TEACHING RECOUNT TEXT BY USING TEXT RENDERING STRATEGY TO THE EIGHTH GRADE STUDENTS OF MTs AISYIYAH PALEMBANG

UNDERGRADUATE THESIS

This thesis was accepted as one of the requirements to get the title of Sarjana Pendidikan (S.Pd.)

by

Fitriana
NIM. 10 25 0018

English Education Study Program

TARBIYAH FACULTY OF
STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY
RADEN FATAH
PALEMBANG
2016

Hal : Pengantar Skripsi

Kepada Yth

Bapak Dekan Fakultas Tarbiyah

UIN Raden Fatah Palembang

Assalamualaikum Wr. Wb.

Setelah kami periksa dan diadakan perbaikan-perbaikan seperlunya, maka skripsi yang berjudul **"Teaching Recount Text by Using Text Rendering Strategy to the Eighth Grade Students of MTs AISYIYAH Palembang"** ditulis oleh saudari Fitriana (10 25 0018) telah dapat diajukan dalam sidang munaqosyah Fakultas Tarbiyah dan Keguruan UIN Raden Fatah Palembang.

Demikianlah surat ini dibuat untuk digunakan pada semestinya. Atas perhatiannya terima kasih.

Wassalamualaikum Wr. Wb.

Palembang, 30 Maret 2016

Pembimbing I	Pembimbing II
Dr. Dewi Warna, M. Pd	Winny. A. Riznanda, M.Pd
NIP. 1974072319993 2 002	

TEACHING RECOUNT TEXT BY USING TEXT RENDERING STRATEGY TO THE EIGHTH GRADE STUDENTS OF MTs AISYIYAH PALEMBANG

This thesis was written by Fitriana, Student Number. 10 25 0018 was defended by the writer in the Final Examination and was approved by the examination committee on July, 28 2016

This thesis was accepted as one of the requirements to get the title of Sarjana Pendidikan (S.Pd.)

Palembang, July 28, 2016
Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Fatah Palembang
Fakultas Tarbiyah

Examination Committee Approval

Chairperson	Secretary
Hj. Lenny Marzulina, M. Pd	M. Hollandyah, M. Pd
NIP. 19710131 201101 2 001	NIP. 19740507 2001101 1 001

Member : Hj. Renny Kurnia Sari, M. Pd ( )

Member : Eka Sartika, M. Pd ( )

Certified by,
Dean of Tarbiyah faculty

Prof. DR. Kasinyo Harto, M.Ag

MOTTO

It is literally true that you can succeed best and quickest by helping others to succeed. –Napoleon Hill-

Dedication:

- **My beloved parents: Bastian and Sukmawati who always pray, support and love me very much.**
- **My beloved siblings Resti Arhantia and Rasiman who always support and advice for me.**
- **My big families**
- **My aimamater**

LETTER OF STATEMENT

Dengan ini menyatakan bahwa skripsi saya yang berjudul **"TEACHING RECOUNT TEXT BY USING TEXT RENDERING STRATEGY TO THE EIGHTH GRADE STUDENTS OF MTS AISYIYAH PALEMBANG"** adalah hasil karya saya sendiri. Apapbila skripsi tersebut dikemudian hari terbukti secara jelas dan nyata bukan merupakan hasil kerja saya maka saya bersedia diberi sanksi ole UIN Raden Fatah Palembang dalam bentuk pencopotan atau pembatalan gelar akademik, sesuai dengan pasal 70 undang-undang No. 20 tahun 2003 tentang system pendidikan Nasional yang berbunyi "Lulusan yang karya ilmiah yang digunakannya untuk mendapat gelar akademik, profesi, profesi, atau vokasi sebagaimana dimaksud dalam pasal 25 ayat (2) terbukti merupakan jiplakan dipidana penjara paling lama dua tahun dan/ atau pidana denda sebanyak Rp. 200.000.000,- (Dua Ratus Juta).

Palembang, November 2016
Yang menyatakan,

Fitriana
10250018

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The researcher would like to express great thanks to Allah SWT, for all of mercy and blessing to the researcher with health and power in accomplishing the thesis entitled "Teaching Recount Text by Using Text Rendering Strategy to the Eighth Grade Students of MTs Aisyiyah Palembang" as a partial fulfillment of requirements to get a bachelor's degree of Sarjana pendidikan (S.Pd).

The researcher would like to express her deepest gratitude to all who have given guidance, help, support, suggestion, and motivation in finishing this thesis, especially:

1. The Lord, Allah SWT, and my beloved prophet Muhammad SAW for giving me help and strength.
2. The Dean of Tarbiyah Faculty of UIN Raden Fatah Palembang
3. The Head of English Education Study Program, "Hj. Lenny Marzulina, M.Pd"
4. The Secretary of English Education Study Program, "M. Hollandyah, M. Pd"
5. My beloved advisors, " DR. Dewi Warna, M. Pd and Winny A Riznanda, M.Pd" who had given guidance, corrections, and suggestion in finishing this thesis.
6. My beloved examiners, " Hj. Renny Kurnia Sari, M. Pd and Eka Sartika, M. Pd."
7. My Lectures, Manallulaili, M. Ed, Annisa Astrid, M.Pd, M.Pd, Alhenri Wijaya, M.Pd, Benny Wijaya, M.Pd, and all the lectures that had taught researcher" thanks for precious knowledge.
8. The administration staff, "Yuniasari, S.Pd".
9. The head master of MTs Aisyiyah Palembang, " M. Fauzi, M.Pd" who had given permission to do the research, the English teacher of MTs Aisyiyah Palembang, "Wira Lestari, S.Pd", all the teachers and administration staff of MTs Aisyiyah Palembang.
10. All the eighth grade students of MTs Aisyiyah Palembang, thanks for their assistance and cooperation during the research.

11. The principle of MTs Paradigma Palembang who had given permission to do the Try Out of research instruments, all English teachers at MTs Paradigma Palembang and the eighth grade students.
12. All of my families who had given their pray and motivation to support me.
13. My best friends, " Hanik Habibah, Denny Agustin, Uliatul fadila, Sahran Imam and Yohana"
14. All my classmates of PBI 01 (2010) that I can not mention one by one. Thanks for your help, support and care.
15. Last but not least, "Mardian, M.Kom". Who always support, help, care, pray, and beside me.

Finally, thus any comments and suggestion will be humbly accepted to make this research better.

Palembang, Juni 2016

The researcher,

FB

ABSTRACT

The objectives of the study are to find out whether or not there is a significant difference on the eighth grade students' recount reading achievement of MTs Aisyiyah Palembang between those who are taught by using text rendering strategy and those who are taught by using text rendering strategy and those who are not and to find out whether or not there is significant improvement on the eighth grade students' recount reading achievement between those who are not before and after treatment at MTs Aisyiyah Palembang. The population of this study consisted of 95 students of MTs Aisyiyah Palembang in the academic year 2015/2016. The sample is 62 students which was taken by using purposive sampling. This research is a quantitative experiment study. One of the quasi-experimental design that is *pretest-posttest non-equivalent group design.* The instruments used in collecting the data were multiple choice recount reading test. Based on the result of the data analysis by using *Independent Sample T-test* revealed that there was a significant difference from the students' recount reading achievement. The p-output is 0.001 which was lower than 0.05 and t-value is 3.455 was higher than t-table 1.67065. Moreover, the *Paired Sample T-test* analysis, specified $\alpha = 0.025$, and level of significant is 0.000 and degree of freedom (df) is 30, the t-value is 14.335. Consequently, there was a significant improvement from the scores since the level of significance is lower than 0.025. Therefore, text rendering strategy can be an alternative strategy for English teacher to enhance their students' recount reading achievement.

Keyword: *Recount reading achievement, Text rendering strategy*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF APPENDICES

LIST OF DOCUMENTATIONS

1. Fotokopi Kartu Tanda Mahasiswa
2. Fotokopi Bayaran Terakhir
3. Fotokopi Kwitansi Bayaran Ujian Komprehensif
4. Surat Pengajuan Judul Skripsi
5. Surat Penunjukan Pembimbing
6. Surat Keterangan Pembimbing
7. Surat Permohonan Izin Tes Uji Soal dari Ketua Jurusan
8. Surat Keterangan Telah Melakukan Tes Uji Soal
9. Surat Keterangan Penelitian
10. Surat Keterangan Telah melakukan Penelitian
11. Rekapitulasi Nilai Ujian Komprehensif
12. Sertifikat BTA
13. Sertifikat OSPEK
14. Sertifikat KKN
15. Foto-foto

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents: (a) background, (b) problems of the study, (c) objectives of the study, (d) significance of the study, (e) hypotheses of the study, and (f) criteria of testing the hypotheses

1.1. Background

English is an international language and it is widely used in the world. It is very important for all people to master English in order to communicate with other countries especially in Indonesia, as a developing country. Harmer (2001, p. 1) states that English is not the language with the largest number of native or first language speakers, it has become a lingua franca. A lingua franca is defined as a language widely adopted for communication between two speakers whose native languages are different from each other's and where one or both speakers are using it as a second language. In teaching English, teachers should teach four language skills, (i.e. listening, speaking, reading and writing). Reading is one of the important skills that must be learned by students at schools.

Reading is important because it is one of the most frequently used language skills in everyday life to get the information (Medina, 2012, p. 81). It means that reading is important part that needs to be developed. By reading, students can get much information and knowledge, as well as it can improve their ability in English. According to Mikulecky (1998, p. 2), reading is very important for learning English. She further states that reading will help students learning how to use English, in terms of learning new words. Based on the

explanation above, it is clear that reading is essential skill in learning English. Therefore, the students must have ability in reading comprehension. In this context the researcher believes that the students will get benefits when learning reading. They will get more information, knowledge, new vocabulary about something.

After conducted an interview with one of the teacher of English and students of MTs Aisyiyah Palembang on February 8th, 2015 some information acquired on students' learning problems that happened when the teacher of English teachers reading comprehension to the students about the texts. For instance, they were not really enthusiastic in following the lesson given, only some of them were active. They had poor vocabulary. Moreover, the students were lazy to read very long texts, and they did not like the type of the texts given. That is why, they couldn't understand the content of the text and find the information inside it easily. Besides, many of them were unable to finish the exercises, because they tend to be confused about the texts they read.

The researcher also got the information from the teacher of English of MTs Aisyiyah Palembang about the Eighth Grade students' difficulties in learning reading text, especially in recount texts. Based on the data evaluation from teacher of English of MTs Aisyiyah Palembang, it was known that 50% of the total of the students got the lowest scores, under the criteria of KKM (7.0). It happened because the students did not understand what the texts were about, so they were unable to answer the questions given. Besides, they got less motivation to learn English, especially in reading.

In relation to the facts above, the researcher gets some information from an article NICHD is "Important Reading Facts", about students' problems in reading comprehension. It states that some qualification of the students who have problem in reading through research that most

children will learn to read, no matter what method is used to teach them. But unless they receive special help, at least 20% of them cannot master this simple task that the rest of us take for granted.

Additionally, the Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS) conducted in 2011 revealed that out of a total of 45 countries surveyed, Indonesia ranked 42nd in students' literacy rate. According to the PIRLS, Indonesia students scored an average of 405 in reading literacy, far below the mean International score of 500.

From the explanation above, the researcher presumes that they must be a better strategy or technique in teaching reading comprehension to students, particularly, the eighth grade students of MTs Aisyiyah, Palembang. One of the appropriate strategies that the researcher used in this research is Text Rendering Strategy. In this case, the researcher is sure that Text Rendering Strategy can solve such the problems and it was appropriate to be used in teaching reading recount texts. Since the researcher read the statement stated in the book of RTI for Middle Classroom written by Esteves and Whitten that Text Rendering strategy was suitable to be applied in teaching reading comprehension. That is why, the researcher used this strategy in teaching recount text toward the Eight Grade Students of MTs Aisyiyah Palembang.

Esteeves & Whitten (2014, p. 194-195), state that text rendering strategy is good at applying to the students in the middle class especially the eighth grade ones that enable them to parse their reading comprehension on any reading types. They further state that trough this strategy the students can achieve their personal best trough one of the reading text which will be explored in greater understanding to tackle their problems or challenges to strength their essential skill such as critical thinking, content area vocabulary and text comprehension.

This strategy does not only focus on the unfamiliar words in the reading texts, but also on the sentences that the students should know. It makes the students participate in learning activities, especially in reading comprehension. This strategy has a big role in increasing students' reading comprehension. There are some strengths of applying this strategy (i.e. it is easy for the students to understand the texts given, able to do the exercises in the texts). Thus, the researcher conducted a research entittled "Teaching Recount Text by Using Text Rendering Strategy to the Eighth Grade Students of Mts Aisyiyah Palembang**".**

1.2. Problems of the Study

Based on the general background of the study above, the problems was formulated as follows:

1. Is there any significant difference on the eighth grade students' recount reading achievement between those who are taught by using Text Rendering strategy and those who are not?
2. Is there any significant improvement on the eighth grade students' recount reading achievement before and after treatment?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

Based on the problems above, the objectives of this study illustrated as follows:

1. To find out whether or not there is a significant difference on the eighth grade students' recount reading achievement between those who are taught by using Text Rendering strategy and those who are not.

2. To find out whether or not there is a significant improvement on the eighth grade students' recount reading achievement before and after treatment.

1.4 Significances of the Study

This study is expected to give valuable input and contribution to some parties, as follows:

a) Students

The students are expected to be more motivated in studying English by using Text Rendering Strategy especially in reading recount texts, since it is interesting and enjoyable.

b) Teachers of English

They are expected to get valuable information of the effectiveness of teaching recount reading by using Text Rendering Strategy.

c) Next Researcher

Hopefully, this research can be used as a reference or guidance for any researcher to do ongoing deep research particularly related to their research in term of recount reading.

1.5 Hypotheses

The researcher proposed two hypotheses in this research. They are null hypothesis (H_o) and the alternative hypothesis (H_a). The hypotheses are as follows:

$(H_o)_1$: There is no significant difference between students who were taught using text rendering strategy and those who were not taught using text rendering strategy.

$(H_a)_1$: There is a significant difference between students who were taught using text rendering strategy and those who were not taught using text rendering strategy.

$(H_o)_2$: There is no significant improvement on the eighth grade students' recount reading achievement before and after treatment.

$(H_a)_2$: There is a significant improvement on the eighth grade students' recount reading achievement before and after treatment.

1.6 Criteria of Testing the Hypotheses

To prove research problem, testing research hypothesis was required as follows:

1. (H_o) The null hypothesis was accepted whenever the p-output was higher than 0.05 and the alternative hypothesis (H_a) was rejected.
2. (H_a) The alternative hypothesis was accepted whenever the p-output was lower than 0.05 and the alternative hypothesis (H_a) was accept.
3. If r-test was higher than r-table the null hypothesis (Ho) was rejected and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) was accepted.
4. If r-table was higher than r-test was the null hypothesis was accepted, and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) was rejected.

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter discusses: (a) theoretical framework; (b) previous related study; and (c) research setting.

2.1. The Concept of Teaching

According to Moore (2005, p. 4), teaching process is having a deep knowledge of the subject matter and a solid understanding of the principles of teaching and learning. In addition, Richards and Renandya (2006, p. 6) state that teaching is viewed as something that is constructed by individual teachers to integrate theory and practice in teaching and learning process for the students.

Teaching may be defined as showing or helping someone to learn, how to do something, giving instruction, guiding in the study of something, providing with knowledge, causing to know or understand (Brown, 2007, p. 8). In this context, the researcher thinks that teaching is such an activity that is not only considered as showing or helping students in the teaching-learning activity but also guiding them to follow the lesson in order they can get the knowledge of the materials given.

Concerning with the definition from the experts, it is clear that teaching is learning process between the teacher and students in transfering knowledge. The teacher must be active in giving some lesson for students and there are some interaction in the classroom when learning.

2.2. The Concept of Reading Comprehension

According to Nunan (2003, p. 68), reading is a fluent process of readers combining information from a text and their own background knowledge to build meaning. Komiyama (2009, p. 32) adds that reading is an important skill for English language

learners in today's world; it supports the development of overall proficiency and provides access to crucial information at work and in school. Reading is the fundamental skill upon which all formal education comprehends. In short, reading is such one of the important language skills that supply the information for students to develop their English proficiency. Like other experts, Brown (2007, p. 264) states "reading is a process interrelated with thinking, and with other communication abilities listening, speaking, and writing. In this case, reading is like a process that has something to do with other language skills, such as listening, speaking and writing and they are related one another. Meanwhile, according to Brown (2007, p. 366), reading comprehension is primarily a matter of developing appropriate, efficient comprehension strategies. Furthermore, Snow (2002, p.11) defines reading comprehension as the process of simultaneously extracting and constructing meaning through interaction and involvement with written language. In addition, Wolley (2011, p.15) defined reading comprehension as the process of making meaning from text. The goal, therefore, is to gain an overall understanding of what is described in the text rather than to obtain meaning from isolated words or sentences reading comprehension may appear to be both simple and obvious.

In summary, reading comprehension is like comprehending the texts, in which the students try to make meanings of the texts.

2.3. The Concept of Recount Text

In relation to teaching reading, there are some of the types of the texts (i.e. descriptive, narrative, recount, spoof). Indeed, recount text is such a text that tells about past event in term of nonfiction passages that is usually relate to experience,

childhood related to facts of lives, etc. According to Knapp & Watkins (2005, p. 224), basically it is written out to make a report about an experience of a series of related event. A recount is written out to inform an event or to entertain people. Recount text is text function as for telling an incident in the past.

A recount text has a social function. The purpose of a social function is to retell an event with a purpose to inform or entertain the readers (Siahaan and Shinoda, 2008, p. 9). Recount tells a series of events and evaluate their significance in some way. It is also to give audience a descriptions of what occured and when it occured. The story recount has expressions of attitude and feeling, usually made by narrator about the events. There are some types of recount text that a teacher of English usually teaches his or her students in the classroom. According to Keir (2009, p. 9), divided recount text into three common types in common. They are as follows:

a) Personal recount (is where the author is recounting an experience that they were involved in directly).
b) Factual recount (can be used to retell a particular incident or event, such as an accident or newspaper report).
c) Imaginative recount (is the retell of an imaginary event through the eyes of a fiction character, such as, the day in the life of Shrek).

In this study, the researcher will apply personal and factual recount texts in teaching reading comprehension to the eight grade students of MTs Aisyiyah Palembang.

In relation to concept and types of recount text, Stubbs (2000, p. 9) elaborates the three generic structures of a recount text. They are:

a) Orientation

It provides information about the setting (when & where) and introduces participants/character (who)

b) Events

It tells what happened, in temporal sequence (personal comment/expression of evaluation)

c) Re-orientation (optional):

It's closure of events (e.g. comments or conclusion).

2.4. The Concept of Text Rendering Strategy

Balajthy and Wade (2006, p. 12) define Text Rendering is a strategy of deconstructing text that allows students to make prediction regarding the importance of the text and connect them to students' prior knowledge, select the portions that are most meaningful to them. Similarly, Elbow (1999, p. 38) Text Rendering is a strategy for teaching students how to make predictions, which means, Text Rendering is a strategy that helps students to make prediction about something, such as a picture and a text students need to be provided with copies of text that they can mark-up with highlighting and notations. Students underline key pieces of text that resonate with them. Students often note phrases or sentences that they are important, interest them, they feel strong emotions about, lack clarity about, or connect to prior knowledge.

Moroever, Esteves and Whitten (2014, p. 193) adds that, Text Rendering strategy helps students clarify and expand their thinking about informational texts by breaking these texts into small parts, highlighting significant pieces and discussing them with peers. Moreover,

From the concept above, text rendering is consider as reading strategy that helps students clarify, expand their thinking about informational text as well as make prediction about something inside the text.

2.5. Teaching Procedure of Using Text Rendering Strategy

According to Esteves and Whitten (2014, p. 194)' proposed steps in teaching reading through text rendering startegy, text rendering consist of some steps. They are:

a. The teacher places students in small groups of 4 to 5 persons.
b. The teacher explains that this activity
c. The teacher helps the students identify how they are interpreting a reading's salient point
d. The teacher gives the students a chance to consider how and why their other friends have similar and different understanding and "take - away" from the same text.
e. The teacher asks each student to share one sentence from the document that he or she thinks is most significant.
f. The teacher asks each student to share one phrase that he or she thinks is particularly important.
g. The teacher asks each student to share a word that he or she thinks is very significant.
h. The teacher asks the students to discuss what they heard from each other
i. The teacher asks each group to interpret to texts.

j. The teacher asks the students to have their attention to the similarities and differences in their sentences, phrases and words.

k. The teacher asks the students to share and discuss any new insights about the reading.

l. Finally, the teacher takes glean from the students' discussion.

2.6. Previous Related Studies

There are some research discuss teaching recount reading, especially related to Text Rendering Strategy.

The first one was the study conducted by Rantini in 2012 which entitled "Teaching Reading through combining Text Rendering Strategy and Galery Walk strategy at the eighth grade students of Junior high school". In her study, she discussed about whether or not teaching reading using combining between Text Rendering Strategy and Galery Walk strategy was effective to improve the student reading comprehension. Her study used pretest – posttest group design and quantitative method. It was found that there was significant difference in reading comprehension by using Text Rendering strategy and Gallery Walk strategy. Researcher finds some similarities and differences between Rantini's study and the researcher's study. The similarities are on teaching skill and strategy. In other words, both Rantini's and the researcher focus on teaching reading and using Text Rendering strategy.While, the differences are on the sample of the study. In this case, Rantini' sample of study was eighth grade students of junior high school in West-Sumatra,while the researcher's sample of study were the eighth grade students of MTs AISYIYAH Palembang. Another difference is that Rantini's research used

combining between Text Rendering Strategy and Galery Walk to improving teaching reading, while the researcher's research only uses Text Rendering Strategy.

The second one was the study conducted by Gunawan in 2013 which entitled, "Teaching Reading Comprehension through Combination Text Rendering Strategy and Think Pair Share Strategy to the First Year Students of Junior High School**".** In his study, he discussed about whether or not teaching reading comprehension using combining between Text Rendering Strategy and Think Pair Share strategy was effective to improve the student reading comprehension. His study was used on group pretest – posttest design and quantitative method. In his study it was found that the interaction between students reading comprehension and text rendering strategy and think pair share was shown from the significance. 0,000 lower than 0,05. It means that text rendering strategy and think pair share were effective in teaching reading comprehension. Furthermore, it was found that there was significant difference in reading comprehension by using text rendering strategy and think pair share strategy. Researcher finds some similarities and differencess between Gunawan's study and the researcher's study.The similarities are on teaching skill and strategy. In other words, both Gunawan's and the researcher focus on teaching reading comprehension and text rendering strategy.While, the differences are on sample of study. In this context, Gunawan'sstudy was first grade students of junior high school in West-Sumatra,while the researcher's sample of study will be the eighth grade students of MTs Aisyiyah Palembang. Another difference is that Gunawan's research used combining between Text Rendering Strategy and Think Pair Share Strategy to

improving teaching reading, while the researcher's research only focuses on Text Rendering Strategy.

2.7. Research Setting

In this study, MTs Aisyiyah Palembang was chosen as research subjects. MTs Asiyiyah of Palembang was established in 1989 which is located on Jln. Balayuda Km 4.5 Kemuning Ario District Palembang.

The headmaster of MTs Aisyiyah of Palembang is Mr. Fauzi, S.Pd who are helped by twenty-nine teachers and four staffs. The total number of the students of that school are three hundred and eighten students. Class VII consist of one hundred and thirty nine students, class VIII consist of ninety six students, and class IX consist of eighty three students.

This research was implemented to the eighth grade students of MTs Aisyiyah Palembang. The treatment was conducted for about two months. The treatment was given twice a week, so there are twelve meetings altogether. Each meeting takes 70 minutes (2 x 35). The researcher applied the Text Rendering strategy to the students through oral and written instructions. Additionally, the researcher demonstrated Text Rendering Strategy to the students through whole-class, guided practice using the text book. The researcher used recount reading text as reading materials. The texts are taken from junior high school books and internet.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This chapter discusses: (a) method of the study, (b) variables of the study, (c) operational definition, (d) population and sample, (e) technique for collecting data, and (f) technique for analyzing data.

3.1 Research Method

In this study,quasi experimental design was chosen. Fraenkel, Wallen and Hyun (2012, p. 242) explain that quasi-experimental design which is not included the use of random assignment. It means that the subject research was taken non randomly from the population but it was taken in all subjects from the group naturally. Instead, quasi-experiment does not have randomly assigned groups. As we know, there are many research designs in quasi-experimental. One of the quasi-experimental designs is the pretest-posttest non-equivalent group design. Where the control group is given pretest-posttest and the experimental group is given treatment after pretest and before posttest. One group pretest-posttest in control group, The formula is suggested by Cohen, Manion & Morison (2007, p. 283) as follows:

Experimental	: O1	X
	O2	

Where:

------- = Dash line indicates that the experimental and control group have not been equated by randomization.

O1 = Pretests in experimental group

O3 = Pretests in control group

O2 = Posttest for the experimental group

O4 = Posttest for the control group

X = Treatment to experimental group taught using*Text Rendering* strategy

This study included two groups, mainly experimental group and control group. The experimental group were taught by using *Text Rendering* strategy. Meanwhile, the control group were not be taught by using *Text Rendering* strategy.

3.2 ResearchVariables

In this study, there are two kinds of variables, they are independent variable and dependent variable. Bell (2012, p. 1) states that independent variable is a variable that is manipulated by the researcher. The independent variable is something that is hypothesized to influence the dependent variable. Therefore, the independent variable of this study is Text Rendering strategy.

Then, Bell (2012, p. 1) mentions that dependent variable is a variable that is simply measured by the researcher. It is the variable that reflects the influence of the independent variable. Therefore, dependent variable of this study is the students' recount reading achievement.

3.3 Operational Definitions

To reduce misunderstanding between the researcher and the readers about the terms, the following operational definitions are defined. They are as follows:

3.3.1 Recount Reading

In this case, recount reading is a reading text that is used by the researcher in teching reading to the eighth grade students of MTs Aisyiyah Palembang in understanding recount text.

3.3.2 Text Rendering Strategy

This strategy help students clarify and expand their thinking about information texts with highlighting pieces and discussing them, especially recount texts.

3.4 Population and Sample

3.4.1Population

Fraenkel et, al., (2012, p. 66) state that a population is the group to which the results of the study are intended to apply. The population of this study is all of the eighth grade students of MTs Aisyiyah of Palembang. To be detailed, Table 1 illustrated below.

Table 1

Population of the Study

NO	CLASS	Male	Female	Total Students
1	VIII A	17	14	31
2	VIII B	16	15	31
3	VIII C	10	23	33

(Source: MTs Aisyiyah Palembang, Academic Year 2015/2016)

3.4.2 Sample

A sample is a small proportion of population selected for observation or analysis (Best and Khan 2009, p.13). In other words, a sample in a research or study refers to any group on which information is obtained. The sample consists of the students from the population who were chosen to participate in the study.

The sample of this study was selected by using purposive sampling procedure. According to Fraenkel et, al., (2012, p. 100), purposive sampling is different from convenience sampling in that researchers do not simply study whoever is available but rather use their judgment to select a sample that they believe, based on prior information will provide the data they need.The purposive sampling was used, **Class VIII A and VIII B were selected as the sample of the study. Class VIII A and VIII B were chosen based on observation and interview to English teacher, VIII A and VIII B have the same background knowledge and difficulties of reading ability and having the same amount of students conducted the pretest, the average scores of class VIII A was higher than class VIII B.**

Therefore, class A was selected as control group and class VIII B as experimental group. The total sample of the this study are 62 students out of 95 populations. The sample of the study is presented in table 2.

Table 2
The Sample of the Study

NO	GROUP CLASS	TOTAL
1	VIII A (control group)	31
2	VIII B (experimental group)	31
TOTAL		**62**

3.5 Techniques for Collecting the Data

3.5.1 Tests

In collecting the data, the researcher uses reading comprehension test in the form of multiple choice. The texts used is the recount texts there are forty items, in the form of multiple choice which cover four options, namely (a, b, c, and d), all of the questions are adopted from *Practice Your English Competence, 2009* written by Nurzaida and published by *Erlangga publishing company* and internet. The purpose of the test is to know the results in teaching by using Text Rendering strategy. There are two kinds of tests given the students, pretest and posttest. The test items in the pretest are the same as those of pretest, because the purpose of giving them is to know the progress of students' reading comprehension scores before and after treatment.

3.5.1.1. Pretest

Pretest is done before treatment are given. The pretest is administrated to know students' English reading comprehension before treatment.

3.5.1.2 Posttest

The posttest is administrated to control group and experiment group after pretest and treatment. The posttest is administrated to know and compare students' English reading comprehension scores before and after treatment. The researcher used score category to determine the result of the test. The score category was described in the following table 3.

Table 3
Score Category

Category	Score Interval
Very poor	≥ 46
Poor	56 – 65
Good	66 – 80
Excellent	81 – 100

(source: Buku Pedoman IAIN 2010)

3.6 Validity and Reliability

3.6.1 Validity of the Test

Frankel, et. al. (2012, p. 147) state that the validity is the most important idea to consider when preparing or selecting an instrument for use. In this research, content, each question item and construct validity was used.

3.6.1.1 Construct Validity

According to Fraenkel, et. al (2012, p. 148), the construct validity refers to the nature of the psychological construct or characteristic being measured. The researcher asked her lecturers Manalulaili, M.Pd as

Validator I, Mgs. Sulaiman, M.Pd as Validator II and Eka Sartika, M.Pd as Validator III to estimate her instruments. The validators were the lectures of English at UIN Raden Fatah Palembang. Based on the assessment carried out by validator I, II and III, the instrument can be used without revision. It means that the research instrument can be applied in this research.

3.6.1.2 Validity of each question item

To find out the validity of the test question items, the researcher analyzed the items of the tests by conducting a try-out in order to find out the validity of each question items. The instruments of the test was tested to 40 students (VIII A) of eighth grade students of MTs Paradigma Palembang. The result of the test was analyzed by using Pearson Correlation coeffecient formula. The result of significant score of Pearson

Correlation was compared with r_{table} (0.312), it means that the item is valid. From Pearson Correlation Formula, it was also found that there were only forty-one test items out of fifty were valid. Pearson Correlation in SPSS 20 showed that there were 9 questions were considered invalid. They are questions item number 1, 8, 14, 17, 23, 25, 30, 32, and 33, since the score of significance are lower than 0.312. Then, 41 questions item were considered valid. They are questions item number 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49 and 50, since the score of significance are higher than 0.312. Since there were 41 questions are considered valid, the writer just took 40 valid questions item.

3.6.1.3. Content Validity

Content validity refers to the content and format of the instrumental (Fraenkel, et. al. 2012, p. 148). In order to judge whether or not a test has content validity, a specification of the skills or structures should be made based on the curriculum and syllabus.

Table 5

Specification of the Test

Objectives	Test Materials	Indicators	Number of Items	Type of test	Answer Key
the students are able to understand the meanings in short simple essays in the term of recount text to interact with surrounding environment	Recount Text	The students are able; 1. To find out kind of the text	1 and 25	Multiple choice	C and C
		2. To find out reference word	6, 9, 15, 19, 24, and 32		A, D, C, D, D and B
		3. To find the detail and factual information	3, 5, 7, 12, 17, 21, 22, 28, 29, 38, and 40.		C, A, B, D, A, C, B, D, C, A and B
		4. To identify the purpose of the text	16, 30, and 36.		A, A and B
		5. To identify tenses of the text	13		B
		6. To identify main	8, 18, 26,		D, A, B, C

		idea	33 and 34.		and D
		7. To identify the generic structure of the text	4, 31 and 35		A, B and C
		8. To find out the synonym and antonym	2, 10, 11, 14, 20, 23, 27, 37 and 39		B, A, C, A, B, A, D, C, and A

3.6.2. Reliability of the Test

According Frankel, et. al., (2012, p. 154), reliability refers to the consistency of the scores obtained – how consistence they are for each individual from one administration of an instrument to another and from one set of items to another. The researcher estimate the internal consistency reliability of the test, it is a measure of the degree to which the items of parts of the test are homogeneous or consistency with each other. To find out the reliability coefficient of the test, the researcher will use Cronbach's Alpha to know the test reliable or not.

To know the test reliability or not in this study, the researcher was done try out for the eighth grade students of MTs Paradigma Palembang. Then, the researcher calculated the students' score by using Spearman-Brown Prophecy Formula found in SPSS 20 (Statistical Package for the Social Science) program. The scores of

reliability are obtained from tryout analysis which is done once using the instruments test. The school where the tryout conducted is different from the school where the research study were conducted. Therefore, split-half test method is used to obtain the scores of tryout analysis.

To measure the reliability test using split half method, it was found that the p-output of Gutman Split-half Coefficient is 0.717 from the score it can be stated that the reliability of reading test items is reliable since the p-output is higher than r-table (0,312) with sample (N) is 40 students. **The result analysis of reliability test was described in Table 6 (see appendix Y).**

Table 6
Result of Reliability Analysis Using Split Half

N	Guttman Split-Half Coefficient
40	0.717

3.6.3. Readability Test

Readability test is done to know the appropriate level of reading texts for students' class level in comprehending the reading texts. It means that readability test is done to put the

reading texts in an appropriate class meeting based on the difficulty level of each reading text during research treatments.

Readability test is measured using online readability test which is accessed From http//www.creadabilityformula.com. There are seven categories in reading text level. They are : (a) **very easy level** whenever the result of flesh reading ease score is within 90-100, (b) **easy text level** whenever the result of flesh reading ease score is within 80-89, (c) **fairly easy text level** when the flesh reading ease score within 70-79, (d) **standard text level** when the flesh ease score within 60-69, (e) **fairly difficult text level** when the flesh reading ease score is within 50-59, (f) **difficult text level** when the flesh reading ease score is within 30-49, (g) **very confusing text level** when the flesh reading ease score is within 0-29.

In this study, the researcher put the reading text level in a proper order (i.e. easy, fairly easy and standard). In order to make the students not to feel not to shocked and bored with the text given. So, the researcher gave the students a step by step reading text. For the first time, the researcher gave a preliminary or an introductory text with an easy level to attract their learning interest.

There are ten texts that the researcher used in this study. The text consists of recount text and the result analysis of readability test was described in Table 7.

Table 7

The Result of Readability Test for Research Treatments

No	Test Title	Text Type	Test Statistic			Flesh Reading Ease Score	Test Category
			Number of Sentences	Words per Sentences	Character per word		
1	My adolescence	Recount	8	10.5	4.0	75.5	Easy
2	Santolo beach	Recount	14	11.0	3.8	82	Easy
3	I lost my wallet	Recount	15	8.9	3.9	84.6	Easy
4	Visiting Bali	Recount	20	11.8	4.1	81.6	Easy
5	Visiting to the zoo	Recount	10	11.8	3,7	89.5	Easy
6	Our trip to the blue mountain	Recount	15	8.9	3.9	82.9	Easy
7	Fun Holiday	Recount	16	9.5	4.0	76.4	Fairly easy
8	My first experience ride Motorcycle	Recount	18	12.5	4.0	75.5	Fairly easy
9	Be the winner in English contest	Recount	28	18.0	4.3	67.8	Standard
10	My Grandpa's funeral in Toraja	Recount	24	11.8	4.4	69.3	Standard

3.7. Research Teaching Schedule

The writer did treatment to experimental group students suitable with English teacher schedule for eighth grade students'. The treatment was conducted in twelve meetings including the pretest and posttest. In this study, it presents the number of materials, kinds of materials, and time allocation are illustrated trough a table of teaching materials for research treatments. The table of teaching materials for research treatments is figured out in Table 8.

Table 8

Teaching Schedule and Materials for Research Treatments

No	Control Day/ Date	Experiment Day / Date	Reading text Title	Text Category	Research treatment meeting	Time Allocation
1	Tues, 24-11-15 (13.00 - 14.10)	Tues, 24-11-15 (16.45 - 17.45)	Pretest	Test	1st	2x35’
2	Thurs, 26-11-15 (15.45 - 16.45)	Wed, 25-11-15 (16.45 – 17.45)	My Adolescence	Easy	2nd	2x35’
3	Tues, 1-12-15 (13.00 – 14.10)	Tues, 1-12-15 (16.45 – 17.45)	**Santolo Beach**	Easy	3rd	2x35’
4	Thurs, 3-12-15 (15.45 - 16.45)	Wed, 2-12-15 (16.45 – 17.45)	I Lost My Wallet	Easy	4th	2x35’
5	Tues, 8-12-15 (13.00 – 14.10)	Tues, 8-12-15 (16.45 - 17.45)	Visiting Bali	Easy	5th	2x35’
6	Thurs, 10-12-15 (15.45 - 16.45)	Wed, 9-12-15 (16.45 – 17.45)	Visiting to the Zoo	Easy	6th	2x35’
7	Tues,12-1-16 (13.00 – 14.10)	Tues, 13-1-16 (16.45 - 17.45)	Our trip to the Blue Mountain	Easy	7th	2x35’
8	Thurs, 14-1-16 (15.45 -	Wed, 13-1-16 (16.45 –	Fun Holiday	Fairly Easy	8th	2x35’

	16.45)	17.45)				
9	Tues,19-1-16 (13.00 – 14.10)	Tues, 19-1-16 (16.45 - 17.45)	My first experience ride motorcycle	Fairly Easy	9th	2x35’
10	Thurs, 21-1-16 (15.45 - 16.45)	Wed, 20-1-16 (16.45 – 17.45)	Be the Winner in English Contest	Standard	10th	2x35’
11	Tues,26-1-16 (13.00 – 14.10)	Tues, 26-1-16 (16.45 - 17.45)	My Grandpa’s funeral in Toraja	Standard	11th	2x35’
12	Thurs, 28-1-16 (15.45 - 16.45)	Wed, 27-1-16 (16.45 – 17.45)	Posttest	Test	12nd	2x35’

3.8. Techniques for Analyzing the Data

Data obtained from the quasi experimental study is submitted using statistical analysis by using statistical package for the social science (SPSS) version 20. The researcher analyze the data from the test (pretest and posttset) between two groups experimantal and control groups using some techniques, as follows:

3.8.1. Descriptive Statistics

The researcher use descriptive statistic to find out number of sample, the score of minimal, maximal, mean, standard deviation and standard error of mean are obtained. Descriptive statistic are obtained from students’ pretest and posttest scores in control and

experimental group. Then, to get the result analysis of descriptive statistics SPSS Statistics Program Version 20 is used.

3.8.2. Independent Sample T-Test

Independent sample t-test was used for testing and finding significant difference between student's posttest scores in control and experimental whenever the p-output is lower than (0,05) level.

3.8.3. Paired Sample T- Test

Paired sample t-test was used to compare mean, standard deviation, standard error between pretest and posttest in experimental group and pretest and posttest in control group whenever the significance value of the t-obtained is 0,05.

3.9. Pre-requisite Analysis

Before analyzing the data, pre-requisite analysis is done to see whether the data obtained is normal and homogen. The following is the procedures in pre-requisite analysis.

3.9.1. Normality Test

Normality test is used to measure whether a data set resembles the normal distribution, (Harmon, 2011, p. 10). The data is classified into normal when the p-output is higher than 0.05. in measuring normality test, I-sample Kolmogorov Smirnov is used.

3.9.2. Homogeneity Test

Homogeneity test is used to measure whether the data obtained are homogenous or not. Martin and Bridgman (2012, p. 24) define that the score is categorized homogeny when the p-output was higher than mean significant difference at 0.05 levels. In measuring

homogeneity test, Levene Statistics in SPSS version 20 is used. The homogeneity test is used to measure students' pretest and posttest scores in control and experimental groups.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATION

This chapter presents: (a) findings, and (b) interpretation of the study.

4.1. Findings

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

4.1.1. Data Descriptions

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

4.1.1.1. 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 (see appendix G, H, and J)

1) Students' Pretest Scores in Control and Experimental Group

Table 9

Distributing Frequency Data and the Score Category of Students' Pretest Scores in Control and Experimental Group

	Scores Interval	Category	Frequency (%)
Control Group	81-100	Excellent	0 (0%)
	66-80	Good	3 (9.6%)
	56-65	Fair	6 (19.4%)
	47-55	Poor	11 (35.6%)
	≥46	Very Poor	11 (35.6%)
xperimental Group	81-100	Excellent	0 (0%)
	66-80	Good	0 (0%)
	56-65	Fair	2 (6.4%)
	47-55	Poor	12 (38.7%)
	≥46	Very Poor	17 (55%)

(Source: MTs Aisyiyah Palembang, Academic Year 2015/2016)

Based on the result above, it was found that there are 3 students in good category, 6 students in fair category, 11 students in poor category, and 11 students in very poor category. It can be concluded that the result of pretest in students' control group are in average level. It could be stated that the students' in control group do not need the treatment. Meanwhile, there are 2 students in fair category, 12 students in poor category, and 17 students in very poor category. It can be concluded the result of students' pretest in experimental group are in poor level. Therefore, the students' in experimental group need to be given treatment.

2) Students' Posttest Scores in Control and Experimental Group

Table 10

Distributing Frequency Data and the Score Category of Students' Posttest Scores in Control and Experimental Group

	Scores Interval	Category	Frequency (%)
Control Group	81-100	Excellent	0 (0%)
	66-80	Good	2 (6.4%)
	56-65	Fair	11 (35.5%)
	47-55	Poor	13 (42%)
	≥46	Very Poor	5 (16.2%)
Experimental Group	81-100	Excellent	2 (6.5%)
	66-80	Good	9 (29%)
	56-65	Fair	10 (32.4%)
	47-55	Poor	9 (29.1%)
	≥46	Very Poor	1 (3.2%)

(Source: MTs Aisyiyah Palembang, Academic Year 2015/2016)

Based on the result above, it was found that there are 2 students in good category, 11 students in fair category, 13 students in poor category, and 5 students in very poor category. It can be concluded that the result of students' posttest in control group are not improved. There were many students in very poor category.

Meanwhile, there are 2 students in excellent category, 9 students in good category, 10 students in fair category, 9 students in poor category, and 1 student in very poor category. It can be concluded that the result of students' posttest in experimental group are in good level. It could be stated that the result of students' posttest in experimental group are better than students' posttest in control group. The students' score had increased after the researcher did treatment for students.

3) Improvement Score from Pretest to Posttest in Experimental Group and Control Group

The result of improvement score from pretest to posttest in experimental group and control group is described in Table 11.

Table 11
Table of Improvement from Pretest to Posttest in Experimental group and Control group

1) Table of Improvement from Pretest to Posttest in Experimental Group

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP		IMPROVEMENT (%)
PRETEST	POSTTEST	
50	72.5	22.5%
52.5	62.5	10%
37.5	50	12.5%
45	72.5	27.5%
47.5	60	12.5%
40	52.5	12.5%
42.5	75	32.5%
45	70	25%
60	82.5	22.5%
47.5	65	17.5%
47.5	77.5	30%
47.5	62.5	15%
47.5	75	27.5%
47.5	60	12.5%
37.5	55	17.5%
40	55	15%
50	72.5	22.5%

42.5	60	17.5%
67.5	82.5	15%
30	50	20%
35	52.5	17.5%
37.5	60	22.5%
50	75	25%
47.5	50	2.5%
40	40	0%
35	60	25%
37.5	52.5	15%
37.5	60	22.5%
37.5	65	27.5%
35	55	20%
50	75	25%

From the analyses above, it was found that there were thirty students who got improvement from 2.5% to 25%, and one student have no got improvement.

4) Table of Improvement from Pretest to Posttest in Control Group

Table 12

CONTROL GROUP		**IMPROVEMENT (%)**
PRETEST	**POSTTEST**	
52.5	65	12.5%
52.5	60	7.5%
60	60	0%
45	62.5	17.5%
42.5	45	2.5%
45	52.5	7.5%

50	60	10%
52.5	62.5	10%
42.5	50	7.5%
37.5	55	17.5%
62.5	52.5	-10%
52.5	60	7.8%
50	50	0%
45	50	5%
60	50	-10%
57.5	65	7.5%
55	55	0%
52.5	67.5	15%
72.5	62.5	-10%
50	50	0%
42.5	42.5	0%
57.5	62.5	5%
67.5	60	-7.5%
70	70	0%
37.5	40	2.5%
40	42.5	2.5%
40	52.5	12.5%
60	50	-10%
52.5	52.5	0%
35	40	5%
55	50	-5%

From the analyses above, it was found that there were eighteen students who got improvement from 2.5% to 17.5%, and thirteen students had no improvement

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; (a) pretest scores in control group and pretest scores in experimental group, (b) posttest score in control group, and posttest scores in experimental group (see appendix K and L).

1) Students' Pretest Scores in Control and Experimental Group

Table 13

Descriptive Statistics of Students' Pretest Scores in Control and Experimental Group

	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation
Pretest Scores in Control Group	31	35	73	51.45	9.634
Pretest Scores in Experimental Group	31	30	63	43.95	7.410

Based on the table above, the descriptive statistics from students' pretest scores in control group there are 31 students who are in the group of pretest control. The minimum score is 35, the maximum score is 73, the mean score is 51.45, and the score of standard deviation is 9.634. Meanwhile, the descriptive statistics from students' pretest scores in experimental group found that there are 31 students who are in the

group of pretest experimental. The minimum score is 30, the maximum score is 63, the mean score is 43.95, and the score of standard deviation is 7.410. it can be stated the mean score of students' pretest in control group higher than the mean score of students' pretest in experimental group. It caused the students in experimental group had not given the treatment yet.

2) Students' Posttest Scores in Control Group

Table 14

Descriptive Statistics of Students' Posttest Scores in Control and Experimental Group

	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation
Posttest Scores in Control group	31	40	70	54.76	8.148
Posttest Scores in Experimental group	31	40	83	63.15	10.781

Based on the table above, the descriptive statistics from students' posttest scores in control group found that there are 31 students who are in the group of posttest control. The minimum score is 40, the maximum score is 70, the mean score is 54.76, and the score of standard deviation is 8.148. Meanwhile, the descriptive statistics from students' posttest scores in experimental group found that there are 31 students who are in the group of pretest experimental. The minimum score is 40, the maximum score is 83, the mean score is 63.15, and the score of standard deviation is 10.781. it can be stated the mean score of students' posttest in experimental group higher than the mean score of

students' posttest in control group. It shows that the students' score had increased after treatment.

4.1.2. Prerequisite Analysis

In prerequisite analysis, there were two analyses should be done. They were 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 (see appendix M, N, O, and P).

1) Students' Pretest Scores in Control and Experimental Groups

Table 15

Normality Test of Students' Pretest Scores in Control and Experimental groups Using 1-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z

No	Students' Pretest	N	Kolmogorov Smirnov	Sig.	Result
1	Control Group	31	0.575	0.895	**Normal**
2	Experimental Group	31	0.755	0.619	**Normal**

From the table analysis, it was found that p-output from students' pretest in control group is 0.575 and experimental group is 0.755. from the score, it could be stated that the students' pretest score in control and experimental group were considered normal since the result of the 1-sample kolmogorov smirnov z were higher than 0.05.

2) Students' Posttest Scores in Control and Experimental Groups

Table 16

Normality Test on Students' Posttest Scores in Control and Experimental Groups Using 1-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z

No	Students' Posttest	N	Kolmogorov Smirnov	Sig.	Result
1	Control Group	31	0.887	0.411	**Normal**
2	Experimental Group	31	0.729	0.663	**Normal**

From the table analysis, it was found the p-output from students' posttest in control group is 0.887 and experimental group is 0.729. From the score, it could be stated that the students' posttest score in control and experimental group were considered normal since the result of the 1-sample kolmogorov smirnov z were higher than 0.05.

4.1.2.2. Homogeneity Test

In measuring homogeneity test, Levene Statistics is used. Levene Statistics is a formula that used to analyze the homogeneity data, it was found in SPSS 20 program. The homogeneity test is used to measure students' pretest scores in experimental and control groups and students' posttest scores in experimental and control groups.

1) Students' Pretest Scores in Control and Experimental Groups

Table 17

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

No	Students' pretest	N	Levene statistics	Sig.	Result
1	Control Group	31	1.437	0.235	Homogen
2	Experimental Group	31			

In measuring homogeneity test, it was found that the p-output is 1.437. it can be stated that the students' pretest scores in control and experimental group were considered homogeny since the result of Levene Statistics was higher than 0.05.

2) Students' Posttest Scores in Control and Experimental Groups

Table 18

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

No	Students' Posttest	N	Levene Statistics	Sig	Result
1	Control group	31	2.755	0.102	Homogen
2	Experimental group	31			

Based on measuring homogeneity test, it was found the p-output is 2.755. From the result of the output, it can be stated that the students' posttest in control and experimental group was homogen since it was higher than 0.05.

4.1.3. Result of Independent Sample T-test

In this study, independent sample t-test was used to measure a significant difference on students' recount reading comprehension score taught by using Text Rendering strategy and who were not at MTs Aisyiyah Palembang. The analysis result of independent sample t-test is figured out in Table 19 (see appendix S).

Table 19

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

Using Text Rendering Strategy and Who Were Not at MTs Aisyiyah Palembang	Independent Sample t-Test			Ho
	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
	3.455	60	0.001	**Rejected**

From the table analysis, it was found that the p-output was 0.001 and the t-value was 3.455. Since the p-output was lower than 0.05 and the t-value (3.455) was higher than t-table (1.67065). It can be stated that there was a significant difference on students' reading comprehension score taught by using Text Rendering strategy and those who were not at MTs Aisyiyah Palembang.

4.1.4. Result of Paired Sample T-test

In this study, to measure the significant improvement on students' recount reading score taught by using Text Rendering Strategy before and after treatment, the writer used the paired sample t-test to analyze the result of students' pretest score and the result of students' posttest scores (see appendix T and U).

Table 20

Result Analysis of Significant Improvement on Students Reading Comprehension before and after being taught by using Text Rendering Strategy

	Paired Sample T-Test			Ha
Text Rendering Strategy	T	Df	Sig.(2-tailed)	
	14.335	30	0.000	Accepted

Based on the table above, it was found that the p-output is 0.000 with df=30 (2.457), and T-value= 14.335. it can be stated that there is significant improvement from students' pretest to posttest scores in experimental group taught using Text Rendering Strategy since p-output is lower than 0.025. It is concluded that the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted.

4.2 Interpretations

Based on the findings above, the researcher finally comes to following interpretation.

First, from the result of using independent sample t-test it shown that there was significant difference **Text Rendering strategy was effective in teaching recount reading achievement to the eighth grade students of MTs Aisyiyah Palembang.** The students who are taught by using Text Rendering strategy in experimental group have improvement score than control group. It means that Text Rendering strategy successfully improved students' reading comprehension achievement compared to those who are not. The result showed that the alternative hypothesis (Ha) was accepted and the null hypothesis (Ho) was rejected. Furthermore, from the result analysis using paired sample t-test, it show that there was a significant improvement from students pretest to posttest score in experimental group, it means that there was a significant difference on students' recount reading achievement who are taught by using Text Rendering strategy before and after treatment.

There were several factors that made Text Rendering strategy could improve the students' recount reading achievement. First, Text Rendering strategy can help students expand their thinking while reading the text. In other words, they can expand their thinking or ideas by having a discussion or share among other small groups to talk about recount reading in relation to language features or generic structures. After

that, each student from each group reread the text and highlighted the difficult words, in order they could comprehend the text given along the treatment.

The students can comprehend the recount text easily because in comprehending the students could focus on the text. It showed that when the researcher did the treatment in the experimental group. **there were ten meetings that the researcher did during the treatment. On the first and second meetings, the students were still confused about text rendering strategy, but on the third meeting, the students started to understand the concept of text rendering strategy and finally, on the fourth meeting till the tenth, they could be active readers apply Text Rendering strategy in answering the questions at the end of material that the researcher had already prepared before.**

While, the students read the text they can recite what they got from text with word, phrase, and sentence. It is related to Esteves and Whitten (2014, p. 193) state that Text Rendering strategy helps students clarify and expand their thinking about informational texts by breaking these texts into small parts, highlighting significant pieces and discussing them with peers.

Second, in the treatment class the researcher found some students have chance to discuss current events with a format that allows them to connect the event to their knowledge or experiences. They really enjoyed after the researcher explain what is recount text and using Text Rendering strategy. They are easy to comprehend, also share the information the text with peers. Likewise, Gunawan (2013, p. 12) concludes that Text Rendering strategy also involves the cognitive process to get meaning and information from the texts. It makes students more understand, more comprehend and develop their knowledge to get information on texts that the teacher showed up.

The other factors that improved the students' scores in control and experimental group were the technique that used in teaching recount reading. The control group still used teacher's technique. The teacher asked students read aloud, explain the material and students did the exercise. After all, the students feel bored and not comprehend the text well. Besides, in experimental group the students enjoy, active and easy to comprehend the text and did the exercise at the end of materials.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

This chapter presents: (a) conclusion and (b) suggestions

5.1. Conclusion

Based on the findings and interpretations presented in the previous chapter, the reseacher concluded that there was a significant difference on students' recount reading achievement taught by using Text Rendering strategy. The result could be seen from the improvement of the eighth grade students, as follows: the students become active readers in the class, the students were motivated and interested to learn especially in reading skill, the students were very enthusiastic in expressing their ideas about the recount texts and answer the questions given.

Therefore, it could be concluded that Text Rendering strategy was effective and successfully was applied to the eighth grade students of MTs Aisyiyah Palembang. The students also could increase their reading achievement. It also could

be seen from the result of the test, it implied that Text Rendering strategy could be used as an alternative strategy in teaching reading.

5.2. Suggestions

Based on the conclusion above and on the study that has been done, the researcher would like to offer some suggestions to the teachers of English and the students of MTs Aisyiyah Palembang: The teacher of English at MTs Aisyiyah Palembang can apply Text Rendering strategy as an alternative strategy to improve students' recount reading text. The Text Rendering strategy does not only improve the students' recount reading achievement but also stimulate students to be active in teaching English activity. Teachers as facilitator for the students to make the atmosphere in the class were enjoy, active and enthusiastic. Furthermore, the teacher must also be active and well prepare the material in order to make the strategy applied effectively.

The researcher suggests and motivates the students to improve their vocabulary, grammar, other aspects of reading in order to comprehend reading text

by using text rendering strategy will enhance their reading recount text comprehension ability. Besides, the students should also practice reading more.

For other researchers who want to conduct the research in teaching reading can use the result of this research as a basic way for conducting the research and as an additional references for further relavant research certainly with different variables and conditions. The other researchers also can consider the weaknesses of the result from this research to conduct a better research.

REFERENCES

Balajhty, E & Wade. S. L (2006). *Struggling readers assessment and instruction in grades k-6.* New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Bell, B. (2012). *Independent variable and dependent variable*. Retrieved from: http://www.psychologyandsociety.com/index.html.

Best, J. W & Khan, J. V. (2009). *Research in education (7th Ed)*. Boston, MA: Allyn and bacon.

Brown, D. H. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. New York, NY: Pearson Education.

Cohen, L., Manion, L, & Morisson, K. (2007). *Research method in education*. London, UK: Routledge.

Elbow, P. (1999). *Everyone can write: essays toward a hopeful theory of writing and teaching writing.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Esteves, K. J. & Whitten, E. (2014). *RTI in middle school classroom: Proven tools and strategies.* Minneapolis, MN: Free Spirit Publishing Inc.

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research.* New York, NY : Mcgraw Hall, Inc.

Gunawan, H. (2013). *Teaching reading comprehension trough combination of text rendering strategy and think pair share strategy to the first year students of junior high school. Vol 2. No. 2*. Retrieved from: http://ejournal-s1.stkip-pgri-sumbar.ac.id

Harmer, J. (2007). The practice of English language teaching (3rd ed). Cambridge, UK: Longman, Inc.

Harmon, M. (2011). *Normality testing in excel the complete guide*. Retrieved from: http://excelmasterseries.com

Keir, J. (2009). *Text types book 3 informative texts*. Sydney, NSW: Ready-Ed publications.

Knapp, P., & Watkins, M. (2005). *Genre, text, grammar*. Australia: University of New South Wales Press ltd.

Komiyama, R. (2009). *ETF motivating students to read*. Sacramento: TESOL teacher education of California State University. Boston, MA: University of Hongkong.

Martin, W. E & Bridgmon, K. D. (2012). Quantitative & statistical research methods from hypothesis to results. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass A willey imprint.

Medina, L. S. (2012). *Effect of strategy instruction in an EFL reading comprehension course: A case study*. Retrieved from: http://redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=169224317006

Mikulecky, B. S & Jeffries, L. (1998). *Reading power (2nd edition)*. New York, NY : Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.

Moore, D. K. (2005). *Effective instructional strategies: from theory to practice*. New Delhi, India: Sage Publication, Inc.

NICHD. (2002). Important reading facts. Retrieved from: www.readingnowerie.com

Nunan, D. (2003). *Second language teaching & learning*. New York, NY: Mc Graw Hill.

PIRLS. (2011). *International results in reading*. Boston, MA: Printed and bound in the United States.

Rantini, D. (2013). *Teaching reading through combining text rendering strategy and gallery walk strategy at grade eighth students of junior high school. Vol 2. No. 2*. Retrieved on March 2nd 2015 from: http://ejournal-s1.stkip-pgri-sumbar.ac.id

Richards. J. C & Renandya, W. A. (2002). *Methodology in language teaching*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Siahaan, S., & Shinoda. K. (2008). *Generic text structure*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.

Snow, C. E. (2002). *Reading for understanding: toward a research and development program in reading comprehension*. Santa Monica: RAND.

Stubbs. S. (2000). *Targeting text: recount, information report & explanation*. Sydney, NSW: Blake Education.

Wolley, G. (2011). *Reading comprehension: Assisting children with learning difficulties*. DOI 10. 1007/978-94-007-1174-7_22.

Zaida, N. (2009). Practice your English competence. Jakarta, Indonesia: Erlangga

APPENDIX A

NAMES OF STUDENTS' TRY OUT

No	Name
1	Ali Emron
2	Arifin
3	Asna Susilawati

4	Agustina
5	Anelka Delvo Rizi
6	Ahmad Zulfikar. S
7	Budimin
8	Bebi Rizki
9	Bella Safitri
10	Dian sawitri
11	Diki Agustian
12	Emi
13	Erik Ferdiansyah
14	Fitriani
15	Gebby Pareran
16	Iin Sarmila
17	Ilis Karlina
18	Julismanto
19	Laina Ashari
20	M. Akmal Kiran
21	M. Arjun Cakra Jingga
22	M. Lika
23	Minti Maryani
24	M. Rafli
25	Muji Patra Wijaya
26	M. Rizki Fadhillah
27	M. Redho Ramdani
28	M. Apri
29	M. Setiawan
30	Nurwani
31	Okta Via Warzana
32	Poniem
33	Putra Hartono
34	Rahmat Diantoro
35	Rina Karunia
36	Riska Yanti
37	Riki Saputra
38	Rani Hariyanti
39	Rani
40	Riza Umami

APPENDIX B

STUDENTS' NAME IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP

No	Name
1	Adhetia Riska. P
2	Anisa
3	Anjeli
4	Aprila
5	Arsil Azhim
6	Desfer Ananda
7	Dinda Sayyidah. A
8	Dzarril Khiffari
9	Erik Domika
10	Hani Oktarina
11	Irdiansyah
12	Khoirunisa
13	M. Septa Perdana
14	M. Sirod Syamsudin
15	M. Syahrul Afandi
16	Nadia Sabila
17	Novi Sartika
18	Nurbaiti
19	Okta Marisa
20	Prengki Tornando
21	Rafli Riduan Idris
22	Reza Agustina
23	Ridho Rizki Saputra
24	Riki Marten

25	Septian Agung Rizki
26	Septian Dwi Rizki
27	Umi Amelia Soleha
28	Yeni Oktaviani
29	Shinta Ayudia. P
30	Nurhaliza
31	Atia Fadila

APPENDIX C

STUDENTS' NAME IN CONTROL GROUP

No	**Name**
1	Andri Afriansyah
2	Andro Alfala
3	Bella Berliana Safitri
4	Chandra Wijaya
5	Cici Pitriani
6	Dedi Saputra
7	Deni Saputra
8	Elsa Miranda Dwita. P
9	Eltriando
10	Fajri Meldianto
11	Hakiki Wulandari
12	Indah Purnama Sari
13	Jasliha
14	Laksmana Andika Putra
15	Lestari Agustin
16	M. Dimas Eko Prasetio
17	M. Erlangga
18	M. Hari Ardiansyah
19	M. Jumadil
20	M. Prayudha. H

21	M. Rizki Kurniawan
22	Nadia Juli Anggaraini
23	Niken Dwi Amanda
24	Pebrian Widana
25	Poppy Pingky. D.S
26	Rahma Fitria
27	Renita Jesica
28	Siti Fatimah
29	Sofyan Tegar Ariangga
30	Widi Kurniawan
31	Yandre M. Nasir

APPENDIX E

STUDENTS' PRETEST AND POSTTEST SCORE IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP

No	**Score**	
1	50	72.5
2	52.5	62.5
3	37.5	50
4	45	72.5
5	47.5	60
6	40	52.5
7	42.5	75
8	45	70
9	60	82.5
10	47.5	65
11	47.5	77.5
12	47.5	62.5
13	47.5	75
14	47.5	60
15	37.5	55
16	40	55
17	50	72.5
18	42.5	60
19	67.5	82.5
20	30	50
21	35	52.5
22	37.5	60
23	50	75
24	47.5	50

25	40	40
26	35	60
27	37.5	52.5
28	37.5	60
29	37.5	65
30	35	55
31	50	75

APPENDIX F

STUDENTS' PRETEST AND POSTTEST SCORE IN CONTROL GROUP

No	**Score**	
1	52.5	65
2	52.5	60
3	60	60
4	45	62.5
5	42.5	45
6	45	52.5
7	50	60
8	52.5	62.5
9	42.5	50
10	37.5	55
11	62.5	52.5
12	52.5	60
13	50	50
14	45	50
15	60	50
16	57.5	65
17	55	55
18	52.5	67.5
19	72.5	62.5

20	50	50
21	42.5	42.5
22	57.5	62.5
23	67.5	60
24	70	70
25	37.5	40
26	40	42.5
27	40	52.5
28	60	50
29	52.5	52.5
30	35	40
31	55	50

APPENDIX G

DISTRIBUTIONS OF DATA FREQUENCIES ON STUDENTS' PRETEST SCORE IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP

Frequencies

Statistics

pretest_experiment

N	Valid	31
	Missing	0

pretest_experiment

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	30	1	3.2	3.2	3.2
	35	3	9.7	9.7	12.9
	38	6	19.4	19.4	32.3
	40	3	9.7	9.7	41.9

	43	2	6.5	6.5	48.4
	45	2	6.5	6.5	54.8
	48	7	22.6	22.6	77.4
	50	4	12.9	12.9	90.3
	53	1	3.2	3.2	93.5
	60	1	3.2	3.2	96.8
	63	1	3.2	3.2	100.0
	Total	31	100.0	100.0	

APPENDIX H

DISTRIBUTION OF DATA FREQUENCY ON STUDENTS' PRETEST SCORE IN CONTROL GROUP

Frequencies

Statistics

Pretest_control

N	Valid	31
	Missing	0

Pretest_control

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	35	1	3.2	3.2	3.2
	38	2	6.5	6.5	9.7
	40	2	6.5	6.5	16.1

	43	3	9.7	9.7	25.8
	45	3	9.7	9.7	35.5
	50	3	9.7	9.7	45.2
	53	6	19.4	19.4	64.5
	55	2	6.5	6.5	71.0
	58	2	6.5	6.5	77.4
	60	3	9.7	9.7	87.1
	63	1	3.2	3.2	90.3
	68	1	3.2	3.2	93.5
	70	1	3.2	3.2	96.8
	73	1	3.2	3.2	100.0
	Total	31	100.0	100.0	

APPENDIX I
DISTRIBUTION OF DATA FREQUENCY ON STUDENTS' POSTTEST SCORE IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP

Frequencies

Statistics

Posttest_experiment

N	Valid	31
	Missing	0

Posttest_experiment

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	40	1	3.2	3.2	3.2
	50	3	9.7	9.7	12.9
	53	3	9.7	9.7	22.6

	55	3	9.7	9.7	32.3
	60	6	19.4	19.4	51.6
	63	2	6.5	6.5	58.1
	65	2	6.5	6.5	64.5
	70	1	3.2	3.2	67.7
	73	3	9.7	9.7	77.4
	75	4	12.9	12.9	90.3
	78	1	3.2	3.2	93.5
	83	2	6.5	6.5	100.0
	Total	31	100.0	100.0	

APPENDIX J

DISTRIBUTION OF DATA FREQUENCY ON STUDENTS' POSTTEST SCORE IN CONTROL GROUP

Frequencies

Statistics

Posttest_control

N	Valid	31
	Missing	0

Posttest_control

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	40	2	6.5	6.5	6.5
	43	2	6.5	6.5	12.9
	45	1	3.2	3.2	16.1

50	7	22.6	22.6	38.7
53	4	12.9	12.9	51.6
55	2	6.5	6.5	58.1
60	5	16.1	16.1	74.2
63	4	12.9	12.9	87.1
65	2	6.5	6.5	93.5
68	1	3.2	3.2	96.8
70	1	3.2	3.2	100.0
Total	31	100.0	100.0	

APPENDIX K
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF STUDENTS' PRETEST AND POSTTEST SCORES IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP

Descriptives

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
pretest_experiment	31	30	63	43.95	7.410
Valid N (listwise)	31				

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Posttest_experiment	31	40	83	63.15	10.781
Valid N (listwise)	31				

APPENDIX L
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF STUDENTS' PRETEST AND POSTTEST SCORES IN CONTROL GROUP

Descriptives

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Pretest_control	31	35	73	51.45	9.634
Valid N (listwise)	31				

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Posttest_control	31	40	70	54.76	8.148
Valid N (listwise)	31				

APPENDIX M

NORMALITY TEST OF STUDENTS' PRETEST SCORES IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP

NPar Tests

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		pretest_experiment
N		31
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	43.95
	Std. Deviation	7.410
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.136
	Positive	.131
	Negative	-.136
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.755
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.619

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

APPENDIX N

NORMALITY TEST OF STUDENTS' PRETEST SCORES IN CONTROL GROUP

NPar Tests

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Pretest_control
N		31
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	51.45
	Std. Deviation	9.634
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.103
	Positive	.103
	Negative	-.092
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.575
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.895

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

APPENDIX O

NORMALITY TEST OF STUDENTS' POSTTEST SCORES IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP

NPar Tests

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Posttest_experiment
N		31
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	63.15
	Std. Deviation	10.781
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.131
	Positive	.131
	Negative	-.130
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.729
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.663

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

APPENDIX P

NORMALITY TEST OF STUDENTS' POSTTEST SCORES IN CONTROL GROUP

NPar Tests

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Posttest_control
N		31
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	54.76
	Std. Deviation	8.148
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.159
	Positive	.125
	Negative	-.159
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.887
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.411

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

APPENDIX Q

HOMOGENEITY TEST ON STUDENTS' PRETEST SCORES IN EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS

Oneway

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Ss_Score

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
1.437	1	60	.235

ANOVA

Ss_Score

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	871.875	1	871.875	11.804	.001
Within Groups	4431.855	60	73.864		

Total	5303.730	61			

APPENDIX R

HOMOGENEITY TEST ON STUDENTS' POSTTEST SCORES IN EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS

Oneway

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Ss_score

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
2.755	1	60	.102

ANOVA

Ss_score

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1090.323	1	1090.323	11.940	.001

Within Groups	5479.032	60	91.317		
Total	6569.355	61			

APPENDIX S

RESULT ANALYSIS OF INDEPENDENT SAMPLE T-TEST

T-Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means	
		F	Sig.	t	df
Ss_scores	Equal variances assumed	2.755	.102	-3.455	60
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.455	55.842

	t-test for Equality of Means		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference

Ss_scores	Equal variences assumed	.001	-8.387	2.427
	Equal Variences not assumed	.001	-8.387	2.427

		t-test for Equality of Means	
		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		Lower	Upper
Ss_scores	Equal variences assumed	-13.242	-3.532
	Equal Variences not assumed	-13.250	-3.524

APPENDIX T

RESULT ANALYSIS OF PAIRED SAMPLE T-TEST OF PRETEST-POSTTEST IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP

T-Test

Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	pretest_experiment	43.95	31	7.410	1.331
	posttest_experiment	63.15	31	10.781	1.936

Paired Samples Correlations

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	pretest_experiment & posttest_experiment	31	.723	.000

		Paired Differences		
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	pretest_experiment - posttest_experiment	-19.194	7.455	1.339

		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	pretest_experiment posttest_experiment	-21.928	-16.459	-14.335	30	.000

APPENDIX U

RESULT ANALYSIS OF PAIRED SAMPLE T-TEST OF PRETEST-POSTTEST IN CONTROL GROUP

T-Test

Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	pretest_control	51.45	31	9.634	1.730
	posttest_control	54.76	31	8.148	1.464

Paired Samples Correlations

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	pretest_control & posttest_control	31	.618	.000

		Paired Differences		
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	pretest_control - posttest_control	-3.306	7.890	1.417

		Paired Differences		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
		Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	pretest_control – posttest_control	-6.200	-.413	-2.333	30	.027

APPENDIX W

ANSWER KEY

1. C	11. C	21. C	31. B
2. B	12. D	22. B	32. B
3. C	13. B	23. A	33. C
4. A	14. A	24. D	34. D
5. A	15. C	25. C	35. C
6. A	16. A	26. B	36. B

7. B	17. A	27. D	37. C
8. D	18. A	28. D	38. A
9. D	19. D	29. C	39. A
10. A	20. B	30. A	40. B

APPENDIX Y

THE RESULT OF TRY OUT ANALYSIS OF RELIABILITY TEST

Reliability

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	40	62.5

	Excluded[a]	24	37.5
	Total	64	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Part 1	Value	.556
		N of Items	20[a]
	Part 2	Value	.516
		N of Items	20[b]
	Total N of Items		40
Correlation Between Forms			.563
Spearman-Brown Coefficient	Equal Length		.720
	Unequal Length		.720
Guttman Split-Half Coefficient			.717