## CHAPTER IV

## RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents research finding which has been collected during research that conclude about description of data, hypothesis testing, and discussion based on the result of the research.

## A. Research Finding

In research finding presents about data presentation that would like to discuss about the result of analyzing data.

## 1. Data Presentation

The purpose of the research is to find out the effect of using Predict, Locate, Add, and Note (PLAN) strategy on students' reading comprehension in explanation text at second grade MA Darul Huda Wonodadi Blitar.

Based on research method that explained in chapter III, teaching and learning process in this research was divided into some steps. The first step was administered pre-test to experimental class and control class to know students' reading comprehension before giving the treatment. The second step was gave the treatment to experimental class by using PLAN strategy and conventional method in control class. The last step was administered post-test to experimental class and control class. It was
intended to measure the students' reading comprehension after given the treatment and without a treatment.

After the researcher got students' pre-test and post-test score from experimental class and control class, the scores of students pre-test and post-test can be arranged in the form of frequency through scoring criteria that divided into five criteria. Those criteria would be represented below:

Table 4.1 Scoring Criteria

| No | Grade | Criteria | Range Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | A | Excellent | $90-100$ |
| 2. | B | Good | $70-89$ |
| 3. | C | Average | $50-69$ |
| 4. | D | Poor | $35-49$ |
| 5. | E | Very Poor | $0-34$ |

From the table above, the researcher explains the criteria of students' score in reading comprehension in both experimental and control class. To know the percentages of students' score both pre-test and post-test, the researcher will explain the results of both experimental and control class scores from pre-test and post-test. The results of the test will be presented below:

## a. The Data of Experimental Class

Pre-test in experimental class was done before this class was given a treatment by using Predict, Locate, Add, and Note (PLAN) strategy. The purpose of pre-test in experimental class is to know how fat students' reding comprehension especially in explanation text before given the treatment. When pre-test was conducted, a
student was absent. Therefore, the researcher only counted the score of the students who were present when pre-test was administered. The result of students' score was shown in the table below:

Table 4.2 Descriptive Statistics of Experimental Pre-test

| Statistics |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Students' score of pre-test |  |  |
| N | Valid | 18 |
|  | Missin $\mathrm{g}$ | 0 |
| Mean |  | 55.39 |
| Median |  | 55.00 |
| Mode |  | 40 |

Based on the table 4.2, it was known that the mean of students' score in pre-test was 55.39 , the median was 55.00 and the most frequent score was 40 as the mode. Then the researcher measured the frequency of pre-test score. The aim was to know how many often the number appeared. The score started from minimum into maximum. It means that the scores appeared from lowest until highest one. The table of frequency of pre-test scores in experimental class could be seen below:

Table 4.3 Frequency of Experimental Pre-test

| Score | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 30 | 1 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 5.6 |
| 33 | 1 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 11.1 |
| 40 | 3 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 27.8 |
| 43 | 1 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 33.3 |
| 47 | 1 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 38.9 |
| 53 | 2 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 50.0 |
| Valid | 1 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 55.6 |
|  | 1 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 66.7 |
| 60 | 2 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 77.8 |
| 67 | 2 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 88.9 |
| 70 | 2 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 94.4 |
| 80 | 1 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 100.0 |
| 87 | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |
| Total | 18 |  |  |  |

From the table 4.3, it was found that students who got score 30, 33 showed that their ability in reading comprehension was categorized as very poor. While, the students who got score 40, 43, and 47 means that their ability was categorized as poor. Then the students who got $53,57,60$, and 67 means that their ability was categorized as average. Finally, the students who got score 70, 80, and 87 based on the scoring table they were categorized as good.

After the researcher calculated the pre-test scores from experimental class, then the researcher calculated the post-test scores one. The test had the same form of pre-test. This test was conducted
after giving the treatment in experimental group. The table of descriptive statistic would be presented below:

## Table 4.4 Descriptive Statistics of Experimental Post-test

## Statistics

Score posttest

| N | Valid | 18 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Missing | 0 |
| Mean |  | 78.89 |
| Median | 80.00 |  |
| Mode |  | $77^{\mathrm{a}}$ |

From the table 4.4, it was known that the mean of students' score in post-test was 78.89 , the median was 80.00 and the most frequent score was 77 as the mode. Then the researcher measured the frequency of post-test score in order to know how many often the number appeared. The frequency of the students' score was presented in the following table below:

Table 4.5 Frequency of Experimental Post-test

$\left.$| Score posttest |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Score |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | | Cumulative |
| :---: |
| Percent | \right\rvert\,

From the table 4.5, it was found that students who got score 63 showed that their ability in reading comprehension was categorized as average. While, the students who got score $70,73,77,80,83$, and 87 means that their ability was categorized as good. Finally, the students who got 90 means that their ability was categorized as excellent.

## b. The Data of the Control Class

Control class is a class which given a treatment in reading comprehension without using PLAN strategy. The teaching and learning activity was done by the researcher as usual or did not use PLAN strategy. The result of students' score was shown in the table below:

## Table 4.6 Descriptive Statistics of Control Pre-test

Statistics
Control group score

| N | Valid | 18 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Missing | 0 |
| Mean |  | 42.33 |
| Median | 43.00 |  |
| Mode | 43 |  |

Based on the table 4.6, it can be known that the mean of students' score in pre-test was 42.33 , the median was 43.00 , and the mode was 43 . The frequency of the students' score was presented in the following table below:

Table 4.7 Frequency of Control Pre-test

Score Pre-test

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Valid | 30 | 3 | 16.7 | 16.7 | Cumulative <br>  <br>  <br>  <br> 33 |
|  | 37 | 1 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 22.2 |
|  | 40 | 1 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 33.3 |
|  | 43 | 5 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 38.9 |
|  | 47 | 2 | 27.8 | 27.8 | 66.7 |
|  | 50 | 1 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 77.8 |
|  | 53 | 2 | 11.6 | 5.6 | 83.3 |
|  | 60 | 1 | 5.6 | 11.1 | 94.4 |
|  | Total | 18 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

From the table above, it was found that students who got score 30, 33 showed that their ability in reading comprehension was categorized very poor. Meanwhile the students who got score 37, 40, 43 , and 47 were categorized as poor. Finally the students who got score 50,53 , and 60 were categorized as average.

After the researcher calculated the pre-test scores from control class, then the researcher calculated the post-test scores one. The test had the same form of pre-test. Post-test in control class was done to know the improvement of students' reading comprehension ability although the learning process was without using PLAN strategy. The table of descriptive statistic would be presented below:

Table 4.8 Descriptive Statistics of Control Post-test

## Statistics

Score post-test

| N | Valid | 18 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Missing | 0 |
| Mean |  | 57.06 |
| Median |  | 56.50 |
| Mode |  | $53^{\mathrm{a}}$ |

Based on the table 4.8, it was known that the mean of students' score in post-test was 57.06 , the median was 56.50 and the most frequent score was 53 as the mode. The frequency of students' score was presented in the following table below:

Table 4.9 Frequency of Control Post-test

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative <br> Percent |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Valid | 40 | 2 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 11.1 |
|  | 47 | 2 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 22.2 |
|  | 50 | 2 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 33.3 |
|  | 53 | 3 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 50.0 |
|  | 60 | 3 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 66.7 |
|  | 67 | 3 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 83.3 |
|  | 70 | 2 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 94.4 |
|  | 73 | 1 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 18 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

From the table above, it was found that students who got score 40, 47 showed that their ability in reading comprehension was categorized poor. Meanwhile the students who got score 50, 53, 60 and 67 were categorized as average. Finally the students who got score 70 and 73 were categorized as good.

## c. The Difference of Statistical Data in Post-test of the Control and

## Experimental Groups.

Based on the result of students' pre-test score of control and experimental group were normal and homogeneous, so the researcher only compared the students' score of post-test.

The researcher compared students' score of post-test both of group that consisted of the highest score, the lowest score and the mean score in reading comprehension. After that, the researcher found out the score of each group from students' score in post-test to know whether the students' reading comprehension was getting down, same or different. The result of difference statistical data in
post-test of control and experimental group can be seen in thr table below:

Table 4.10 Descriptive Statistics of Control and Experimental Group

Statistics

|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | Control Class | Experimental Class |
| N | Valid | 18 | 18 |
|  | Missing | 0 | 0 |
| Mean |  | 57.06 | 78.89 |
| Median | 56.50 | 80.00 |  |
| Mode | $53^{\mathrm{a}}$ | $77^{\mathrm{a}}$ |  |
| Minimum | 40 | 63 |  |
| Maximum | 73 | 90 |  |

From the table above, it can be seen the difference of the students' score in post-test of both of control and experimental class in reading explanation text. In post-test of control group showed that the highest score was 73 , the lowest score was 40 and the mean score was 57.06 , while in post-test of experimental class showed that the highest score was 90 , the lowest score was 63 and the mean score was 78.89.

The result showed that the experimental class who were taught reading by using PLAN strategy was higher than the control class who were taught without PLAN strategy. It showed that there was significant difference of the students' reading comprehension in explanation text by using predict, locate, add, and note (PLAN) strategy and those were taught reading explanation text without

PLAN strategy. In other word, the using of PLAN strategy in teaching reading was effective to improve students’ reading comprehension at the second grade of MA Darul Huda Wonodadi Blitar on academic year 2019/2020.

In this research, the researcher used statistical test by using computation Independents Sample T-Test by SPSS 23 version. It used to know the significant difference of mean both of control and experimental group. In this research, the researcher obtained different class (XI MIA and XI IIS) describe by SPSS 23 to make sure the effect of using PLAN strategy on students' reading comprehension. The result of describing the data as follow:

Table 4.11 Group Statistics of Two Groups
Group Statistics

|  | Group | $\mathbf{N}$ | Mean | Std. <br> Deviation | Std. Error <br> Mean |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Score | experimental group | 18 | 78.8889 | 8.20967 | 1.93504 |
|  | control group | 18 | 57.0556 | 10.41759 | 2.45545 |

Based on the table 4.11, the data presented the performance scores of the subject of two groups which the students who were taught reading text without using Predict, Locate, Add, and Note (PLAN) strategy and those were taught reading text by using Predict, Locate, Add, and Note (PLAN) strategy. Output independent sample statistics shows that there are mean score differences between the
control group and experimental group. The mean score of experimental group is 78.88 and the mean score of control group is 57.05. The subject of students ( N ) in the control and experimental group were same, that are 18. The standard deviation of experimental group 8.209 and error mean 1.935 . On the control group, the standard deviation is 10.417 and the error mean is 2.455 .

## B. Hypothesis Testing

The hypothesis testing in this research are as follow:

1. If alternative hypothesis $(\mathrm{Ha})$ is accepted and the null hypothesis $(\mathrm{Ho})$ is rejected. It means that there is different score on students' reading comprehension who was taught without and using PLAN strategy. The different is significant.
2. If the significant value is higher than 0.05 , the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is rejected and the null hypothesis (Ho) is accepted. It means that there is no significant score on students' reading comprehension who was taught without and using PLAN strategy. The different is not significant.

To know whether the significant value is higher or lower than 0.05 , the researcher analyzed the data by using SPSS 23. In addition, in interrupting significance value, if it is higher than 0.05 ( $\mathrm{Sig}>0.05$ ), Ho is accepted. While if it is lower than 0.05 ( $\mathrm{Sig}<0.05$ ) Ho is rejected. In other word, Ho is rejected if $\mathrm{Sig}<0.05$.

Table 4.12 The Result of Analyzing Independent Sample T Test Independent Samples T Test

|  |  | Levene's Test for <br> Equality <br> of <br> Variances |  | t-test for Equality of Means |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2- <br> tailed) | Mean Differe nce | Std. <br> Error <br> Differe <br> nce | 95\% Confidence Interval of the Difference |  |
|  |  | Lower |  |  |  |  |  |  | Upper |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Scor } \\ \text { e } \end{array}$ | Equal variances assumed |  | 2.366 | . 133 | $\begin{aligned} & 6.98 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | 34 | . 000 | $\begin{aligned} & 21.833 \\ & 33 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.1262 \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} 15.479 \\ 98 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28.186 \\ & 69 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Equal variances not assumed |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 6.98 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 32.2 \\ & 38 \end{aligned}$ | . 000 | $21.833$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.1262 \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} 15.467 \\ 16 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28.199 \\ & 51 \end{aligned}$ |

On the table 4.17 shows the result of output independent sample T test. The result of SPSS the significance value $<0.05(0.000<0.05)$, so (Ho) is rejected and (Ha) is accepted. It means that (Ha) which states that there is significant different on students' reading comprehension of second grade at MA Darul Huda Wonodadi Blitar between who were taught by using PLAN strategy is accepted. Meanwhile (Ho) which states that there is no significant different on students' reading comprehension of second grade at MA Darul Huda Wonodadi Blitar between who were taught reading text without using PLAN strategy and those who are taught by using PLAN strategy is rejected.

## C. Discussion

In this point, the researcher presents about the data analysis on the research that has been presented in the previous sub chapter. The discussion intended to know the students improvement on students' reading comprehension by using Predict, Locate, Add, and Note (PLAN) strategy is effective or not.

Considering on the result of data analysis, it was found that PLAN strategy in effective to teach reading comprehension. Cohen and Cowen, (2008:219) cited in Saputri (2016) define that PLAN is an appropriate strategy used in teaching and learning reading especially to improve students comprehension in science text or textbook. The previous researcher also had proved that PLAN strategy can be effective and improve students' comprehension in reading text. For the first research had been conducted by Ramadanis (2012). The second research had been conducted by Saputri (2016). From the result of research that conducted by Ramadanis, Saputri, and the researcher, those shown that PLAN strategy is effective in teaching and learning reading aimed to improve students' reading comprehension.

Based on the analysis obtained from the students' post-test control class the mean score is 57.05 . While the mean score of the students' posttest experimental class is 78.89 . And the result, it indicates that after giving treatment by using PLAN strategy the students have better ability and the researcher has known in the application of treatment the students'
attention be focused in learning, and the students easy to understand, and it can helps students to recognize text easily. It means that PLAN strategy is effective to teach reading. It is related with Best (2005) cited in cited in Seagrave (2006:8) defined that the main advantage of activing of prior knowledge was that students gained access to related information and built upon it to make inferences and restructure misconceptions, and it also helps students to recognize text construction easily. PLAN strategy works for both good and poor readers to increase their knowledge based prediction, PLAN strategy is also useful for introducing the text in a process on analyzing and summarizing the text.

Based on the result above, the researcher conclude that the eleventh grade of MA Darul Huda Wonodadi Blitar have good response in reading comprehension after the application of PLAN strategy. Therefore, the teacher can apply classroom by using PLAN strategy in teaching English especially in reading comprehension.

