## CHAPTER IV

## RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION

This chapter explains about the description of data, hypothesis testing and discussion based on the result of research.

## A. The Description of Data

In this part, the researcher presents the students' ability of reading comprehension taught by using Tea Party strategy and taught without using Tea Party as a strategy in the teaching reading. To know students' ability of reading comprehension, the researcher gave pre-test and post-test in experimental group and control group. The aim is to know the differences of students' score taught by using Tea Party strategy and taught without Tea Party strategy. The researcher used test as the instrument of this research.

## 1. The Students' Pre-Test Scores

The researcher gave pre-test in experimental group and control group in the form of multiple choices. The pre-test scores of students showed in table 4.1.

Table 4.1
Pre-Test Score of Experimental Group and Control Group

| No | Name | Pre-test <br> Experimental |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | AA | 30 |
| 2 | AS | 70 |
| 3 | AOD | 35 |
| 4 | BAP | 30 |
| 5 | DOL | 50 |
| 6 | DA | 70 |


| No | Name | Pre-test <br> Control |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | AFR | 55 |
| 2 | ASA | 45 |
| 3 | AFR | 30 |
| 4 | BN | 35 |
| 5 | GEG | 40 |
| 6 | LM | 60 |
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| 7 | DRP | 60 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8 | FNH | 80 |
| 9 | FDN | 55 |
| 10 | F | 75 |
| 11 | HTR | 75 |
| 12 | LP | 70 |
| 13 | LB | 45 |
| 14 | MRN | 30 |
| 15 | MJB | 20 |
| 16 | MAR | 35 |
| 17 | MMK | 30 |
| 18 | SR | 60 |
| 19 | RWN | 55 |
| 20 | PAN | 40 |
| 21 | KS | 45 |


| 7 | ML | 55 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8 | MSS | 30 |
| 9 | MFN | 20 |
| 10 | MFR | 60 |
| 11 | MSF | 35 |
| 12 | MZS | 60 |
| 13 | NS | 30 |
| 14 | RDP | 20 |
| 15 | RAS | 35 |
| 16 | RK | 20 |
| 17 | RN | 40 |
| 18 | SA | 35 |
| 19 | SYC | 45 |
| 20 | TIP | 30 |
| 21 | TN | 50 |
| 22 | RNS | 55 |

Table 4.2
Descriptive Statistic Pre-Test Experimental Group and Control Group

Pre-Test Experimental Group

| N $\quad$ Valid | 21 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Missing | 0 |
| Mean | 50.4762 |
| Median | 50.0000 |
| Mode | 30.00 |
| Std. Deviation | 1.82965 E 1 |
| Range | 60.00 |
| Minimum | 20.00 |
| Maximum | 80.00 |
| Sum | 1060.00 |

Pre-Test Control Group

| N $\quad$ Valid | 22 |
| :--- | ---: |
| $\quad$ Missing | 0 |
| Mean | 40.2273 |
| Median | 37.5000 |
| Mode | $30.00^{\mathrm{a}}$ |
| Std. Deviation | 1.33164 E 1 |
| Range | 40.00 |
| Minimum | 20.00 |
| Maximum | 60.00 |
| Sum | 885.00 |

Table 4.2 showed that there are 21 students in Experimental group. It shown that mean score of pre-test is 50,47 , it means that the average score of 21 students are got 50 . The median score is 50 , the mode score is 30 and the standard deviation is 1,82965 . The highest pretest score of Experimental Group is 80 and the lowest score is 20 .

Moreover, the result on the table 4.2 can conclude that there are 22 students in Control group. It shown that mean score of pre-test is 40,22 , it means that the average score of 21 students are got 40 . The median score is 37,50 , the mode score is 30 and the standard deviation is 1,331641 . The highest pre-test score of Control Group is 60 and the lowest score is 20 .

## 2. The Students' Post-Test Scores

After the researcher got scores from pre-test, the researcher gave treatment to the students by using Tea Party strategy in Experimental class and traditional strategy in Control class. When treatment finished, the researcher gave post-test in both of classes (Experimental class and Control class) to know students' score after being taught by using Tea Party strategy and taught without using by Tea Party strategy. The data of the students' score after being taught by using Tea Party strategy and taught without using Tea Party strategy can be seen at table 4.3 .

Table 4.3
Post-Test Score of Experimental Group and Control Group

| No | Name | Post Test <br> Experimental |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | AA | 75 |
| 2 | AS | 80 |
| 3 | AOD | 70 |
| 4 | BAP | 70 |
| 5 | DOL | 50 |
| 6 | DA | 85 |
| 7 | DRP | 85 |
| 8 | FNH | 100 |
| 9 | FDN | 75 |
| 10 | F | 65 |


| No | Name | Post Test <br> Control |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | AFR | 70 |
| 2 | ASA | 55 |
| 3 | AFR | 35 |
| 4 | BN | 25 |
| 5 | GEG | 55 |
| 6 | LM | 90 |
| 7 | ML | 60 |
| 8 | MSS | 30 |
| 9 | MFN | 35 |
| 10 | MFR | 85 |
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| 11 | HTR | 75 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12 | LP | 90 |
| 13 | LB | 70 |
| 14 | MRN | 55 |
| 15 | MJB | 50 |
| 16 | MAR | 50 |
| 17 | MMK | 50 |
| 18 | SR | 75 |
| 19 | RWN | 55 |
| 20 | PAN | 70 |
| 21 | KS | 90 |


| 11 | MSF | 55 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12 | MZS | 75 |
| 13 | NS | 45 |
| 14 | RDP | 60 |
| 15 | RAS | 50 |
| 16 | RK | 45 |
| 17 | RN | 35 |
| 18 | SA | 55 |
| 19 | SYC | 50 |
| 20 | TIP | 40 |
| 21 | TN | 45 |
| 22 | RNS | 75 |

Table 4.4
Descriptive Statistic Post-Test Experimental Group and Control Group

Post-Test Experimental Group

| N | Valid | 21 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
|  | Missing | 0 |
| Mean |  | 70.7143 |
| Median |  | 70.0000 |
| Mode | $50.00^{\mathrm{a}}$ |  |
| Std. Deviation | 1.48565 E 1 |  |
| Range | 50.00 |  |
| Minimum | 50.00 |  |
| Maximum | 100.00 |  |
| Sum | 1485.00 |  |

Post-Test Control Group

| N | Valid <br>  <br>  <br> Mean <br> Missing | 22 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Median |  | 0 |
| Mode |  | 53.1818 |
| Std. Deviation | 55000 |  |
| Range |  | 1.74946 E 1 |
| Minimum |  | 65.00 |
| Maximum |  | 25.00 |
| Sum |  | 90.00 |

Based on the table 4.4 above can conclude that there are 21 students in Experimental group. It shown that mean score of post-test is 70,71 , it means that the average score of 21 students are got 70 . The median score is 70 , the mode score is 50 and the standard deviation is 1,4856. The highest post-test score of Experimental Group is 100 and the lowest score is 50 .

Moreover, the result on the table 4.4 can conclude that there are 22 students in Control group. It shown that mean score of post-test is 53,18 , it means that the average score of 21 students are got 53 . The median score is 52,50 , the mode score is 55 and the standard deviation is 1,74946. The highest post-test score of Control Group is 90 and the lowest score is 25 .

## 3. The significant different of students' scores in experimental group and control group

After the researcher got the data in the form of score of pre-test and posttest, then the researcher analyzed the data used statistical test using Independent Sample T test by using SPSS 16. It used to know the effectiveness of using Tea Party strategy in reading comprehension. The result is as follow:

Table 4.5
Independent Samples T test

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Group | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
| students' score | Treatment | 21 | 70.7143 | 14.85646 | 3.24194 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Independent Samples T-test

|  |  | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances |  | t-test for Equality of Means |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | F | Sig. | T | df | Sig. (2tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95\% Confidence Interval of the Difference |  |
|  |  | Lower |  |  |  |  |  |  | Upper |
| students' score | Equal variances assumed |  | . 426 | . 518 | 3.534 | 41 | . 001 | 17.53247 | 4.96098 | 7.51357 | 27.55136 |
|  | Equal variances not assumed |  |  | 3.548 | 40.465 | . 001 | 17.53247 | 4.94187 | 7.54816 | 27.51678 |

Based on the table 4.5, output Group Statistics in the first column shows that the number of subjects or respondents of experimental is 21 students and control group is 22 students. The second column shows the mean of eexperimental group and control group. There are different means scores between post-test experimental group and post-test control group. The mean score of post-test experimental group is 70.71 and the mean score of post-test control group is 53.18 . So, the mean score of post-test experimental group is higher than the mean score of post-test control group. Moreover, output Independent Samples T-test shows that the significant (2-tailed) is 0.001 .

## B. Hypothesis Testing

According to Ary (2010; 92-93) stated that Hypothesis testing involves the following steps:

1. State, in operational terms, the relationships that should be observed if the research hypothesis is true.
2. State the null hypothesis.
3. Select a research method that will enable the hypothesized relationship to be observed if it is there.
4. Gather the empirical data and select and calculate appropriate descriptive statistics for these data.
5. Calculate inferential statistics to determine the probability that your obtained results could have occurred by chance when the null hypothesis is true.
6. If the probability of the observed findings being due to chance is very small (e.g., only 1 in 100 chances), one would have sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis.

In this research, the researcher analyzed the data used SPSS 16 program. The researcher looked the significance (2-tailed). The result is 0,001. According Prasetyowati (2016:85) stated 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

It means that the significance (2-tailed) smaller than significance level $(0,001<0,05)$ and the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected. So, there is significant different of students' achievement in reading comprehension
taught by using Tea Party strategy and taught by using lecturing strategy at MTs Sultan Agung Jabalsari Tulungagung.

## C. Discussion

The aim of this research is to know the significant difference of students' ability in reading comprehension recount text between those who were taught by using tea party strategy and those who were taught without using tea party strategy for the eight grade students of MTs Sultan Agung Jabalsari Sumbergempol Tulungagung in the academic year of 2017/2018. The mean score of post-test experimental group is 70.71 and the mean score of post-test control group is 53.18. In addition, the mean score of post-test for experimental group is higher than the mean score of post-test control group. Moreover, output Independent Samples T-test show that the significance (2tailed) smaller than significance level $(0,001<0,05)$ and the null hypothesis $(\mathrm{Ho})$ is rejected.

Based on the research finding, Tea Party strategy can help the students to improve their reading ability in recount text, because it can activate the students' background knowledge by making prediction. The students will make prediction about a story based on some key word. The students will make relation between what they know and what on the key word. The more key words they got, the more they interested and want to get more key words. Work together in group, made students easier to make predictions about text. By combine each student's key word, every group make prediction about text
before they read the real text. It supported by Beers (2002), he stated that the more we frontload students' knowledge of a text and help them become actively involved in constructing meaning prior to reading, the more engaged they are likely to be as they read the text. According to May (2001: 116) proposes seven strategies to achieve comprehension. A reader should: predict the next words, confirming his/her prediction, changing his/her prediction if necessary, correcting his/her own miscues, using substitution that get us closer to the author's meaning, using omissions and insertions to make the author's language sound more like to his/her language, stalling for think time by representing words or phrases. Those seven strategies point out that predicting plays an important role in achieving reading comprehension.

In previous research, Lahope (2012) conducted a research to find out whether tea party strategy to improve students' ability in reading comprehension in narrative text or not. In her research, she used preexperimental design. Her research findings reveal that students' mean score in pre-test was 10.16 and the mean score in post-test was 12.76 . The result indicated that students' score after giving the treatment was higher than students' score before giving the treatment. It proved that using this strategy students will be easier to comprehend reading especially recount text.

Moreover, based on the calculation the result of post-test in this research showed that this strategy positively influences students' reading ability in recount text after the treatment. It can be said that the use of Tea Party strategy was significantly successful increased the students'
achievement in writing recount text. So, it means that the result of this research was verified the theory by Shoob and Tompkins. According to Shoob (2008:34) Tea party is a strategy that can help students to making prediction before they read the written text. The tea party is one of pre reading strategies that help students activate background knowledge, anticipate what they will read, make predictions before they read, and make connections to information they already know. According to Tompkins (1998:84) stated that Tea Party is a strategy to encourage students to read or reread pre-selected excerpt from the story. It can be summarized that Tea Party strategy can help the students to improve students' reading ability. So, it can be concluded that the use of Tea Party strategy was effective to increase the students' achievement in reading comprehension of recount text of the eight grades of MTs Sultan Agung Jabalsari.

