## CHAPTER IV

## RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION

This chapter describes about research finding that includes about the description of data, normality and hypothesis testing, and the discussion based on the results of the study.

## A. The Description of Data

The aim of this study was to obtain the effect of using self-monitoring approach to reading and thinking Strategy toward Reading Comprehension in descriptive text of the first grade Students at MTs Ma'arif Bakung Udanawu Blitar. The data of this research were the scores of the students' pre-test and posttest in order to know whether there is different score of the students before and after being taught by using Self-Monitoring Approach to Reading and Thinking strategy. The tests were given to class F of seventh grade students of MTs Ma'arif Bakung Udanawu Blitar which consists of 40 students as a subject of the research. The student scores of pre-test and post-test can be seen in table 4.1.

Table 4.1 The result of pre-test and post-test

| No | Name | Pre-test score | Post-test score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | AAK | 50 | 75 |
| 2 | AYP | 35 | 60 |
| 3 | AH | 40 | 75 |
| 4 | AS | 80 | 90 |
| 5 | BEU | 80 | 90 |
| 6 | DA | 65 | 85 |
| 7 | FA | 55 | 85 |
| 8 | FDN | 65 | 70 |
| 9 | IC | 70 | 85 |
| 10 | IGP | 70 | 85 |
| 11 | IDA | 60 | 80 |
| 12 | KN | 50 | 80 |
| 13 | KC | 40 | 65 |
| 14 | LNI | 55 | 70 |
| 15 | MAD | 45 | 65 |
| 16 | MFCF | 70 | 75 |
| 17 | MNS | 45 | 80 |
| 18 | MAN | 75 | 85 |
| 19 | MZB | 45 | 70 |
| 20 | MDW | 35 | 75 |
| 21 | MKN | 55 | 75 |
| 22 | MRAA | 55 | 90 |
| 23 | MS | 70 | 85 |
| 24 | MJN | 35 | 70 |
| 25 | MIM | 35 | 75 |
| 26 | MAAS | 55 | 85 |
| 27 | MRM | 50 | 75 |
| 28 | MIAS | 55 | 90 |
| 29 | MRA | 40 | 75 |
| 30 | NTA | 70 | 80 |
| 31 | NF | 65 | 85 |
| 32 | RBP | 45 | 60 |
| 33 | RNA | 70 | 80 |
| 34 | RP | 50 | 65 |
| 35 | RST | 75 | 85 |
| 36 | TN | 65 | 75 |
| 37 | TH | 75 | 80 |
| 38 | US | 40 | 65 |
| 39 | WIL | 55 | 85 |
| 40 | WB | 55 | 70 |
|  | $\mathrm{N}=40$ | $\mathrm{X}=56,13$ | $\mathrm{X}=77,25$ |

Based on the table above, the researcher used the alphabet to replace students' name because the students' name can't write completely. There are 40 students as subjects or respondents of the research. The highest score of pre-test is 80 and the lowest score is 35 . After getting treatment, the students did post-test. The highest score of post-test is 90 and the lowest score 60 . The mean score of pre-test is 56,13 and the mean score of post-test is 77,25 . So, the different mean is 21.12.

The data of students pre-test and post-test can be arranged in the form of frequency and percentage through scoring criteria and it is divided into five criteria, those are: excellent, good, average, poor and very poor.

Table 4.2 Table of criteria students' score

| No | Grade | Criteria | Range Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A | Excellent | $100-85$ |
| 2 | B | Good | $84-70$ |
| 3 | C | Average | $69-55$ |
| 4 | D | Poor | $54-50$ |
| 5 | E | Very Poor | $49-0$ |

Table above explained the criteria of students' score in reading comprehension. The formula to find out the percentage score as follow:
$P=\underline{F} X 100 \%$
N
Where:
$\mathrm{P}=$ Symbol of percentage
F = Frequency
$\mathrm{N}=$ Subject on the sample

Table 4.3 The percentage of students' reading comprehension before being taught by using Self- Monitoring Approach to Reading and Thinking

## Strategy

| No | Criteria | Range Score | Fx | $\%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Excellent | $100-85$ | - | - |
| 2 | Good | $84-70$ | 11 | $27,5 \%$ |
| 3 | Average | $69-55$ | 14 | $35 \%$ |
| 4 | Poor | $54-50$ | 4 | $10 \%$ |
| 5 | Very Poor | $49-0$ | 11 | $27,5 \%$ |
|  |  |  | $\mathrm{~N}=40$ | $\mathrm{P}=100 \%$ |

Based on the table 4.2.1, it is known that the students' achievement before being taught using Self-Monitoring Approach to Reading and Thinking Strategy, there are $27.5 \%$ students had good score where the students got range score from 84-70, $27.5 \%$ students had average score where the students got range score from $69-55,35 \%$ students had poor score where the students got range score from 5450 , and $10 \%$ students had very poor score where the students got range score from 49-0. It means that most of them can't understand in reading comprehension and students' reading achievement need to improve again.

Table 4.4 The percentage of students' reading comprehension after being taught by using Self- Monitoring Approach to Reading and Thinking Strategy

| No | Criteria | Range Score | Fx | $\%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Excellent | $100-85$ | 14 | $35 \%$ |
| 2 | Good | $84-70$ | 20 | $50 \%$ |
| 3 | Average | $69-55$ | 6 | $15 \%$ |
| 4 | Poor | $54-50$ | - | $\%$ |
| 5 | Very Poor | $49-0$ | - | $\%$ |
|  |  |  | $\mathrm{~N}=40$ | $\mathrm{P}=100 \%$ |

Based on the table 4.2.2, it is known that the students' achievement before being taught using Self-Monitoring Approach to Reading and Thinking Strategy, there are $35 \%$ students had excellent score where the students got range score from $100-85,35 \%$ students had good score where the students got score $84-70$ from, $50 \%$ students had Average score where the students got range score from 69 -55 , and $15 \%$ and there was no students who had poor and very poor score. It means that Self -Monitoring Approach to Reading and Thinking strategy can help the students to understand in reading comprehension and students reading achievement can increase.

In this research, the researcher used statistical test using computation paired sample T-test by SPSS 24.0. It is used to know the effectiveness of using Self-Monitoring Approach to Reading and Thinking strategy in reading comprehension. These subject are referred to as paired or dependent because they are drawn dependently from same subject. The result is as follow:

Table 4.5 Descriptive Statistic of Pre-test Statistics

| Statistics |  |
| :--- | ---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| PRETEST |  |
|  | Valid |
|  | Missing |
| Mean | 40 |
| Std. Error of Mean | 56.13 |
| Median | 2.145 |
| Mode | 55.00 |
| Std. Deviation | 55 |
| Variance | 13.563 .958 |
| Range | 45 |
| Minimum | 35 |
| Maximum | 80 |
| Sum | 2245 |

Based on the table 4.3 above can conclude that consist of 40 students. It shown that mean score 56,13 , is mean that the average of 40 students are got 56,13 . Based on the criteria of student score 56,13 is average/enough score. The median score is 55.00 and the mode score is 55 . Meanwhile, the mode score showed the most frequently appeared number, and the most appeared number was 55. In addition, the minimum score was 35 and the maximum score was 80 . The mode is simply that value which has the highest frequency. And the standard deviation is 13.563.

Table 4.6 Descriptive Statistic of Post-test Statistics

| Statistics |  |
| :--- | ---: |
|  | POSTEST |
| N | Valid |
|  | Missing |
| Mean | 00 |
| Std. Error of Mean | 77.25 |
| Median | 77.351 |
| Mode | 80 |
| Std. Deviation | 8.545 |
| Variance | 73.013 |
| Range | 30 |
| Minimum | 60 |
| Maximum | 90 |
| Sum | 3090 |

Based on the table 4.3.1 above can conclude that consist of 40 students. It shown that mean score 77,25 , is mean that the average of 40 students are got 77,25 . Based on the criteria of student score 77,50 is average/enough score. The median score is 77,50 and the mode score is 85 . Meanwhile, the mode score showed the most frequently appeared number, and the most appeared number was
85. In addition, the minimum score was 60 and the maximum score was 90 . The mode is simply that value which has the highest frequency. And the standard deviation is 8.545 .

Table 4.7 Frequency of Pre-test

| PRETEST |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | 35 | 4 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
|  | 40 | 4 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 20.0 |
|  | 45 | 4 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 30.0 |
|  | 50 | 4 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 40.0 |
|  | 55 | 8 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 60.0 |
|  | 60 | 1 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 62.5 |
|  | 65 | 4 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 72.5 |
|  | 70 | 6 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 87.5 |
|  | 75 | 3 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 95.0 |
|  | 80 | 2 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 40 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Based on the table 4.4 can see that twelve students got score $35-45$, it means that the ability of students' reading comprehension is very poor. The students score 50-54 are four students has poor ability in reading comprehension. Then nine students got score 55-69 it means that the students have average ability in reading comprehension. The students got score 70-84 are nine students, it means that the students have good criteria in reading comprehension. The students got score $85-100$ are 2 students it means. The students got score 80 are two students, it means the students have excellent ability in reading comprehension.

Table 4.8 Frequency of Post-test

| POSTEST |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | 60 | 2 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
|  | 65 | 4 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 15.0 |
|  | 70 | 6 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 30.0 |
|  | 75 | 8 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 50.0 |
|  | 80 | 6 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 65.0 |
|  | 85 | 10 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 90.0 |
|  | 90 | 4 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 40 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

The result on the table 4.4.1 can see that six students got score 55-69, it means that the ability of students' reading comprehension is average. The students score 70-84 are twenty students has good ability in reading comprehension. Then fourteen students got score $85-100$ it means that the students have excellent ability in reading comprehension. The students got score 70-84 are nine students, it means that the students have good criteria in reading comprehension. The students got score 85-100 are 2 students it means the students have excellent ability in reading comprehension.

Table 4.9 Paired Samples Statistic

| Paired Samples Statistics |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
| Pair 1 | PRETEST | 56.13 | 40 | 13.563 | 2.145 |
|  | POSTEST | 77.25 | 40 | 8.545 | 1.351 |

Based on the table 4.5, the data presented are the performance scores of the members of one group which the students who were taught before and after
using Self-Monitoring Approach to Reading and Thinking strategy in reading comprehension. Output paired sample statistics shows that there are mean scores differences between pre-test and post-test. The mean score of pre-test is 56,13 and the mean score of post-test is 77.25 . So, the mean score of post-test is higher than the mean score of pre-test. The number of pre-test and post-test given by the researcher are 20 questions in the form of multiple choice which consist of 3 stories in pre-test and 2 story in post-test. The pre-test was done before treatment. The post-test was done after giving treatment process. The number of subjects or respondents of each samples $(\mathrm{N})$ is 40 students. Meanwhile, standard deviation of pre-test is 13.563 and standard deviation of post-test is 8545 .

Table 4.10 Paired Samples Correlation

| Paired Samples Correlations |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pair 1 |  <br> POSTEST |  | 40 | .663 | .000 |

Based on table 4.6, output paired samples correlation shows the correlation between both samples is 0.663 and numeral significance is 0.000 . For interpretation of decision based on the result of probability achievement that is:
a. If the probability $>0.05$, so the null hypothesis (Ho) accepted
b. If the probability $<0.05$, so the null hypothesis (Ho) rejected

The numeral significant is 0.00 smaller from $0.05(0.00<0.05)$. It means that the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected. So, there is no significant different
achievement in teaching descriptive text toward the students reading comprehension between who are using self-monitoring approach to reading and thinking (SMART) strategy at first grade of MTs Ma’arif Bakung Udanawu Blitar.

## B. The result of normality and homogenity testing

In calculating the data, the researcher used SPSS 24.0 version using formula Homogeneity of One-sample Kolmogorov-smirnov test. The result can be seen as below:

## Table 4.11 Normality Result

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

|  |  | PRETEST | POSTEST |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N |  | 40 | 40 |
| Normal Parameters ${ }^{\text {a,b }}$ | Mean | 56.13 | 55.00 |
|  | Std. <br> Deviation | 13.563 | 13.301 |
| Most Extreme Differences | Absolute | . 133 | . 125 |
|  | Positive | . 133 | . 125 |
|  | Negative | -. 122 | -. 124 |
| Test Statistic |  | . 133 | . 125 |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) |  | . $072^{\text {c }}$ | . $117^{\text {c }}$ |

a. Test distribution is Normal.

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the significance value of pretest was $0.72>0.050$. It means that the data distribution of pre-test was normal. Then the significance value of post-test was $0.117>0.050$. It means that the data distribution of post-test was also normal. It can be concluded that both of the data (pre-test and post-test) were normal distributions.

## Table 4.12 Homogenity result

Homogeneity test is intended to show that two or more groups of data samples come from populations having the same variance. To know the homogeneity, the researcher used one way anova with SPSS. The result can be seen in the table below:

| ANOVA |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PRETEST | Sum of <br> Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |  |
| Between <br> Groups | 1861.202 | 9 | 206.800 | 1.168 | .350 |  |
| Within Groups | 5313.173 | 30 | 177.106 |  |  |  |
| Total | 7174.375 | 39 |  |  |  |  |

Based on the result, F is 1.168 with sig 0.350 the test is homogeny because the significant show $1.168>0.350$, so Ho is rejected.

Table 4.13 Homogeneity post-test

| ANOVA |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| POSTEST | Sum of <br> Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |  |
|  | 3443.333 | 9 | 382.593 | 1.272 | .292 |  |
| Between <br> Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Within Groups | 9026.042 | 30 | 300.868 |  |  |  |
| Total | 12469.375 | 39 |  |  |  |  |

Based on the result, F is 1.272 with sig 0.292 the test is homogenity because the significant show $1.272>0.292$, so Ho is rejected.

Table 4.14 Paired Samples Test
Paired Samples Test

| Paired Samples Test |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Paired Differences |  |  |  |  | t | df | Sig. (2tailed ) |
|  |  | Mean | Std. Deviat ion | Std. <br> Error <br> Mean | 95\% Confidence Interval of the Difference |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Lower | Upper |  |  |  |
| Pair 1 | PRETEST POSTEST | -21.125 | 10.158 | 1.606 | -24.374 | -17.876 | -13.153 | 39 | . 000 |

Based on table 4.10, output paired samples test shows the result of compare analysis with using T-test. The difference mean score of pre-test and post-test is 13.153. Standard deviation is 10.158 , mean standard error is 1.606 , the lower different is $\mathbf{- 2 4 . 3 7 4}$, while upper different is -17.876 . The result of t -count is 13.153 (symbol minus in this matter ignored) with df is 39 and significance is 0.000 . The significance value is 0.00 and the significance level is 0.05 . It means that the significance value is smaller than significance level $(0.00<0.05)$. So, the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted and null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected. The alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted and the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected. It means that there is significant different of students' achievement in reading comprehension before and after being taught using Self-Monitoring Approach to Reading and Thinking strategy.

## C. Hypothesis Testing

From the analysis above, the hypothesis of this study which is use in SPSS 24.0 are:
a. the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted and null hypothesis $(\mathrm{Ho})$ is rejected It means that there is different score of students' achievement in reading before and after taught using SelfMonitoring Approach to Reading and Thinking strategy. The different is significant effect students achievement in teaching descriptive text toward the students reading comprehension.
b. the alternative hypothesis $(\mathrm{Ha})$ is rejected and null hypothesis $(\mathrm{Ho})$ is accepted. It means that there is no different score of students' achievement in reading before and after taught using SelfMonitoring Approach to Reading and Thinking strategy. The different is not significant effect students achievement in teaching descriptive text toward the students reading comprehension.

So, the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted and the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected. It means that there is significant difference of students' achievement in reading comprehension before and after being taught using Self Monitoring Approach to Reading and Thinking strategy of first grade of MTs Ma'arif Bakung. That, it can be concluded that by using Self -Monitoring Approach to Reading and Thinking strategy in teaching reading comprehension of first grade of MTs Ma'arif Bakung is effective.

## D. Discussion

Based on this study, the researcher used pre experimental design (one group pre-test post-test design). This study classified as pre-experimental research design because it has little or no control of extraneous variable. Since there was no
control of extraneous variable so, the researcher used one group pre-test and posttest as the research design. This design involves only one group as its subject and it involves teaching and learning process was divided into three steps. First step was giving pre-test for students to know the students reading comprehension before being taught by Self-Monitoring Approach to Reading and Thinking(SMART) strategy. This test is given in order to know how far the students' ability in reading comprehension of descriptive text. Pre-test was conducted on April $06^{\text {th }}, 2019$. The form of test is multiple choice which consists of 20 questions. The questions of pretest consist of 3 stories about descriptive text. There were 40 students as respondents or subjects of this research at VII F MTs Ma'arif Bakung Udanawu Blitar. The second step the researcher gives treatment the self-monitoring approach to Reading and Thinking strategy(SMART) strategy. The third steps are giving post-test to know the score of the students after giving treatment of self-monitoring approach to Reading and Thinking strategy (SMART) strategy .

The mean score of reading comprehension before being taught using SelfMonitoring Approach to Reading and Thinking strategy is bad because the mean score is 56,13 . After getting treatment, the mean score is 77.25 . It is improved and the mean score of post-test is higher than the mean score of pre-test. The increasing score above related with the benefit of using SMART (self-monitoring approach to reading and thinking) strategy on reading comprehension. The result of the research was stating that applying strategy in teaching learning is effective. It was proved by the significant difference score of students' reading
comprehension ability between before and after taught by using Self-Monitoring Approach to Reading and Thinking strategy. Regarding on the result of data analysis above, it is strongly related by the use of SMART (self-monitoring approach to reading and thinking) itself as a strategy in teaching reading. The SMART (self-monitoring approach to reading and thinking) in teaching reading is strengthened by the statement stated by Buehl (2001) SMART offers a number of advantages as a teaching strategy, they are (1)students can actively monitor their reading success,(2) students learn to verbalize what they do and do not understand in a reading,(3) students are encouraged not to be satisfied until an entire reading makes sense and they are given specific steps to try to clear up trouble spots,(4) students become involved in putting the material into their own words thus helping them to remember as well as understand it. This strategy can monitor students to be aware of what they do understand and identify what they do not understand. Moreover, to use appropriate strategies can resolve students problem in reading comprehension. Then, this strategy also effective especially in cooperative group or tutorial settings.

The first of previous study, it comes from rusmanita (2013). This research a comparison with this study shows that previous study give two strategy to compare the percentage of coefficient effect. Another study conducted by Fitriyah (2014) In Reading Comprehension Of Second Grade Students At MTs AlHuda. Using Self Monitoring Approach to Reading and Thinking strategy in teaching reading comprehension is not only affective but an alternative to make the students feel enjoyable and more active. Furthermore by Dianto (2014). The
design of study was experimental research. It focuses in descriptive writing using mind mapping. That is different strategy and skill with the study but effective to improve writing descriptive texts.

So, using self-monitoring approach to reading and thinking (smart) strategy based on the discussion above it can be used for any grade and genre texts to teach reading ability is effective.

