## CHAPTER IV

## RESEARCH FINDING

This chapter, the researcher presents the results and the finding of analyzing the data.

## A. Description of The Data

The research objective was to know the students' ability of the tenth grade of MA Syekh Subakir in reading recount and narrative text when they taught by using context clue technique. Besides that, this research also used to find out whether there was a significant different achievement of students' reading ability at the tenth grade of MA Syekh Subakir in reading recount and narrative text when they taught by using context clue technique and those taught without using context clue technique.

In order to achieve the objectives of the research, the researcher did some steps to collect the data. Based on research method in chapter III in this research, the teaching and learning process was divided into some steps to collect the data. The first step was did interview and pre-observation to know the students' real situation. The second step was administered pre-test to control and experimental group to know students’ ability in reading before gave treatment. The third step was gave the treatment to experimental group by teaching reading narrative text by using context clue technique. In this research, the researcher conducted four times of treatment in experimental class. In the first treatment, students were given story of recount and narrative text and gave the treatment by
used context clue. Meanwhile, in the control group, the researcher used the conventional teaching or as usual teaching. The next step of data collection method was administered post-test to both groups. It was intended to measured students' reading ability after the treatment of experimental group and conventional teaching of control group were given. The researcher wanted to know whether there were or not any significant difference on their achievement in reading comprehension of the both groups.

The data of this research consisted of pre-test score and post-test score of control and experimental group. Those were explained as follows:

## 1. The Students' Reading Comprehension When They Were Taught Without Context Clue Technique

a. The pre-test of control group

Control group was a class which was given a treatment in reading comprehension was without using context clue technique. The teaching and learning activity was done by the researcher as usual or using conventional research. Before the researcher gave the treatment, the researcher administered a pretest for the control group. The subject of pretest in control group consisted of 31 students. Here is table of the students' pre-test score;

Table 4.1
The Students' Score on Pre-test

| NO. | SUBJECT | SCORE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | AH | 72 |
| 2 | AA | 64 |
| 3 | BS | 56 |
| 4 | DU | 76 |
| 5 | DH | 68 |
| 6 | DR | 68 |
| 7 | DRW | 56 |
| 8 | FR | 52 |
| 9 | IN | 68 |
| 10 | INR | 52 |
| 11 | IA | 72 |
| 12 | KY | 60 |
| 13 | LA | 68 |
| 14 | LS | 76 |
| 15 | MA | 68 |
| 16 | MAA | 64 |
| 17 | MN | 68 |
| 18 | MD | 72 |
| 19 | MI | 60 |
| 20 | MK | 68 |
| 21 | NS | 56 |
| 22 | NSH | 76 |
| 23 | NL | 72 |
| 24 | PR | 76 |
| 25 | SA | 60 |
| 26 | SW | 64 |
| 27 | UA | 76 |
| 28 | WS | 56 |
| 29 | MY | 80 |
| 30 | KA | 68 |
| 31 | LS | 64 |

Table above showed about the score of the students who were though
without context clue technique on pre-test. According to the table, the higher score of the students was 76 and the lower score of students was 52 . Then, the
data calculated by using SPSS 16.0 to know mean, median and mode. Here was the result of SPSS 16.0.

Table 4.2
Descriptive Statistic of Pre-test
Statistics
DATA

| N | Valid | 31 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
|  | Missing | 0 |
| Mean |  | 66.32 |
| Median |  | 68.00 |
| Mode |  | 68 |

Table 4.3
Frequency of Pre-test
DATA

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | 52 | 2 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 |
|  | 56 | 4 | 12.9 | 12.9 | 19.4 |
|  | 60 | 3 | 9.7 | 9.7 | 29.0 |
|  | 64 | 4 | 12.9 | 12.9 | 41.9 |
|  | 68 | 8 | 25.8 | 25.8 | 67.7 |
|  | 72 | 4 | 12.9 | 12.9 | 80.6 |
|  | 76 | 5 | 16.1 | 16.1 | 96.8 |
|  | 80 | 1 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 31 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

By using SPSS program 16.0, it was known that the mean of students’
score in pretest was 66.32 ; the mode was 68 ; and the median was 68.00 .

Table 4.4
Frequency and Percentage of the Students' Score on Pre-test

| Intervals | Frequency | Categorization | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $90-100$ | 0 | Excellent | $0 \%$ |
| $70-89$ | 10 | Very Good | $32.25 \%$ |
| $50-69$ | 21 | Good | $67.74 \%$ |
| $30-49$ | 0 | Fair | $0 \%$ |
| $0-29$ | 0 | Poor | $0 \%$ |

The table above showed that the students' score was categorized as
follow: 1) Excellent (90-100), frequency of the students who got those score was $0(0 \%) .2$ ) Very good (70-89), frequency of the students who got those score was $10(32.25 \%)$. 3) Good (50-69), frequency of the students who got those score was $21(67.74 \%)$. 4) Fair (30-49), frequency of the students who got those score was 0 (0\%). 5) Poor (0-29), frequency of the students who got those score was $0(0 \%)$.

After finding the students' frequency and percentage of their score, then researcher made the histogram of the students' frequency and percentage (table 4.4), so that it was easier to understand the result of the data.

The table 4.4 could be shown in the form of histogram below.


Figure 4.1 Histogram of the control group students' score in pre-test
Based on the data of table 4.4, the researcher knew that zero students or $0 \%$ got score between $0-30$ in poor categorization, zero students or $0 \%$ got $30-$ 49 in fair categorization, 21 students or $67.74 \%$ got score $50-69$ in good categorization, 10 students or $32.25 \%$ got 70-89 in very good categorization and zero student or $0 \%$ got score $90-100$ in excellent categorization. It could be concluded that students' scores of the control group in pre-test were not spread in very good categorization.

## b. Post-test of Control Group

Administering a post-test in reading ability for control group was done to know the improvement of students' ability in reading recount and narrative text although the learning activity was without using context clue technique. The subject of post-test in control group consisted of 31 students.

Table 4.5
The Students' Score on Post-Test

| NO. | SUBJECT | SCORE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | AH | 68 |
| 2 | AA | 72 |
| 3 | BS | 60 |
| 4 | DU | 72 |
| 5 | DH | 68 |
| 6 | DR | 68 |
| 7 | DRW | 68 |
| 8 | FR | 60 |
| 9 | IN | 72 |
| 10 | INR | 60 |
| 11 | IA | 76 |
| 12 | KY | 68 |
| 13 | LA | 68 |
| 14 | LS | 68 |
| 15 | MA | 72 |
| 16 | MAA | 68 |
| 17 | MN | 68 |
| 18 | MD | 72 |
| 19 | MI | 68 |
| 20 | MK | 72 |
| 21 | NS | 60 |
| 22 | NSH | 72 |
| 23 | NL | 76 |
| 24 | PR | 72 |
| 25 | SA | 64 |
| 26 | SW | 68 |
| 27 | UA | 72 |
| 28 | WS | 68 |
| 29 | MY | 76 |
| 30 | KA | 60 |
| 31 | LS | 68 |

Table above showed about the score of the students who though without using context clue technique on post-test. According to the table, the
higher score of the students was 76 and the lower score of students was 60 . Then, the data calculated by using SPSS 16.0 to know mean, median and mode. Here was the result of SPSS 16.0.

Table 4.6
Descriptive Statistic of Post-Test


Table 4.7
Frequency of Post-Test

| DATA |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | 60 | 5 | 16.1 | 16.1 | 16.1 |
|  | 64 | 1 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 19.4 |
|  | 68 | 13 | 41.9 | 41.9 | 61.3 |
|  | 72 | 9 | 29.0 | 29.0 | 90.3 |
|  | 76 | 3 | 9.7 | 9.7 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 31 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

By using SPSS program 16.0, it was known that the mean of students'
score in pretest was 68.52 ; the mode was 68 ; and the median was 68.00 .

Table 4.8
Frequency and Percentage of Students' Score on Post-test

| Intervals | Frequency | Categorization | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $90-100$ | 0 | Excellent | 0 |
| $70-89$ | 13 | Very Good | $41.93 \%$ |
| $50-69$ | 18 | Good | $58.06 \%$ |
| $30-49$ | 0 | Fair | 0 |
| $0-29$ | 0 | Poor | 0 |

The table above showed that the students' score was categorized as
follow: 1) Excellent (90-100), frequency of the students who got those score was $0(0 \%) .2$ ) Very good (70-89), frequency of the students who got those score was 13 (41.93\%). 3) Good (50-69), frequency of the students who got those score was 18 (58.06\%). 4) Fair (30-49), frequency of the students who got those score was 0 $(0 \%) .5)$ Poor (0-29), frequency of the students who got those score was $0(0 \%)$.

The researcher found the students' frequency and percentage of their score, then researcher made the histogram of the students' frequency and percentage (table 4.8), so that it was easier to understand the result of the data.

The table 4.8 could be shown in the form of histogram below.


Figure 4.2 Histogram of the control group students' score in post-test
Based on the data of table 4.8, the researcher knew that zero students or $0 \%$ get score between 0-29 in poor categorization, zero students or $0 \%$ got $30-$ 49 in fair categorization, 19 students or $61.29 \%$ got score $50-69$ in good categorization, 12 students or $38.7 \%$ got 70-89 in very good categorization and zero student or $0 \%$ got score $90-100$ in excellent categorization. It could be concluded that students' scores of the control group in post-test were not spread in very good categorization.

## 2. The Students' Reading Comprehension When They Were Taught With Context Clue Technique.

a. Pre-test of Experimental group

Experiment group was a class which was given a treatment in reading comprehension by using context clue technique. Before the researcher gave the
treatment, the researcher administered a pre-test of reading recount text as a pretest that administered for the experimental group. Subject of pre-test in experimental group consisted of 30 students. Here was the table of the students' pre-test score;

Table 4.9
The Students' Score on Pre-test

| NO. | SUBJECT | SCORE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | AM | 76 |
| 2 | AR | 72 |
| 3 | AW | 72 |
| 4 | AI | 76 |
| 5 | AMM | 56 |
| 6 | DN | 64 |
| 7 | ET | 76 |
| 8 | LK | 56 |
| 9 | LW | 68 |
| 10 | LD | 64 |
| 11 | LP | 68 |
| 12 | LL | 80 |
| 13 | MS | 72 |
| 14 | MN | 76 |
| 15 | MA | 56 |
| 16 | MC | 76 |
| 17 | NS | 76 |
| 18 | NI | 72 |
| 19 | NC | 68 |
| 20 | N | 72 |
| 21 | NA | 64 |
| 22 | NH | 76 |
| 23 | NHH | 64 |
| 24 | RR | 64 |
| 25 | SF | 64 |
| 26 | SM | 60 |
| 27 | SR | 68 |
| 28 | UK | 84 |
| 29 | AA | 60 |
| 30 | NA | 64 |

Table above showed about the score of the students who were though
using context clue technique on pre-test. According to the table, the higher score of the students was 84 and the lower score of students was 56 . Then, the data
calculated by using SPSS 16.0 to know mean, median and mode. Here was the result of SPSS 16.0.

Table 4.10
Descriptive statistic of Pre-test Statistics

| DATA |  |
| ---: | ---: |
| N | Valid |

a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown

Table 4.11
Frequency of Pre-test

| DATA |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | 56 | 3 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
|  | 60 | 2 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 16.7 |
|  | 64 | 7 | 23.3 | 23.3 | 40.0 |
|  | 68 | 4 | 13.3 | 13.3 | 53.3 |
|  | 72 | 5 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 70.0 |
|  | 76 | 7 | 23.3 | 23.3 | 93.3 |
|  | 80 | 1 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 96.7 |
|  | 84 | 1 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 30 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

By using SPSS program 16.0, it was known that the mean of students' score in pre-test was 68.80 ; the mode was 64 ; and the median was 68.00 .

Table 4.12
Frequency and Percentage of Students' Score on Pre-test

| Intervals | Frequency | Categorization | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $90-100$ | 0 | Excellent | 0 |
| $70-89$ | 14 | Very Good | $46,33 \%$ |
| $50-69$ | 16 | Good | $53,33 \%$ |
| $30-49$ | 0 | Fair | 0 |
| $0-29$ | 0 | Poor | 0 |

The table above showed that the students' score categorized as follow:

1) Excellent $(90-100)$, frequency of the students who got those score were $0(0 \%)$.
2) Very good (70-89), frequency of the students who got those score was 14 (46.66\%). 3) Good (50-69), frequency of the students who got those score was 16 (53.33\%). 4) Fair (30-49), frequency of the students who got those score was 0 $(0 \%) .5)$ Poor (0-29), frequency of the students who got those score was $0(0 \%)$.

After finding the students' frequency and percentage of their score, then researcher made the histogram of the students' frequency and percentage (table 4.12), so that it was easier to understand the result of the data.

The table 4.12 could be shown in the form of histogram below.


Figure 4.3 Histogram of the experiment group students' score in pre-test
Based on the data of table 4.12, the researcher knew that zero students or $0 \%$ got score between $0-29$ in poor categorization, zero students or $0 \%$ got $30-$ 49 in fair categorization, 16 students or $53.33 \%$ got score $50-69$ in good categorization, 14 students or $46.66 \%$ got 70-89 in very good categorization and zero student or $0 \%$ got score 90 -100 in excellent categorization. It could be concluded that students' scores of the experimental group in pre-test were not spread in very good categorization.
b. Post-test of Experimental Group

Administering a post-test in reading comprehension for experimental group was done to know the improvement of students' ability in reading recount and narrative text by using context clue technique. The subject of post-test in experimental group consisted of 30 students. Here was table of the students' posttest score;

Table 4.13
The students' Score on Post-test

| NO. | SUBJECT | SCORE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | AM | 80 |
| 2 | AR | 76 |
| 3 | AW | 76 |
| 4 | AI | 76 |
| 5 | AMM | 72 |
| 6 | DN | 72 |
| 7 | ET | 84 |
| 8 | LK | 56 |
| 9 | LW | 72 |
| 10 | LD | 72 |
| 11 | LP | 72 |
| 12 | LL | 88 |
| 13 | MS | 76 |
| 14 | MN | 80 |
| 15 | MA | 52 |
| 16 | MC | 76 |
| 17 | NS | 84 |
| 18 | NI | 76 |
| 19 | NC | 76 |
| 20 | N | 76 |
| 21 | NA | 72 |
| 22 | NH | 80 |
| 23 | NHH | 76 |
| 24 | RR | 72 |
| 25 | SF | 76 |
| 26 | SM | 72 |
| 27 | SR | 76 |
| 28 | UK | 92 |
| 29 | AA | 76 |
| 30 | NA | 76 |

Table above showed about the score of the students who were though using context clue technique in post-test. According to the table, the higher score of the students was 92 and the lower score of students was 52 . Then, the data
calculated by using SPSS 16.0 to know mean, median and mode. Here was the result of SPSS 16.0.

Table 4.14
Descriptive statistic of Post-test
Statistics
DATA

| N | Valid | 30 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
|  | Missing | 0 |
| Mean |  | 75.33 |
| Median | 76.00 |  |
| Mode |  | 76 |

Table 4.15
Frequency of Post-test

| DATA |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

By using SPSS program 16.0, it was known that the mean of students'
score in post-test was 75.33 ; the mode was 76 ; and the median was 76.00

Table 4.16
Frequency and Percentage of Students' Score on Post-test

| Intervals | Frequency | Categorization | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $90-100$ | 1 | Excellent | $3,3 \%$ |
| $70-89$ | 27 | Very Good | $90 \%$ |
| $50-69$ | 2 | Good | $6,66 \%$ |
| $30-49$ | 0 | Fair | 0 |
| $0-29$ | 0 | Poor | 0 |

The table above showed that the students' score was categorized as
follow: 1) Excellent (90-100), frequency of the students who got those score was
$1(3.3 \%) .2)$ Very good (70-89), frequency of the students who got those score was 27 ( $90 \%$ ). 3) Good (50-69), frequency of the students who got those score was $2(6.66 \%)$. 4) Fair (30-49), frequency of the students who got those score was $0(0 \%) .5)$ Poor (0-29), frequency of the students who got those score was $0(0 \%)$.

After found the students' frequency and percentage of their score, then researcher made the histogram of the students' frequency and percentage as below:

The table 4.16 could be shown in the form of histogram below.


Figure 4.4 Histogram of the experiment group students' score in post-test

Based on the data of table 4.16, the researcher knew that zero students or $0 \%$ got score between 0-29 in poor categorization, zero students or $0 \%$ got $30-$ 49 in fair categorization, two students or $6.66 \%$ got score $50-69$ in good categorization, 27 students or $90 \%$ got 70-89 in very good categorization and one student or $3.3 \%$ got score $90-100$ in excellent categorization. It could be concluded that students' scores of the experimental group in post-test were not spread in very good categorization.

## B. Normality and Homogeneity Testing

## 1. Normality Testing

a. Testing normality of pre-test experimental and control group

Table 4.17
Normality Testing of Pre-test
One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

|  |  | Unstandardized Residual |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N |  | 60 |
| Normal Parameters ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Mean | . 0000000 |
|  | Std. Deviation | 7.57284576 |
| Most Extreme Differences | Absolute | . 130 |
|  | Positive | . 090 |
|  | Negative | -. 130 |
| Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z |  | 1.005 |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) |  | . 264 |
| a. Test distribution is Normal. |  |  |

The table above showed the result of test normality calculation used SPSS 16.0 program. To know the normality of data, the researcher used Kolmogorov-Smirnov because the number of sample more than 50 students.

Based on the table of data, the number of sample was 61 . Table significant data of experimental and control group used Kolmogorov-Smirnov was $0.264>0.05$. It could be concluded that the data was normal distribution.
b. Testing normality of post-test experimental and control group

Table 4.18 Normality Testing of Post-Test One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

|  |  | Unstandardized Residual |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N |  | 60 |
| Normal Parameters ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Mean | . 0000000 |
|  | Std. Deviation | 7.15825942 |
| Most Extreme Differences | Absolute | . 168 |
|  | Positive | . 156 |
|  | Negative | -. 168 |
| Kolmogorov-Smirnov $\mathbf{Z}$ |  | 1.298 |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) |  | . 069 |
| a. Test distribution is Normal. |  |  |
|  |  |  |

The table above showed the result of test normality calculation used SPSS 16.0 program. To know the normality of data, the researcher used Kolmogorov-Smirnov because the number of sample more than 50 students.

Based on the table of data, the number of sample was 61 . So, the researcher analyzed normality data was used Kolmogorov-Smirnov. Table significant data of experiment and control group used Kolmogorov-Smirnov was $0.069>0.05$. It could be concluded that the data was normal distribution.

## 2. Homogeneity Testing

Table 4.19
Homogeneity Testing
Test of Homogeneity of Variances
SCORE

| Levene Statistic | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| .064 |  | 1 |  |

Table above showed the result of homogeneity test. Homogeneity of variance was 0.801 .

| ANOVA |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SCORE | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |  |
|  | 86.400 | 1 | 86.400 | 1.491 | .227 |  |
| Between Groups | 3360.000 | 58 | 57.931 |  |  |  |
| Within Groups | 3446.400 | 59 |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Based on the result of testing homogeneity, the significant of group based on the changeable on students reading comprehension material between taught with context clue technique and without context clue technique was 0,801 which were more than 0.05 . So, it can be concluded that the data group by based on the changeable on students reading ability between taught with context clue technique and taught without context clue technique had the same variant.

## C. The Result of Data Analysis

## 1. The data score comparison of experimental and control group

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 of both groups that consisted of the highest score, the lowest score and the mean score in reading ability. After that, the researcher found out the score of each group from students' score in post-test to know whether the students' comprehension was lower, constant or higher. The result of difference of statistical data in post-test of control group and experimental group could be seen in the table 4.20 below;

Table 4.20
Data Score Comparison

| Experimental Class |  |  |  | Control Class |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. | Subject | Score |  | No. | Subject | Score |  |
|  |  | Pre-test | Post-test |  |  | Pre-test | Post-test |
| 1. | AM | 76 | 80 | 1 | AH | 72 | 68 |
| 2. | AR | 72 | 76 | 2 | AA | 64 | 72 |
| 3. | AW | 72 | 76 | 3 | BS | 56 | 60 |
| 4. | AI | 76 | 76 | 4 | DU | 76 | 72 |
| 5. | AMM | 56 | 72 | 5 | DH | 68 | 68 |
| 6. | DN | 64 | 72 | 6 | DR | 68 | 68 |
| 7. | ET | 76 | 84 | 7 | DRW | 56 | 68 |
| 8. | LK | 56 | 56 | 8 | FR | 52 | 60 |
| 9. | LW | 68 | 72 | 9 | IN | 68 | 72 |
| 10. | LD | 64 | 72 | 10 | INR | 52 | 60 |
| 11. | LP | 68 | 72 | 11 | IA | 72 | 76 |
| 12. | LL | 80 | 88 | 12 | KY | 60 | 68 |
| 13. | MS | 72 | 76 | 13 | LA | 68 | 68 |
| 14. | MN | 76 | 80 | 14 | LS | 76 | 68 |
| 15. | MA | 56 | 52 | 15 | MA | 68 | 72 |
| 16. | MC | 76 | 76 | 16 | MAA | 64 | 68 |
| 17. | NS | 76 | 84 | 17 | MN | 68 | 68 |
| 18. | NI | 72 | 76 | 18 | MD | 72 | 72 |
| 19. | NC | 68 | 76 | 19 | MI | 60 | 68 |
| 20. | N | 72 | 76 | 20 | MK | 68 | 72 |
| 21. | NA | 64 | 72 | 21 | NS | 56 | 60 |
| 22. | NH | 76 | 80 | 22 | NSH | 76 | 72 |
| 23. | NHH | 64 | 76 | 23 | NL | 72 | 76 |
| 24. | RR | 64 | 72 | 24 | PR | 76 | 72 |
| 25. | SF | 64 | 76 | 25 | SA | 60 | 64 |
| 26. | SM | 60 | 72 | 26 | SW | 64 | 68 |
| 27. | SR | 68 | 76 | 27 | UA | 76 | 72 |
| 28. | UK | 84 | 92 | 28 | WS | 56 | 68 |
| 29. | AA | 60 | 76 | 29 | MY | 80 | 76 |
| 30. | NA | 64 | 76 | 30 | KA | 68 | 60 |
|  | NA | 64 | 76 | 31 | LS | 64 | 68 |


| TOTAL | 2064 | 2260 | TOTAL | 2056 | 2124 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MEAN | 68,8 | 75,3 | MEAN | 66,3 | 68,5 |
| LOWEST | 56 | 52 | LOWEST | 52 | 60 |
| HIGHEST | 84 | 92 | HIGHEST | 80 | 76 |

From the table above the mean score of pre-test and post-test of the experimental group were 68.8 and 75.3. Meanwhile, the highest score pre-test and post-test of the experimental group were 84 and 92 , the lowest scores pre-test and post-test of the experimental group were 56 and 52. In addition, the mean score pre-test and post-test of the control group were 66.3 and 68.5. Meanwhile, the highest score pre-test and post-test of the control group were 80 and 76. The lowest scores pre-test and post-test of the control group were 52 and 60 . Based on the data above, the difference of mean score between experimental and control group score were 7.

## D. Interpretation of the Data

To measure the students' reading ability who taught by using and without using context clue technique, the researcher has evaluated the data by using SPSS 16.0. The researcher evaluated the data to know whether tcount was bigger or smaller than $t$ table. Here was the result of analyzed the data by used $t$ test of SPSS 16.0;

Table 4.21
The Result of $t$-test

Group Statistics

| CLASS | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| EXPERIMENTAL | 30 | 75.33 | 7.581 | 1.384 |
| CONTROL |  |  |  |  |
|  | 30 | 68.53 | 4.783 | .873 |

Independent Samples Test

|  | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances |  | t-test for Equality of Means |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | F | Sig. | T | Df | Sig. (2tailed) | Mean Differen ce | Std. Error Differenc e | 95\% Confidence Interval of the Difference |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lower | Upper |
| Equal variances assumed | . 733 | . 395 | 4.155 | 58 | . 000 | 6.800 | 1.637 | 3.524 | 10.076 |
| Equal variances not assumed |  |  | 4.155 | 48.930 | . 000 | 6.800 | 1.637 | 3.511 | 10.089 |

Interpretation of the data above could be done by concerning on significant value (Sig). In this case, in interpreting significance value, when it was higher than 0.05 (Sig > 0.05), Ho was accepted while when it was lower than 0.05 ( Sig < 0.05 ) Ho was rejected. In other words, Ho is rejected if $\mathrm{Sig}<0.05$.

Table 4.21 showed that the result of output independent sample $t$-test was 0.000 . The researcher concluded that the significance value $<0.05(0.000<$ 0.05), so Ho was rejected and Ha was not rejected (accepted). It meant that Ha which stated that there was a significant difference on the students' reading ability those taught by using and without using context clue technique was not rejected (accepted). Whereas Ho which stated that there was no significant difference on
the students' reading ability between those taught by using context clue technique and without using context clue technique was rejected.

## E. Discussion

Regarding on the result of data analysis, the significant value of $t$-test was 0.000 . It was smaller than 0.05 , so based on those result, the null hypothesis (Ho) was rejected and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) was not rejected (accepted). It was found that context clue technique was effective to teach reading comprehension. The previous researchers also had proved that context clue technique can be effective and improve the students' ability in reading narrative text. It was supported by some researchers, such as Pribadi, his research was focused on improving reading comprehension by using context clue technique. The second research was conducted by Rahayu. The last research was conducted by Sasmita that focused on using context clue technique in reading ability. From the results of research that was conducted by Pribadi et.al, the researcher concluded that context clue was effective in teaching and learning reading purposed to teach students' reading comprehension. According to Shokoohi \& Askari (2010:17) context clue was a useful tool in learning and teaching of reading comprehension. In the other word, context clue is effective to teach reading comprehension through clue that the author added in the texts so that the reader understood the texts although the reader did not know unfamiliar or difficult word.

The result of this research showed that there was the improvement of students' score in pre-test and post-test from both groups. This reason was that the
recount and narrative texts has not been taught yet in the both groups. So, when students were taught recount and narrative texts in reading comprehension by any teaching strategy or technique, they got the improvement although the improvement for experimental group was higher than the control group. It can be predicted that the improvement may be bigger if the students in experimental group pay more attention in the classroom during the teaching and learning process. It should be noted that during in conducting this research, the students in experimental group became more active than control group.

