean was 1.942. 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference lower was 20.971 and upper was 13.029. Furthermore, the result of t_{count} was 8.755 with df was 29 and significance was 0.000.

The way to know the h_0 can be rejected or not is comparing p-value with the standard level of significance (0.05). From the table 4.11, p-value is lower than the significance level ($0.000 < 0.05$). It means that the h_0 is rejected and the h_a is not rejected. Thus, there is significant different of the students' score in reading comprehension before and after being taught by using chunking a text strategy.

4. Hypotheses Testing

The hypothesis testing of this study can be seen as follows:

- a. If the significant two-tailed (2-tailed) is bigger than level of significant (0.05), the alternative hypothesis (H_a) is rejected and the null hypothesis (H_0) is not rejected.
- b. If the significant two-tail is smaller than level of significant (0.05), the alternative hypothesis (H_a) is not rejected and the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected.

1. Alternative hypothesis (H_a)

There is significant difference on the students' reading comprehension in recount text before and after taught using chunking a text strategyt of the second grade students at Mts Mujahidin Ngadiluwih Kediri.

2. Null hypothesis (H_0)

There is no significant difference on the students' reading comprehension in recount text before and after taught using chunking a text strategyt of the second grade students at Mts Mujahidin Ngadiluwih Kediri.

B. Discussion

Regarding to the research findings above, the data output in students' achievement by analyzing t-test showed that there was significant different of students' achievement before and after being taught by using chunking a

text strategy. The analysis data by using SPSS 16.0 version showed that the mean of pretest was 63.50 and posttest improved to be 80.50 after getting treatment. The mean of pretest was lower than posttest ($63.50 < 80.50$). It meant that the used of chunking a text strategy is effective to improve students' achievement in reading comprehension.

On the output of paired sample test after calculating the data, it showed that t value (Sig. 2-tailed) was 0.000. From comparing with the standard level of significance (0.05), p-value was lower than the significance level ($0.000 < 0.05$). It meant that the alternative hypothesis (H_a) is not rejected and null hypothesis (H_0) was rejected. It could be concluded that there was significant different of students' score before and after being taught by using chunking a text strategy. Thus, it can be interpreted that reading comprehension of the students had improved after getting treatment by using chunking a text strategy.

Based on the result of data analysis above, chunking a text strategy can be used to teach the students' reading comprehension. According to Casteel (1998), Chunking a text is a group of words in a sentence that can break down into short meaningful phrases (usually three to five words). Its strategy helps students to organize the largest passages to be smaller for better understanding. The researcher used chunking a text strategy to improve students' reading comprehension at the second grade of MTs Mujahidin Ngadiluwih Kediri.

The finding of this research was similar with the previous research., the first was written by Firman (2015). The design of this study used quasi experimental design consists of one experimental group and one control group. She found that the mean of control group in pretest was 50.25 and in posttest improved to be 66.54. Meanwhile, the mean of experimental group in pretest was 5.8 and in posttest improved to be 78.04. It meant that the score of experimental group was higher than score of control group. It could be conclude that there were a significant different score in teaching reading comprehension who were being taught by chunking a text strategy and the students who were not.

The second was written by Maryani (2015). He used classroom action research which consisted of two cycles. Each cycles consisted of planning, action, observing, and reflecting. The result of this study showed that after conducting the cycle 1, the use of chunking a text was not successful to improve the students' reading comprehension because only 40% students who got above KKM score (>75). Meanwhile, the result of cycle 2, the use of chunking a text was successful to improve the students' reading comprehension because the students got score under KKM improved to be 100%. It could be seen the mean in questionnaire 1 was 63.88 improved to be 85.38, the mean of observation 1 was 57.14 improved to be 82.14. it meant that the use of chunking a text strategy can improve students' reading comprehension.

Furthermore, teaching by using chunking a text strategy has many advantages for students. According to Anshel (1985) and Giddings (1986) claim that chunking is the one of effective reading strategies that can challenge and make students feel comfortable in reading. Both of challenging and feeling comfortable are caused by breaking down the difficult passages into more comprehensible pieces or small parts to get easier understanding from whole passages. From chunking, the students also encourages in thinking about groups of words rather than an individual word.

In other hand, by doing the reviewing reading reminders of the second step of chunking a text strategy, the students can unlock the unfamiliar words by teacher's help. Its step makes students to be more active, pleasure, and more participated. The students also kept healthy competition for each groups to find unfamiliar words. Then, they write those words and the meaning in their book to gain new vocabulary automatically without teacher's instruction. So, it is as reinforcement for the students to create a good atmosphere in class.

In chunking, the students chunk the text by phrase in order to catch the information easily. To help students chunk, the teacher ask the students to do paragraph shrinking and Identify Significance and Connections in order to clarify main idea. The students also summarize the meaning of a paragraph in ten words or less in each structure of text. The students also ask question based on a text to check their understanding.

In paraphrasing, the researcher found that students gave attention and to be more enjoyed of this strategy. They were to be easier in paraphrasing the meaning after the chunking process and unlocked the unfamiliar words. They understand better in understanding the information of whole text than understand for each word. They felt comfortable and confident while paraphrase the meaning by their own words without opening dictionary frequently. It meant that they showed the progress in reading comprehension. In sharing students' work step, the students also exchange their works to other group in finding different meaning in same word. They also looked focus in discussion.

The other finding of this study had similarities with a thesis of Rini Anggreini (2015) in encouraging motivation in learning activity. During the learning process (treatment), the students looked enthusiastic in joining class and following the five steps by using chunking a text strategy. It meant that, this strategy is effective for encouraging students' motivation and relieving students' stress in learning reading comprehension.

From the explanation above, chunking a text strategy gives students positive effect to improve their achievement in reading comprehension. The students can understand the information and the meaning of whole text easily without any burden on them because it can be done because of chunking. It can be conclude that the use of chunking a text strategy was effective towards students' reading comprehension in recount text of the second grade students at MTs Mujahidin Ngadiluwih Kediri in the academic year 2018/2019.