

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATION

In this chapter, the writer presents: (a) findings and (b) interpretation

A. Findings

The findings of this study were to analyze: (1) data descriptions; (2) prerequisite analysis; and (3) result of hypothesis testing.

1. Data Descriptions

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

a. Distributions of Frequency Data

In the distribution of frequency data, score, frequency, and percentage were analyzed. The scores were got from: (a) pretest scores in control group, (b) posttest scores in control group, (c) pretest score in experimental group, and (d) posttest scores in experimental group. The complete statistical can be seen in Appendix I.

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 (%) |
|--------------|-----------|----------------|
| 35 | 2 | 6,9 |
| 37.5 | 1 | 3,4 |
| 40 | 3 | 10,3 |
| 42.5 | 4 | 13,8 |
| 45 | 4 | 13,8 |
| 47.5 | 3 | 10,3 |
| 50 | 2 | 6,9 |
| 52.5 | 4 | 13,8 |
| 55 | 2 | 6,9 |
| 57.5 | 1 | 3,4 |
| 60 | 3 | 10,3 |
| Total | 29 | 100.0 |

Based on the result analysis of students' pretest scores in control group, it showed that there were two students got 35 (6.9%), one student got 37.5 (3.4%), three students got 40 (10.3%), four students got 42.5 (13.8%), four students got 45 (13.8%), three students got 47.5 (10.3%), two students got 50 (6.9%), four students got 52.5 (13.8%), two students got 55 (6.9%), one student got 57.5 (3.4%), and three students got 60 (10.3%).

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 (%) |
|--------------|-----------|----------------|
| 40 | 5 | 17.2 |
| 42.5 | 1 | 3.4 |
| 45 | 3 | 10.3 |
| 50 | 8 | 27.6 |
| 55 | 6 | 20.7 |
| 57.5 | 1 | 3.4 |
| 60 | 3 | 10.3 |
| 65 | 1 | 3.4 |
| 67.5 | 1 | 3.4 |
| Total | 29 | 100.0 |

Based on the result analysis of students' posttest scores in control group, it showed that there were five students got 40 (17.2%), one student got 42,5 (3.4%), three students got 45 (10.3%), eight students got 50 (27.6%), six students got 55 (20.7%), one student got 57,5 (3.4%), three students got 60 (10.3%), one student got 65 (3.4%), one student got 67.5 (3.4%).

3) Students' Pretest Scores in Experimental Group

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

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

| Scores | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|---------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| 32.5 | 3 | 10,3 |
| 35 | 2 | 6,9 |
| 37.5 | 6 | 20,7 |
| 40 | 4 | 13,8 |
| 42.5 | 2 | 6,9 |
| 45 | 5 | 17,2 |
| 47.5 | 2 | 6,9 |
| 50 | 1 | 3,4 |
| 52.5 | 1 | 3,4 |
| 55 | 3 | 10,3 |
| Total | 29 | 100.0 |

From the analyses above, it was found that there were three students got 32.5 (10.3%), two students got 35 (6.9%), six students got 37.5 (20.7%), four students got 40 (13.8%), two students got 42.5 (6.9 %), five students got 45 (17.2%), two students got 47.5 (6.9%), one student who got 50 (3.4%), one student got 52,5 (3.4%), and three students 55 (10.3%).

4) Students' Posttest Scores in Experimental Group

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

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

| Scores | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|--------------|-----------|----------------|
| 40 | 1 | 3,4 |
| 45 | 2 | 6,9 |
| 47.5 | 1 | 3,4 |
| 50 | 1 | 3,4 |
| 55 | 4 | 13,8 |
| 57.5 | 1 | 3,4 |
| 60 | 5 | 17,2 |
| 62.5 | 1 | 3,4 |
| 65 | 6 | 20,7 |
| 67.5 | 3 | 10,3 |
| 70 | 2 | 6,9 |
| 75 | 1 | 3,4 |
| 75.5 | 1 | 3,4 |
| Total | 29 | 100.0 |

From the analyses above, it was found that there was one student got 40 (3.4%), two students got 45 (6.9 %), one student got 47,5 (3.4%), one student got 50 (3.4%), four students got 55 (13.8%), one student got 57,5 (3.4%), five students got 60 (17.2%), one student got 62,5 (3.4%), six students got 65 (20.7), three students got 67.5 (10.3%), two students got 70 (6.9%), one student got 75 (3.4%), and one student got 75.5 (3.4%).

b. Descriptive Statistics

In the descriptive statistics, the total of sample (N), minimum and maximum scores, mean score, standard deviation were analyzed. The scores were got from; (a) pretest scores in control group, (b) posttest scores in control group, (c) pretest score in experimental group, and (d) posttest scores in experimental group. The complete statistical can be seen in Appendix M.

1) Students' Pretest Scores in Control Group

The result analysis of descriptive statistics of students' pretest in control group is described in Table 12.

Table 12
Descriptive Statistics of Students' Pretest Scores
in Control Group

| Pretest Scores | N | Min | Max | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|-----------------------|----------|------------|------------|-------------|-----------------------|
| | 29 | 35.00 | 60.00 | 47.5000 | 7.31925 |

In descriptive statistics of students' pretest scores in control group, it was found that the total number of sample was 29 students. The minimum score was 35.00, the maximum score was 60.00, the mean score was 47.5000, and the score of standard deviation was 7.31925.

2) Students' Posttest Scores in Control Group

The result analysis of descriptive statistics of students' posttest in control group is described in Table 13.

Table 13
Descriptive Statistics of Students' Posttest Scores
in Control Group

| Posttest Scores | N | Min | Max | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|------------------------|----------|------------|------------|-------------|-----------------------|
| | 29 | 40,00 | 67,50 | 50,9483 | 7,65943 |

In descriptive statistics above, it was found that the total number of sample was 29 students. The minimum score was 40.00, the maximum score was 67.50, mean score was 50.9483, and the score of standard deviation was 7.65943.

3) Students' Pretest Scores in Experimental Group

The result analysis of descriptive statistics in experimental group is described in Table 14.

Table 14
Descriptive Statistics of Students' Pretest Scores
in Experimental Group

| Pretest Scores | N | Min | Max | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|-----------------------|----------|------------|------------|-------------|-----------------------|
| | 29 | 32,50 | 55,00 | 42,2414 | 6,79235 |

In descriptive statistics on students' pretest scores in experimental group above, it was found that the total number of sample was 29 students. The minimum score was 32.50, the maximum score was 55.00, mean score was 42.2414, and the score of standard deviation was 6.79235.

4) Students' Posttest Scores in Experimental Group

The result analysis of descriptive statistics in experimental group is described in Table 15.

Table 15
Descriptive Statistics of Students' Posttest Scores
in Experimental Group

| Posttest Score | N | Min | Max | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|----------------|----|-------|-------|---------|----------------|
| | 29 | 40.00 | 75.50 | 60.4310 | 8.99079 |

In descriptive statistics on students' posttest scores in experimental group above, it was found that the total number of sample was 29 students. The minimum score was 40.00, the maximum score was 75.50, mean score was 60.4310, and the score of standard deviation was 8.99079.

2. Prerequisite Analysis

In prerequisite analysis, there were two analyses should be done. They were normality test and homogeneity test were analyzed.

a. Normality Test

In measuring normality test, *Kolmogorov-Smirnov* is used. The normality test is used to measure students' pretest and posttest in control and experimental groups. The complete statistical can be seen in Appendix Q.

1) Students' Pretest Scores in Control and Experimental Groups

The computations of normality used the computation in SPSS 22. The result of analysis is figured out in Table 16.

Table 16
Normality Test of Students' Pretest and Scores
in Control and Experimental groups

| No | Students' Pretest | N | Kolmogorov Smirnov | Sig. | Result |
|----|--------------------|----|--------------------|-------|--------|
| 1 | Control Group | 29 | 0.116 | 0.200 | Normal |
| 2 | Experimental Group | 29 | 0.147 | 0.113 | Normal |

After the data obtained from the scores of the 29 students in control group and 29 in experimental group, it was found that the p-output was 0.116 and 0.147. From the result of the p-output, it can be stated that the students' pretest control and experimental group were normal since they were higher than 0.05.

2) Students' Posttest Scores in Control and Experimental Groups

The computations of normality used the computation in SPSS 22. The result of analysis is figured out in Table 17.

Table 17
Normality Test on Students' Posttest Scores
in Control and Experimental Groups

| No | Students' Posttest | N | Kolmogorov Smirnov | Sig. | Result |
|----|--------------------|----|--------------------|-------|--------|
| 1 | Control Group | 29 | 0.140 | 0.150 | Normal |
| 2 | Experimental Group | 29 | 0.143 | 0.137 | Normal |

After the data obtained from the scores of the 29 students in control group and 29 in experimental group, it was found that the p-output was 0.140 and 0.143.

From the result of the p-output, it can be stated that the students' pretest control and experimental groups were normal since they were higher than 0.05.

b. Homogeneity Test

In the homogeneity test, the students' pretest and posttest scores in control and experimental groups were analyzed by using Levene Statistics analysis. The complete statistical can be seen in Appendix S.

1) Students' Pretest Scores in Control and Experimental Groups

Homogeneity test used to find whether the group was homogenous or not. The computations of homogeneity used computation in SPSS 22. The result of homogeneity test of students' pretest is figured out in Table 18.

Table 18

Homogeneity Test on Students' Pretest Scores in Control and Experimental groups

| No | Students' Pretest | N | Levene Statistics | Sig. | F | Result |
|-----------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|-------------|----------|---------------|
| 1 | Control Group | 29 | 0.190 | 0.665 | 8,043 | Homogenous |
| 2 | Experimental Group | 29 | | | | |

Based on measuring homogeneity test of students' pretest scores, it was found that the significance level was 0.190. From the result of the output, it can be stated that the students' pretest in control and experimental group was homogenous since it was higher than 0.05.

2) Students' Posttest Scores in Control and Experimental Group

Homogeneity test used to find whether the group was homogenous or not. The computations of homogeneity used computation in SPSS 22. The result of homogeneity test of students' posttest is figured out in Table 19.

Table 19
Homogeneity Test on Students' Posttest Scores
in Control and Experimental groups

| No | Students' Posttest | N | Levene Statistics | Sig. | F | Result |
|----|--------------------|----|-------------------|-------|--------|------------|
| 1 | Control group | 29 | 0.454 | 0.503 | 18.693 | Homogenous |
| 2 | Experimental group | 29 | | | | |

Based on measuring homogeneity test, it was found that the significance level was 0.454. From the result of the output, it can be stated that the students' posttest in experimental and control group was homogenous since it was higher than 0.05.

3. Result of Hypothesis Testing

In this study, independent t-test was used to measure a significant difference on students' reading comprehension score taught by using window notes strategy and who were not at SMP Muhammadiyah 4 Palembang. The analysis result of independent sample t-test is figured out in Table 20 and 21. The complete statistical can be seen in Appendix U.

Table 20
Result Analysis of independent Sample t-test from Students' Pretest Scores in Experimental and Control Groups

| Independent Sample t-Test | | | Ho |
|---------------------------|----|-----------------|-----------------|
| T | Df | Sig. (2-tailed) | |
| -1.581 | 56 | 0.120 | Accepted |

From the table analysis, it was found that the p-output was 0.120 and the t-value was -1.581. Since the p-output was higher than 0.05 level and the t-value (-1.581) was lower than t-table (1.673). It can be stated the null hypothesis (H_0) was accepted, and the alternative hypothesis (H_a) was rejected.

Table 21
Result Analysis of independent Sample t-test from Students' Posttest Scores in Experimental and Control Groups

| Independent Sample t-Test | | | Ha |
|---------------------------|----|-----------------|-----------------|
| T | Df | Sig. (2-tailed) | |
| 4.324 | 56 | 0.000 | Accepted |

From the table analysis, it was found that the p-output was 0.000 and the t-value was 4.324. Since the p-output was lower than 0.05 level and the t-value (4.324) was higher than t-table (1.673). It can be stated that there was a significant difference on students' reading comprehension score taught by using window notes strategy and those who were not at SMP Muhammadiyah 4 Palembang.

B. Interpretations

Based on the findings above, some interpretations were made as follows:

The researcher would like to interpret that window notes strategy was effective in teaching reading comprehension to the Eight Grade Students of SMP Muhammadiyah 4 Palembang. It was believed that the students' ability in learning reading comprehension before being a treatment or taught through window notes strategy was not in fair level. This condition means that teaching reading comprehension through window notes strategy could improve their knowledge about reading comprehension, it is related to Silver, et al. (2007, p. 207) who say that this strategy provides students with a powerful notemaking framework that helps them deepen comprehension by thinking as they read and learn, develop the capacity to reflect on and improve their performance as reader.

This strategy can give an easy way for students in understanding texts, especially facts, feelings, ideas, questions. The researcher found that the students were really interested. When the researcher taught reading comprehension through window notes strategy to the experimental group, the researcher used some texts taken from the books. The students were motivated to learn by responding the text into the window notes frame, the students could be active reader, students could use their power of thinking to express their feeling about the text in order they could combine between the opinion and their learning style to rise the big ideas from the text, it made students easier to understand and find the main idea or information in the text and they thought that reading is interested subject after they studied reading by using window notes strategy.

The researcher realised that window notes strategy could make students more interested in following the teaching-learning process. The researcher concluded that window notes strategy made student easier to comprehend the story given. It is related to Fitri (2013, p. 4) who mentions that window notes strategy can help students to understand and comprehend the text easily, it can make students to be motivated and interested in reading text to improve their ability. In short, there were ten meetings that the researcher did during the treatment. On the first and second meetings, the students were still confused about window notes strategy, but on the third meeting, the students started to understand the concept of window notes strategy and finally, on the fourth meeting till the tenth, they could apply window notes strategy in answering the questions by filling out the notes that the researcher had already prepared before.

According to Asaro and Chute (2010, p. 10), window Notes is a focusing and organizational strategy that students engage in during reading. As students read selected text, they are asked to focus their attention and organize their thoughts in four specific areas. During their reading, they react to text relating to: Facts, Feelings, questions, and Ideas.

Meanwhile, Waterman (2010, p. 109) states that this strategy may motivate students to record information from a variety of learning styles. This strategy of note making asks students to focus on the facts and concepts embedded in the information (mastery), how they feel about that information (understand), what questions they have about it (interpersonal), and what ideas come to their minds that they might draw to remember the topic (self expressive). It means that

this strategy not only about how the students understand and explain their opinion into four specific areas but also this strategy asks students to use their power of thinking to express their self so that the students can combine between the opinion and their learning style that rising big ideas.