CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATIONS

In this chapter, the writer presents : a). findings and b). interpretations

A. Findings

The findings of this study were to find out : 1. data descriptions, 2. prerequisite analysis, 3. result of hypothesis testing.

1. Data Descriptions

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

a). Distributions of Data frequency

In the distributions of data frequency, score, frequency and percentage were analyzed. The scores were got from : (1). Pretest scores in control group, (2). Posttest scores in control group, (3). Pretest scores in experimental group, and (4). Posttest scores in experimental group. To make it clearly, the writer presents table of comparison which is showing the improvement from pretest to posttest of students in experimental and control group in percentage, it can be seen in appendix 18.

(1). Students' Pretest score in Control Group

In distribution of data frequency, the writer got the interval score, frequency and percentage. The result of pretest scores in control group is described in table 14

Table 14
Distribution of Data frequency on Students' pretest scores in control group

Scores	Frequency	Percentage (%)
52.5	3	10.0
55	2	6.7
57.5	1	3.3
60	1	3.3
62.5	4	13.3
65	9	30.0
67.5	1	3.3
70	1	3.3
72.5	2	6.7
80	3	10.0
82.5	2	6.7
85	1	3.3
Total	30	100.0

Based on the result analysis of students' pretest in control group, it showed that there were three students who got the score 52.5 (10%), two students got 55 (6.7%), one student got 57.5 (3.3%), one student got 60 (3.3%), four students got 62.5 (13.3%), nine students got 65 (30%), one student got 67.5 (3.3%), one student got 70 (3.3%), two students got 72.5 (6.7%), three students got 80 (10%), two students got 82.5 (6.7%), and one student got 85 (3.3%).

(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 15

Table 15
Distribution of Data frequency on Students' posttest scores in control group

Scores	Frequency	Percentage (%)
55	1	3.3
60	5	16.7
65	1	3.3
67.5	8	26.7
70	7	23.3
75	3	10.0
80	2	6.2
82.5	3	10.0
Total	30	100.0

Based on the result analysis of students' posttest in control group, it showed that there was one student who got the score 55 (3.3%), five students got 60 (16.7%), one student got 65 (3.3%), eight students got 67.5 (26.7%), seven students got 70 (23.3%), three students got 75 (10%), two students got 80 (6.2%), and three students got 82.5 (10%).

(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 16

Table 16
Distribution of Data frequency on Students' pretest scores in experimental group

Scores	Frequency	Percentage (%)
12.5	1	3.1
15	1	3.1
17.5	1	3.1
27.5	1	3.1
37.5	2	6.2
40	7	21.9
42.5	4	12.5
45	2	6.2
47.5	4	12.5
50	3	9.4
52.5	1	3.1
55	1	3.1
57.5	3	9.4
65	1	3.1
Total	32	100.0

Based on the result analysis of students' pretest in experimental group, it was found that there was one student who got the score 12.5 (3.1%), one student got 15 (3.1%), one student got 17.5 (3.1%), one student got 27.5 (3.1%), two students got 37.5 (6.2%), seven students got 40 (21.9%), four students got 42.5

(12.5%), two students got 45 (6.2%), four students got 47.5 (12.5%), three students got 50 (9.4%), one student got 52.5 (3.1%), one student got 55 (3.1%), three students got 57.5 (9.4%), and one student got 65 (3.1%).

(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 17

Table 17
Distribution of Data frequency on Students' posttest scores in experimental group

Scores	Frequency	Percentage (%)
60	5	15.6
70	5	15.6
72.5	8	25.0
75	2	6.2
82.5	6	18.8
87.5	3	9.4
90	2	6.2
92.5	1	3.1
Total	32	100.0

Based on the result analysis of students' posttest in experimental group, it was found that there were five students who got the score 60 (15.6%), five students got 70 (15.6%), eight students got 72.5 (25%), two students got 75

(6.2%), six students got 82.5 (18.8%), three students got 87.5 (9.4%), two students got 90 (6.2%), and one student got 92.5 (3.1%).

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: (1). Pretest scores in control group, (2). Posttest scores in control group, (3). Pretest scores in experimental group, (4). Posttest scores in experimental group.

(1). Students' Pretest scores in Control Group

The result analysis of descriptive statistics of students' pretest in control group is described in table 18

Table 18
Descriptive Statistics of Students' pretest scores in Control Group

	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation
Pretest scores	30	52.50	85.00	66.4167	9.36987

In descriptive statistics of students' pretest scores in control group, it was found that the total number of sample was 30 students. The minimum score was 52.50, the maximum score was 85.00, the mean score was 66.4167, and the score of standard deviation was 9.36987

(2). Students' Posttest scores in Control Group

The result analysis of descriptive statistics of students' posttest in control group is described in table 19

Table 19
Descriptive Statistics of Students' posttest scores in Control Group

	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation
Posttest scores	30	55.00	82.50	69.4167	7.27191

In descriptive statistics of students' posttest scores in control group, it was found that the total number of sample was 30 students. The minimum score was 55.00, the maximum score was 82.50, the mean score was 69.4167, and the score of standard deviation was 7.27191

(3). Students' Pretest scores in Experimental Group

The result analysis of descriptive statistics of students' pretest in experimental group is described in table 20

Table 20
Descriptive Statistics of Students' pretest scores in Experimental Group

	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. deviation
Pretest scores	32	12.50	65.00	42.8906	11.79648

In descriptive statistics of students' pretest scores in experimental group, it was found that the total number of sample was 32 students. The minimum score was 12.50, the maximum score was 65.00, the mean score was 42.8906, and the score of standard deviation was 11.79648

(4). Students' posttest scores in experimental group

The result analysis of descriptive statistics of students' posttest in experimental group is described in table 21

Table 21
Descriptive Statistics of Students' posttest scores in Experimental Group

	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. deviation
Posttest scores	32	60.00	92.50	75.3125	9.60406

In descriptive statistics of students' posttest scores in experimental group, it was found that the total number of sample was 32 students. The minimum score was 60.00, the maximum score was 92.50, the mean score was 75.3125, and the score of standard deviation was 9.60406

2. Prerequisite Analysis

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

a). Normality Test

In the normality test, the total of sample (N), Kolmogorov-smirnov, significant and result were analyzed. The scores were got from : (1). Students' pretest scores in control group, (2). Students' posttest scores in control group, (3). Students' pretest scores in experimental group, (4). Students' posttest scores in control group

(1). Students' Pretest scores in Control Group

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

Table 22
Normality Test of Students' pretest scores in Control Group

No.	Students' pretest	N	Kolmogorov Smirnov	Sig.	Result
1	Control group	30	1.242	0.091	Normal

After the data obtained from the scores of 30 students in control group, it was found that the significance level was 0.091. From the result of the output, it can be stated that the students' pretest control group was normal. Since, it was higher than 0.025

(2). Students' Posttest scores in Control Group

The computations of normality used the computations in SPSS 16. The result of analysis is figured out in table 23

Table 23
Normality Test of Students' posttest scores in Control Group

No.	Students' posttest	N	Kolmogorov Smirnov	Sig.	Result
1	Control group	30	1.103	0.175	Normal

After the data obtained from the scores of 30 students in control group, it was found that the significance level was 0.175. From the result of the output, it can be stated that the students' posttest control group was normal. Since, it was higher than 0.025

(3). Students' Pretest scores in Experimental Group

The computations of normality used the computations in SPSS 16. The result of analysis is figured out in table 24

Table 24
Normality Test of Students' pretest scores in Experimental Group

No.	Students' pretest	N	Kolmogorov Smirnov	Sig.	Result
1	Experimental group	32	1.220	0.102	Normal

After the data obtained from the scores of 32 students in experimental group, it was found that the significance level was 0.102. From the result of the output, it can be stated that the students' pretest experimental group was normal. Since, it was higher than 0.025

(4). Students' Posttest scores in Experimental Group

The computations of normality used the computations in SPSS 16. The result of analysis is figured out in table 25

Table 25
Normality Test of Students' posttest scores in Experimental Group

No.	Students' posttest	N	Kolmogorov Smirnov	Sig.	Result
1	Experimental group	32	1.005	0.265	Normal

After the data obtained from the scores of 32 students in experimental group, it was found that the significance level was 0.265. From the result of the output, it can be stated that the students' posttest experimental group was normal. Since, it was higher than 0.025

b). Homogeneity Test

In the homogeneity test, the students' pretest and posttest scores in control and experimental group were analyzed by using Levene Statistics analysis.

(1). Students' Pretest scores in Control and Experimental Group

Homogeneity test used to find whether the group was homogenous or not. The computations of homogeneity used computations in SPSS 16. The result of homogeneity test of students' pretest is figured out in table 26

Table 26
Homogeneity Test on Students' pretest scores in Control and Experimental group

No.	Students' pretest	N	Levene statistics	Sig.	F	Result
1	Control group	30	0.300	0.586	74.957	Homogen
2	Experimental group	32				

Based on measuring homogeneity test of students' pretest scores, it was found that the significance level was 0.586. 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 computations in SPSS 16. The result of homogeneity test of students' posttest is figured out in table 27

Table 27
Homogeneity Test on Students' posttest scores in Control and Experimental Group

No.	Students' posttest	N	Levene statistics	Sig.	F	Result
1	Control group	30	3.740	0.058	7.351	Homogen
2	Experimental group	32				

Based on measuring homogeneity test of students' posttest scores, it was found that the significance level was 0.058. From the result of the output, it can be stated that the students' posttest in control and experimental group was homogenous since it was higher than 0.05

3. **Result analysis in measuring a significant difference in students' reading achievement taught by using 3H (Here, Hidden, in my Head) and taught by using strategy that usually used by the teacher of senior high school of Arinda Palembang**

In this study, independent t-test was used to measure the significant difference on students' reading achievement score taught by using 3H (Here, Hidden, in my Head) and taught by using strategy that usually used by the teacher of senior high school of Arinda Palembang. The analysis result of independent sample t-test is figured out in table 28

Table 28
Result Analysis of Measuring a Significant Difference on Students' Reading Achievement after being taught by 3H (Here, Hidden, in my Head) Strategy and Strategy that usually Used by the Teacher of Senior High School of Arinda Palembang

3H (Here, Hidden, in my Head) Strategy and Strategy that usually Used by the Teacher of Senior High School of Arinda Palembang	Independent Sample t-Test			Ho
	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
	2.736	60	0.009	Rejected

From the table analysis, it was found that the p-output was 0.009 and the t-value was 2.736. Since the p-output was lower than 0.05 level and the t-value was higher than critical value of t-table (2.000). It can be stated that there was a significant difference on students' reading achievement score taught by using 3H

(Here, Hidden, in my Head) strategy and strategy that usually used by the teacher of senior high school of Arinda Palembang.

B. Interpretations

Based on the finding in the previous section some interpretations were made:

In doing this research, the treatments had been done in 10 meetings. During the treatments 3H (Here, Hidden, in my Head) strategy had been applied by the writer. There were some problems that happened in the classroom. In the first meeting showed the students looked confused, what is 3H strategy and how to apply it because 3H is a new strategy for the students, beside that in first meeting the writer found that hard for the students to find explicit and implicit information. Although the information was clearly stated in the text, most of the students still had problem in allocating the answer of the questions. In the second meeting the writer found that still hard for the students to find explicit and implicit information then there were some male students who made noise in the classroom. Since they spoke in a loud voice, the other students tended to easily lose their focus, and the room become less conductive for teaching and learning process, but in the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth meeting the students looked more active than previous meetings, the students can find explicit and implicit information from the text. In seventh, eighth, ninth, and the last meeting the students looked accustomed to 3H (Here, Hidden, in my Head) strategy, felt enthusiasm and interested in learning process. Beside that, there are some factors that make 3H strategy better than teacher's strategy in teaching reading. First, by using 3H

strategy the students can answer the questions by using their background knowledge (westwood, 2001, p. 61), second, by using 3H the atmosphere in learning process are enjoyable and the students are not bored. Then, the procedure of 3H is easy and interesting to follow by the students. So, it can be assumed that 3H is recommended to English teacher to apply in teaching and learning reading at senior high school of Arinda Palembang.

Based on the result of the posttest scores in control and experimental group, it showed that there were progressions from the pretest in control and experimental to the posttest in control and experimental group. The mean scores of pretest-posttest in control group increased 3 points and the mean scores of pretest-posttest in experimental group increased 32 points. The students posttest mean score in experimental group was higher than the students' posttest mean score in control group. From the result analysis of measuring a significant difference from students' posttest scores in control and experimental group by using independent t-test, it was found that the value of t-obtained 2.736 and the p-output was 0.009. It could be interpreted that there was a significant difference between students' posttest scores in control and experimental group.

Finally, the null hypotheses (Ho) was rejected and the alternative hypotheses (Ha) was accepted. It could be interpreted that 3H (Here, Hidden, in my Head) strategy could increase the students' achievement in reading and bring advantages to teaching reading of senior high school of Arinda Palembang than the strategy that was used by the teacher. It is related to Graham and Wong in Westwood (2001, p.61) states that 3H (Here, Hidden, in my Head) strategy is a

strategy for teaching students' reading comprehension and increase children's metacognitive functioning related to the comprehension task.