CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATIONS

In this chapter, the writer presents: (1) findings and (2) interpretations.

4.1 Findings

This section describes the results of the pre-test and post-test scores from the samples before and after the experiment. The test of the pre-test and post-test were the same. There were 40 questions which were in mutiple choice form.

4.1.1 Data Descriptions

In data descriptions, there were two analyses. They were distributions of data frequency and descriptive statistics.

4.1.1.1 Distributions of Data Frequency

In the distribution of data frequency, score, frequency, and percentage were analyzed. The scores were obtained from: (1) pretest scores in control group, (2) posttest scores in control group, (3) pretest score in experimental group for SQ3R strategy, (4) posttest scores in experimental group for SQ3R strategy, (5) pretest scores in experimental group for ETR strategy, and (6) posttest scores in experimental group for ETR strategy.

1.   **Students' Pretest Scores in Control Group**

In distribution of data frequency, the writer got the interval score, frequency and percentage. The result of the pretest scores in control group is described in Table 8.

Table 8
Distribution of Data Frequency on Students' Pretest Scores
in Control Group

Scores	Frequency	Percentage (%)
37.5	1	0.8
40	1	0.8
47.5	1	0.8
50	2	1.7
52.5	1	0.8
55	1	0.8
57.5	2	1.7
60	6	5.0
65	1	0.8
70	8	6.6
75	2	1.7
77.5	1	0.8
80	3	2.5
Total	**30**	**100.0**

Based on the analysis of students' pretest scores in control group of 30 students, it showed that there were one student who got 37.5 (0.8%), one student who got 40 (0.8%), one student who got 47.5 (0.8%), two students who got 50 (1.7%), one student who got 52.5 (0.8%), one student who got 55 (0.8%), two students who got 57.5 (1.7%), six students who got 60 (5.0%), one student who got 65 (0.8%), eight students who got 70 (6.6%), two students who got 75 (1.7%), one student who got 77.5 (0.8%), and three students who got 80 (2.5%).

2.   Students' Posttest Scores in Control Group

In distribution of data frequency, the result of the posttest scores in control group is described in Table 9.

Table 9
Distribution of Data Frequency on Students' Posttest Scores
in Control Group

Scores	Frequency	Percentage (%)
37.5	1	0.8
45	1	0.8
50	1	0.8
52.5	3	2.5
55	11	9.1
57.5	3	2.5
60	1	0.8
62.5	1	0.8
65	5	4.1
67.5	1	0.8
70	1	0.8
80	1	0.8
Total	**30**	**100.0**

Based on the analysis of students' posttest scores in control group of 30 students, it showed that there were one student who got 37.5 (0.8%), one student who got 45 (0.8%), one student who got 50 (0.8%), three students who got 52.5 (2.5%), eleven students who got 55 (9.1%), three students who got 57.5 (2.5%), one student who got 60 (0.8%), one student who got 62.5 (0.8%), five student who got 65 (4.1%), one student who got 67.5 (0.8%), one student who got 70 (0.8%), and one student who got 80 (0.8%).

3.   Students' Pretest Scores in Experimental Group for SQ3R Strategy

In distribution of data frequency, the result of the pretest scores in experimental group for SQ3R strategy is described in Table 10.

Table 10
Distribution of Data Frequency on Students' Pretest Scores
in Experimental Group for SQ3R Stategy

Scores	Frequency	Percentage (%)
45	2	1.7
50	4	3.3
52.5	1	0.8
55	3	2.5
57.5	4	3.3
60	3	2.5
62.5	4	3.3
67.5	3	2.5
70	3	2.5
72.5	2	1.7
82.5	1	0.8
Total	**30**	**100.0**

Based on the analysis of students' pretest scores in experimental group for SQ3R strategy of 30 students, it showed that there were two students who got 45 (1.7%), four students who got 50 (3.3%), one student who got 52.5 (0.8%), three students who got 55 (2.5%), four students who got 57.5 (3.3%), three students who got 60 (2.5%), four students who got 62.5 (3.3%), three students who got 67.5 (2.5%), three students who got 70 (2.5%), two students who got 72.5 (1.7%), and one student who got 82.5 (0.8%).

4. **Students' Posttest Scores in Experimental Group for SQ3R Strategy**

In distribution of data frequency, the result of the posttest scores in experimental group for SQ3R strategy is described in Table 11.

Table 11
Distribution of Data Frequency on Students' Posttest Scores
in Experimental Group for SQ3R Stategy

Scores	Frequency	Percentage (%)
50	1	0.8
57.5	1	0.8
60	1	0.8
62.5	2	1.7
65	1	0.8
70	9	7.4
72.5	2	1.7
75	2	1.7
77.5	4	3.3
80	1	0.8
82.5	2	1.7
85	3	2.5
87.5	1	0.8
Total	**30**	**100.0**

Based on the analysis of students' posttest scores in experimental group for SQ3R strategy of 30 students, it showed that there were one student who got 50 (0.8%), one student who got 57.5 (0.8%), one student who got 60 (0.8%), two student who got 62.5 (1.7%), one student who got 65 (0.8 %), nine students who got 70 (7,4%), two students who got 72.5 (1.7%), two students who got 75 (1.7%), four students who got 77.5 (3.3%), one student who got 80 (0.8%), two student who got 82.5 (1.7%), three students who got 85 (2.5%), and one student who got 87.5 (0.8%).

5.   **Students' Pretest Scores in Experimental Group for ETR Strategy**

In distribution of data frequency, the result of the pretest scores in experimental group for ETR strategy is described in Table 12.

Table 12
Distribution of Data Frequency on Students' Pretest Scores
in Experimental Group for ETR Stategy

Scores	Frequency	Percentage (%)
37.5	1	0.8
40	1	0.8
42.5	2	1.7
45	1	0.8
47.5	1	0.8
50	3	2.5
52.5	1	0.8
55	4	3.3
57.5	2	1.7
60	3	2.5
65	4	3.3
67.5	1	0.8
70	4	3.3
72.5	1	0.8
80	1	0.8
Total	**30**	**100.0**

Based on the analysis of students' pretest scores in experimental group for ETR strategy of 30 students, it showed that there were one student who got 37.5 (0.8%), one student who got 40 (0.8%), two students who got 42.5 (1.7%), one student who got 45 (0.8%), one student who got 47.5 (0.8%), three students who got 50 (2.5%), one student who got 52.5 (0.8%), four students who got 55 (3.3%), two students who got 57.5 (1.7%), three students who got 60 (2.5%), four students who got 65 (3.3%), and one student who got 67.5 (0.8%), four students who got 70 (3.3%), one student who got 72.5 (0.8%), and one student who got 80 (0.8%).

6. **Students' Posttest Scores in Experimental Group for ETR Strategy**

In distribution of data frequency, the result of the posttest scores in experimental group for ETR strategy is described in Table 13.

Table 13
Distribution of Data Frequency on Students' Posttest Scores
in Experimental Group for ETR Stategy

Scores	Frequency	Percentage (%)
40	1	0.8
50	4	3.3
55	1	0.8
57.5	1	0.8
60	6	5.0
62.5	2	1.7
65	1	0.8
70	8	6.6
72.5	2	1.7
77.5	2	1.7
80	1	0.8
85	1	0.8
Total	**30**	**100.0**

Based on the analysis of students' posttest scores in experimental group for ETR strategy of 30 students, it showed that there were one student who got 40 (0.8%), four students who got 50 (3.3%), one student who got 55 (0.8%), one student who got 57.5 (0.8%), six students who got 60 (5.0%), two students who got 62.5 (1.7%), one student who got 65 (0.8%), eight students who got 70 (6.6%), two students who got 72.5 (1.7%), two students who got 77.5 (1.7%), one student who got 80 (0.8%), and one student who got 85 (0.8%).

4.1.1.2 Descriptive Statistics

In the descriptive statistics, the total of sample (N), minimum and maximum scores, mean score and standard deviation were analyzed. The results of the tests were presented in the form of scores ranging from 0 to 100 based on the result of each test. The maximum score for narrative reading by using SQ3R strategy in the pre-test of the first experimental group was 82.50, the minimum score was 45.00, the mean score was 60.2500, and the score of standard deviation was 8.93825. The maximum score for narrative reading by using SQ3R strategy in the post-test of the first experimental group was 87.50, the minimum score was 50.00, the mean score was 72.6667, and the score of standard deviation was 8.83111.

Next, the maximum score for for narrative reading by using ETR strategy in the pre-test of the second experimental group was 80.00, the minimum score was 37.50, the mean score was 57.7500, and the score of standard deviation was 10.71476. The maximum score for narrative reading by using ETR strategy in the post-test of the second experimental group was 85.00, the minimum score was 40.00, the mean score was 64.2500, and the score of standard deviation was 10.30044.

After that, the maximum score for narrative reading in the pre-test of the control group was 80.00, the minimum score was 37.50, the mean score was 63.3333, and the score of standard deviation was 11.45330. The maximum score for narrative reading in the post-test of the control group was 80.00, the minimum

score was 37.50, the mean score was 57.7500, and the score of standard deviation was 7.94241.

The following tables show the score distribution of the students' narrative reading scores by using SQ3R and ETR strategies in table 14.

Table 14
The Scores of the Students' Narrative Reading Text

Group	Score							
	Pre-test				Post-test			
	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Dev.
Exp. 1	45.00	82.50	60.2500	8.93825	50.00	87.50	72.6667	8.83111
Exp. 2	37.50	80.00	57.7500	10.71476	40.00	85.00	64.2500	10.30044
Control	37.50	80.00	63.3333	11.45330	37.50	80.00	57.7500	7.94241

4.1.2 Pre-requisite Analysis

In prerequisite analysis, there were two analyses. They were normality test and homogeneity test.

4.1.2.1 Normality Test

Normality test was done to know whether the results of the students' pretest and posttest in control and experimental groups are normal or not. In analyzing the normality, the writer used Kolmogorov-Smirnov test in SPSS 16. The data is obtained from the students' pretest and posttest in control and experimental groups. The test is considered normal whenever it is higher than 0.05. The data of normality test was figured out in Table 15.

Table 15
Data of Normality Test

No.	Group	Test	Kolmogrov-Smirnov Z	Alpha (α 0.05)	Result
1	Exp. 1	Pre-test	0.551	> 0.05	Normal
		Post-test	0.993	> 0.05	Normal
2	Exp. 2	Pre-test	0.643	> 0.05	Normal
		Post-test	0.977	> 0.05	Normal
3	Control	Pre-test	1.021	> 0.05	Normal
		Post-test	1.107	> 0.05	Normal

The Kolmogrov-Smirnov test of the pre-test and post-test results of narrative reading of the first experimental group (using SQ3R strategy) showed that Kolmogrov-Smirnov was 0.551 for pre-test and 0.993 for post-test. Since, 0.551 and 0.993 was higher than 0.05, so it could be concluded that the data were considered normal.

Meanwhile, the Kolmogrov-Smirnov test of the pre-test and post-test results of narrative reading of the second experimental group (using ETR strategy) showed that Kolmogrov-Smirnov was 0.643 for pre-test and 0.977 for post-test. Since, 0.643 and 0.977 was higher than 0.05, so it could be concluded that the data were considered normal.

Finally, the Kolmogrov-Smirnov test of the pre-test and post-test results of narrative reading of the control group showed that Kolmogrov-Smirnov was 1.021 for pre-test and 1.107 for post-test. Since, 1.021 and 1.107 was higher than 0.05, so it could be concluded that the data were considered normal.

4.1.2.2 Homogeneity Test

Homogeneity test was done to know whether the results of the students'
pretest and posttest in control and experimental groups are homogenous or not. In
analyzing the homogeneity, the writer used the Levene Statistics in SPSS 16. The
result is obtained from the students' pretest and posttest in control and
experimental groups. The test is considered homogenous whenever it is higher
than 0.05. The data of homogeneity test was figured out in Table 16.

Table 16
Data of Homogeneity Test

No.	Variable	Test	Group	N	Levene Statistics	Sig.	F	Result
1	SQ3R Strategy	Pre-test	Experimental	30	2.609	0.112	1.351	Homoge nous
			Control	30				
		Post-test	Experimental	30	0.548	0.462	47.318	Homoge nous
			Control	30				
2	ETR Strategy	Pre-test	Experimental	30	0.221	0.640	3.802	Homoge nous
			Control	30				
		Post-test	Experimental	30	3.298	0.075	7.492	Homoge nous
			Control	30				

From the table of measuring homogeneity test of students' pretest scores in
the first experimental and control group, it was found that the significance level
was 0.112. From the result of the output, it can be stated that the students' pretest
in experimental and control group was homogenous since it was higher than 0.05.

Second, based on measuring homogeneity test of students' posttest scores
in the first experimental and control group, it was found that the significance level
was 0.462. From the result of the output, it can be stated that the students' pretest
in experimental and control group by using SQ3R strategy was homogeneous
since it was higher than 0.05.

Third, according to the table of measuring homogeneity test of students' pretest scores in the second experimental and control group, it was found that the significance level was 0.640. From the result of the output, it can be stated that the students' pretest in control and experimental group by using ETR strategy was homogenous since it was higher than 0.05.

Finally, based on measuring homogeneity test of students' posttest scores in the second experimental and control group, it was found that the significance level was 0.075. From the result of the output, it can be stated that the students' pretest in experimental and control group by using ETR strategy was homogenous since it was higher than 0.05.

4.1.3   Hypotheses Testings

They are three hypotheses testings could be solved. They were :

4.1.3.1 Measuring a Significant Difference on Narrative Reading Text Between the Students' Who are Taught by Using SQ3R Strategy and Those are Not

From the table analysis, it was found that the p-output was 0.000 and the t-obtained was 6.879. Since the p-output was lower than 0.05 level and the t-obtained was higher than the t-table (1.672), it can be stated that there was a significant difference on the students' narrative reading text taught by using SQ3R strategy and not taught by using the teacher's method of MTs Paradigma Palembang.

Table 17. Group Statistics
Independent Sample t-Test: Measuring a Significant Difference of Students'
Posttest Scores in Control and First Experimental Groups
(SQ3R Strategy)

Posttest Conrol and First Experimental Groups (SQ3R Strategy)	Independent Sample t-Test			Ho
	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
	6.879	58	0.000	Rejected

4.1.3.2 Measuring a Significant Difference on Narrative Reading Text Between the Students' Who are Taught by Using ETR Strategy and Those are Not

From the table analysis, it was found that the p-output was 0.008 and the t-obtained was 2.737. Since the p-output was lower than 0.05 level and the t-obtained was higher than the t-table (1.672), it can be stated that there was a significant difference on the students' narrative reading text scores taught by using SQ3R strategy and ETR strategy of MTs Paradigma Palembang.

Table 18. Group Statistics
Independent Sample t-Test: Measuring a Significant Difference of Students'
Posttest Scores in Control and Second Experimental Group (ETR Strategy)

Posttest Control and Second Experimental Group (ETR Startegy)	Independent Sample t-Test			Ho
	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
	2.737	58	0.008	Rejected

4.1.3.3 Measuring a Significant Difference on the Students' Narrative Reading Text Between Those Who are Taught by using SQ3R strategy, ETR Strategy, and the Teacher's Method

According to the result of one way annova test for the students' scores of SQ3R strategy, ETR strategy, and the teacher's method on narrative reading text, it was found that the score of the p-value which was 0.000 was lower than 0.05 and the F-obtained was higher than the t-table (1.663). So, Ho (Null Hypotheses) was rejected and Ha (Alternative Hypotheses) was accepted. It can be stated that there was a significant difference on the students' narrative reading text scores taught by using SQ3R strategy, ETR strategy and the teacher's method of MTs Paradigma Palembang.

Table 19. Group Statistics
One Way Annova: Measuring a Significant Difference of Students' Posttest Scores in Control, First Experimental Group and Second Experimental Group

SQ3R Strategy, ETR Strategy, and the Teacher's Method of MTs Paradigma Palembang	One Way Annova			Ho
	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	F	
	87	0.000	20.366	rejected

4.2 Interpretations

In the previous chapter based on the results of statistical analyses, the writer made some interpretations. They were :

First, the writer interpreted that SQ3R and ETR strategies could increase the students' score in reading comprehension and bring advantages to understand narrative reading text at MTs Paradigma Palembang.

Second, in the first and second experimental groups, the students were given treatment by using SQ3R strategy and ETR strategy with the different class of each. In the first time when the writer taught the students, they felt confused to follow the learning process on narrative reading text. But, according to Cohen and Cowen (2008, p. 217), preservice and in-service teachers can use the successful DR-TA and SQ3R strategies to help students improve their reading comprehension ability of informational text, as well as narrative stories. In addition, ETR strategy promotes thoughtful reader response to narrative text. (Carr, Aldinger & Patberg, 2004, p. 90). In other words, the writer showed how strategy was going on. For example, the students could adapt and follow the learning process of narrative reading text by using SQ3R strategy for the first experimental group and ETR strategy for the second experimental group although the writer got some problems in managing and inviting the students to participate the learning process by using both strategies well. By the time, There were the differences between the first experimental group by using SQ3R strategy and the second experimental group by using ETR strategy. In the first experimental group by using SQ3R strategy, the students could follow quickly and enjoy the learning process of narrative reading text after second meeting because some of them could comprehend easier and fast. The students could answer the questions of reading comprehension well at the second to tenth meeting although only the first meeting, the students still felt difficult to answer the questions of reading comprehension. And in the second experimental group by using ETR strategy, the students could follow and enjoy the learning process of narrative reading text after

the fourth meeting, because some students felt confuse and passive in class. They were difficult to answer some questions of reading comprehension. So, the writer was difficult to manage and invite them for participating the learning process by using ETR strategy. In the begining of treatment for both experimental groups, the students were passive in joining the learning process, but after the students understood and could follow the learning process of narrative reading text, they became more active than before.

Third, before the students were given treatment, the students of first experimental and second experimental groups were given pretest, during did the pretest, the students felt difficult and confused to answer the questions. The result of pretest was not satisfying for them and the teacher. The students could not get the high score. So, the students were given the treatment. Then, after treatment, the researcher gave the posttest to the students. The result of posttest showed the significant difference from the result of pretest. The students got higher score than pretest score. It showed that SQ3R strategy and ETR strategy were able to help the students improved their reading skill especially in narrative text. It is supported by Gunderson (2009, p. 223) that SQ3R improves comprehension, retention, and learning from text. Gunderson also states that SQ3R improves reading comprehension because it establishes a kind of "content background knowledge". In addition, Schmitt (2013, p. 227) states that learners who were taught Experience-Text-Relationship (ETR) improved their reading skills.

Next, for control group, the students were given pretest and posttest only without treatment. But, the students in control group were taught by the teacher of

English at MTs Paradigma Palembang. The result of pretest of control group was better than the result of pretest in the first and second experimental groups, the students in control group got higher scores than pretest scores in experimental group. So that the researcher chose class VIII.C as a control group, VIII.a is as a first experimental group by using SQ3R strategy, and VIII.b is as a second experimental group by using ETR strategy. But, the result of posttest in control group was not better than result of posttest in first and second experimental groups. The students in control group got lower scores of posttest than posttest scores in first and second experimental groups. It was because the students in control group were not taught by using SQ3R strategy or ETR strategy.

The last, from the analysis of significant difference from the students' posttest scores in the first experimental, the second experimental and control groups (without treatment), the writer assumed that these strategies were effective in teaching narrative reading text because they let the students be active in class. Comparing two strategies between SQ3R strategy and ETR strategy, from the results, it could be seen that the mean score of posttest of SQ3R strategy was the highest among others because taught by using SQ3R strategy, the students could explore their prior knowledge more while they were studying. This strategy let the students be more active in class and they also could predict the text, they could produce more logical arguments during the class discussion and the test than ETR strategy. In other words, SQ3R strategy could encourage the students to be active, thoughtful readers, and enhance their comprehension.

It is supported by Cherry (2010, p. 107) that the SQ3R method is one of the best encoding strategies. Cherry also states that this encoding strategy is the way to encodes information and determines where it is placed in your long-term memory. It means that the students can memorize their information that they've read. So when they read narrative text in the next time, they do not need to read the text until the end but they can use their background knowledges or experiences. They also can use this encoding strategy when they recite the text without reading a note that they've made some questions in "Question" step.