CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATIONS

In this chapter presents: (1) findings; and (2) interpretations.

4.1 Findings

The findings of the research were to show about: (1) data descriptions; (2) pre-requisite analysis; and (3) result of hypothesis testing.

4.1.1 Data Descriptions

In the data descriptions, distribution of frequency data and descriptive statistics were analyzed.

4.1.1.1 Distribution of Frequency Data

In distribution of frequency data, score, frequency, and percentage were analyzed. The scores were got from; (a) pretest scores of hortatory exposition reading achievement in experimental group, (b) posttest scores of hortatory exposition reading achievement in experimental group and control group.

(a) Students' Pretest Scores in Experimental Group

In distribution of data frequency, the researcher got the interval score, frequency and percentage. The result of the pretest scores in experimental group is described in Table 9.

Table 9
Frequency Data of Students' Pretest Scores in Experimental Group

	Interval Score	***Category***	***N***	***Frequency***	***Persentage(%)***
Control Group	85-100	Excellent	32	0	0%
	75-84	Good		0	0%
	56-74	Average		10	31.25%
	<55	Poor		22	68.75%

Based on the result analysis of students' pretest scores in experimental group, it showed that 22 students (68.75%) were in poor category, and 10 students (31.25%) were in average category.

(b) Students' Posttest Scores in Experimental Group

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

Table 10
Frequency Data of Students' Posttest Scores in Experimental Group

	Interval Score	***Category***	***N***	***Frequency***	***Persentage(%)***
Control Group	85-100	Excelent	32	0	0%
	75-84	Good		3	9.3%
	56-74	Average		24	75%
	<55	Poor		5	15.7%

Based on the result analysis of students' posttest scores in experimental group, it showed that 5 students (15.7%) were in poor category, 24 students (75%) were in average category, and 3 students (9.3%) were in good category.

(c) Students' Pretest Scores in Control Group

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

Table 11
Frequency Data of Students' Pretest Scores in Control Group

	Interval Score	***Category***	***N***	***Frequency***	***Persentage(%)***
Control Group	85-100	Excellent	32	0	0%
	75-84	Good		0	0%
	56-74	Average		9	28.125%
	<55	Poor		23	71.875%

Based on the result analysis of students' pretest scores in control group, it showed that 23 students (71.875%) were in poor category, and 9 students (28.125%) were in average category.

(d) Students' Posttest Scores in Control Group

In distribution of data frequency, the result of the posttest scores in control group is described in Table 12.

Table 12
Frequency Data of Students' Posttest Scores in Control Group

	Interval Score	***Category***	***N***	***Frequency***	***Persentage(%)***
Control Group	85-100	Excellent	32	0	0%
	75-84	Good		1	3.125%
	56-74	Average		9	28.125%
	<55	Poor		22	68.75%

Based on the result analysis of students' posttest scores in control group, it showed that 22 students (68.75%) were in poor category, 9 students (28.125%) were in average category, and 1 students (3.125%) were in good category.

4.1.1.2 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; (1) pretest scores in experimental group; (2) posttest scores in experimental group; (3) pretest scores in control group; and (4) posttest scores in control group.

4.1.1.2.1 Students' Pretest and Posttest Scores in Experimental Group

The result analysis of descriptive statistics of students' pretest in experimental group is described in Table 13.

Table 13
Descriptive Statistics of Students' Pretest and Posttest Scores in Experimental Group

Students' Score	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation
Pretest Score	32	37.50	62.50	50.7031	7.41169
Posttest Score		42.50	80.00	62.8906	9.11639

In descriptive statistics of students' pretest scores, it was found that the minimum score was 32, the maximum score was 62.50, the mean score was 50.7031, and the score of standard deviation was 7.41169. In descriptive statistics of students' posttest scores, it was found that the minimum score was 42.50, the maximum score was 80.00, the mean score was 62.8906, and the score of standard deviation was 9.11639.

4.1.1.2.2 Students' Pretest and Posttest Scores in Control Group

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

Table 14
Descriptive Statistics of Students' Pretest and Posttest Scores in Control Group

Students' Score	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation
Pretest Score	32	32.50	70.00	50.7813	10.82182
Posttest Score		40.00	77.50	53.5156	9.60635

In descriptive statistics on students' pretest scores, it was found that the minimum score was 32.50, the maximum score was 70, the mean score was 50.7813, and the score of standard deviation was 10.82182. In descriptive

statistics on students' posttest score, it was found that the minimum score was 40.00, the maximum score was 77.50, the mean score was 53.5156, and the score of standard deviation was 9.60635.

4.1.2. Prerequisite Analysis

In the prerequisite analysis, normality test and homogeneity test were analyzed.

4.1.2.1 Normality Test

In the normality test, the scores were got from; (1) students' pretest scores in control and experimental groups; and (2) students' posttest scores in control and experimental groups.

4.1.2.1.1 Students' Pretest Scores in Control and Experimental Groups

The computations of normality used the computation in SPSS 20. The result of analysis was figured out in Table 15.

Table 15
Normality Test of Students' Pretest Scores in Control and Experimental Groups Using 1-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov

No	Students' Pretest	N	Kolmogorov Smirnov Z	Sig. (2-tailed)	Result
1	Control Group	32	0.124	0.200	Normal
2	Experimental Group	32	0.133	0.161	

From the table analysis above, it was found the p-output from students' pretest scores in control group was 0.200 and experimental group was 0.161. From the score, it could be stated that the students' pretest scores in control and experimental groups were considered normal since they were higher than 0.05.

4.1.2.1.2 Students' Posttest Scores in Control and Experimental Groups

The computations of normality used the computation in SPSS 20. The result of analysis was figured out in Table 15.

Table 16
Normality Test of Students' Posttest Scores in Control and Experimental Groups Using 1-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov

No	Students' Posttest	N	Kolmogorov Smirnov Z	Sig. (2-tailed)	Result
1	Control Group	32	0.126	0.200	Normal
2	Experimental Group	32	0.126	0.200	

From the table analysis above, it was found the p-output from students' posttest scores in control group was 0.200 and experimental group was 0.200. From the score, it could be stated that the students' posttest scores in control and experimental groups were considered normal since they were higher than 0.05.

4.1.2.2 Homogeneity

In measuring homogeneity test, Levene statistics was used. Levene statistics is a formula that used to analyze the homogeneity data, it was found in SPSS program. The homogeneity test was used to measure students' pretest scores in experimental and control groups, and students' posttest scores in experimental and control groups.

4.1.2.2.1 Students' Pretest Scores in Control and Experimental Groups

Homogeneity test was used to find whether the group was homogen or not. The computations of homogeneity used the computation in SPSS version 20. The result of homogeneity test of students' pretest is figured out in Table 17.

Table 17
Homogeneity Test on Students' Pretest Scores in Control and Experimental groups

No	Students' Pretest	N	Levene Statistics	Sig.	Result
1	Control group	32	3.660	0.060	Homogen
2	Experimental group	32			

Based on measuring homogeneity test of students' pretest scores, it was found that the significance level was 0.060. From the result of the output, it can be stated that the students' pretest scores in control and experimental groups were homogen since it was higher than 0.05.

4.1.2.2.2 Students' Posttest Scores in Control and Experimental Groups

Homogeneity test was used to find whether the group was homogen or not. The computations of homogeneity used the computation in SPSS 20. The result of homogeneity test of students' posttest is figured out in Table 18.

Table 18
Homogeneity Test on Students' Posttest Scores in Control and Experimental groups

No	Students' Pretest	N	Levene Statistics	Sig.	Result
1	Control group	32	0.099	0.754	Homogen
2	Experimental group	32			

Based on measuring homogeneity test, it was found that the significance level was 0.754. From the result of the output, it can be stated that the students' postest scores in experimental and control groups were homogen since it was higher than 0.05.

4.1.2.3 Result of Hypothesis Testing

In this research, independent sample t-test was used to measure a significant difference on eleventh grade students' hortatory exposition reading achievement taught by using Discussion Web strategy and strategy that usually used by the teacher at SMA IBA Palembang. Two-way ANOVA was used to measure a significant difference on eleventh grade students' hortatory exposition reading achievement in good, average, and poor category between those who are taught by using Discussion Web strategy and those who are not at SMA IBA Palembang.

4.1.2.3.1 Result Analysis of Independent Sample T-Test from Students' Posttest Scores in Control and Experimental Groups

In this research, independent t-test was used to measure a significant difference on students' reading comprehension score taught by using Discussion Web strategy and those who are not at SMA IBA Palembang. The analysis result of independent sample t-test is figured out in Table 19.

Table 19
Result Analysis of Independent Sample T-Test from Students' Posttest Scores in Control and Experimental Group

	Independent Sample t-Test						
Using Discussion Web Strategy and	Group	Mean	T	Df	Sig. (2tailed)	Ho	Ha
those who were taught by using	Control	53.5156	4.004	62	0.000	Rejected	Accepted
teacher's method	Experimental	62.8906	4.004	61.831	0.000	Rejected	Accepted

From the table analysis, it was found that the p-output was 0.000 and the t-obtained was 4.004. Since the p-output was lower than 0.05 and t-obtained (4.004)

was higher than t-table with df=62 (1.9990). It can be stated that there was a significant difference on students' hortatory exposition reading scores taught by using Discussion Web strategy and those who were not at SMA IBA Palembang

4.1.2.3.2 Result Analysis in Measuring Interaction Effects Using Two Way ANOVA from Students' Posttest in Experimental and Control Group

In this research, two way ANOVA was used to measure the significant interaction effects on students' hortatory exposition reading score in good, fair and poor category between those who are taught by using Discussion Web strategy and those who are not at SMA IBA Palembang. The analysis result of Two way ANOVA was figured out in table 20 below.

Table 20
Result Analysis of Two Way ANOVA from Students' Posttest in Experimental Group and Control Group

SS Reading Categories on Reading Scores taught using	**Two-way ANOVA**			**Ho**	**Ha**
	Df	**F**	**Sig. (2-tailed)**		
Discussion Web Strategy and conventional method	2	6.875	0.002	Rejected	Accepted

From the table analysis above, it is found that the p-output 0.002. Since the p-output was lower than 0.05, it can be stated that there is significant interaction effect of students' hortatory exposition score in good, fair, and poor category between those who were taught by using Discussion Web Strategy and those who were not at SMA IBA Palembang. So, it is concluded that the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected, and the alternatives hypothesis (Ha) is accepted.

4.2 Interpretations

On the basis of the findings stated previously, some interpretations could be drawn. Before conducting this research, the researcher interviewed the teacher of English of SMA IBA Palembang. Based on the interview, it was acquired that the students got some problems in learning English especially, hortatory exposition text. After conducting the research, it was found that the data of the students' pretest of control group and experimental group were normal and homogenous. In analyzing the normality test, 1-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used. From the result, it could be stated that the students' pretest and posttest scores in control and experimental groups were categories normal since the significant of normality test was higher than 0.05. Then, I analyzed the homogeneity of the sample data from pretest and posttest between control and experimental groups. In analyzing the homogeneity test, Levene statistics was used. From the result, it could be stated that the students' pretest scores in control and experimental groups and the students posttest scores in control and experimental groups were homogen. It emphasized that the abilities of the students were same. Therefore, the data can be proceeded by using t-test the hypothesis of the study.

From the result of t-test analysis, it was found that there was significant difference between the students' posttest score of control group who are taught by using the strategy that usually used by the teacher of English and the experimental group were taught by using Discussion Web strategy.

At the beginning, I had conducted the pretest in both control and experimental. After the students' pretest scores obtained from control and experimental groups, I chose XI IPS 1 as a control group and XI IPS 2 as experimental group. It was because the students' scores in control group were higher than the students' scores in experimental group. It was also proved by the mean of pretest in XI IPS 1 which was higher than XI IPS 2. It was because the students of XI IPS 2 did not focused in answering the questions.

I found that the students faced difficulties before the treatment in experimental group. The problems were the students did not like to read English text, especially hortatory exposition text. In fact, the students did not understand what hortatory exposition is. The students got difficulty to find the main idea in each paragraph and identify detail information of the hortatory exposition text. The last, some of the students got difficulties in conveying ideas of the text. Then, I applied Discussion Web strategy to help students in teaching and learning process of reading hortatory exposition text. After conducting Discussion Web strategy, I found that the students' reading hortatory exposition text achievement significantly difference. Teaching reading through Discussion Web strategy could help the students to convey their ideas by stimulating their background knowledge.

When the I did the treatment in experimental group, there was significant difference through Discussion Web strategy in 10 meetings. In the first meeting, the researcher focused in explaining about hortatory exposition text in order to make the students understand how to use Discussion Web strategy properly. In the

second to forth meeting, the students were still confused how to use the steps of Discussion Web strategy. They could not follow the procedure of Discussion Web strategy easily. I had to explain them again in order to make them comprehend the text given by using this strategy. Nevertheless, giving and getting the ideas from hortatory exposition text made the students interest and motivate to understand the text from different perspective so that it made them comprehend the text easily. Teachers can also incorporate physical movement to help students understand content in a different way or from a different perspective. In the fifth to eighth meeting, the students could adapt with this strategy. They became interested in answering the questions easily and correctly. In the ninth to Tenth meeting, they got used to apply Discussion Web strategy as their new strategy in learning reading skill. They also felt the advantages when they used the strategy. They got experience as they answered the questions in individual and group. This strategy can be as an alternative technique for students in understanding texts, especially hortatory exposition text. It made students easier to understand and find the main idea or information in the text and they thought that reading is an interested subject after they studied reading by using Discussion Web strategy.