#### **CHAPTER IV**

#### RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

#### **4.1** Data

To collect the data of this research, the writer observed the eighth grade students of MTS Al-Wasliyah Percut. There were two classes namely VIII A and VIII B. There were 30 students of each class. VIII B is the experimental class that was taught by using talking Workshop Model. The control class of this study is VIII A that was taught by using conventional method.

The instrument of this research was test. Pre-test consisted 20 multiple choices and post-test consisted of 20 multiple choices and the text was descriptive text. Pre test was given to the experimental and control class before giving the treatment. Post test given to the students after giving the treatment, but the treatment was only given to the experimental class and for control class, the writer did not give the treatment.

The purpose of the research was to obtain the students' reading comprehension who were taught by using Reading Workshop model and those who were taught without using Reading Workshop model, and to find out whether or not there was significant effect of using Reading Workshop model toward reading comprehension on descriptive text.

Students was given two twst in this research which were pre-test and posttest. In this control class students with conventional methods and experimental class with Reading Workshop model. The writer converts the criteria of the assessment on multiple choices as follows:

Table 4.1 The Criteria of the Assessment on Multiple choices

| The Range of Score | Categor   | ry Score |
|--------------------|-----------|----------|
| 85-100             | Excellent | A        |
| 75-84              | Good      | В        |
| 56-74              | Fair      | С        |
| <55                | Poor      | D        |

Then the writer gave the test to the students to get the data about the students' mastery in English reading. After getting the data of this study, the writer analyzed it.

### 4.1.1 Score of Pre-Test and Post-Test Students in Experimental Class

In collecting the data of the students' ability in English reading comprehension in experimental group by using Workshop Model, the writer gave paper test, to test the students' ability. The test is divided into pre-test and post-test. The purpose of this study is to find out the students' mastery in English reading of MTS Al-Wasliyah Percut taught by using Workshop Model that increased or not. The result of this study in English reading comprehension in experimental and control group that can be seen in the following tables:

Table 4.2 Score of the Experimental Class

| No | Name | Pre-Test | Post-Test | gained Score |
|----|------|----------|-----------|--------------|
| 1  | AK   | 80       | 100       | 20           |
| 2  | AR   | 80       | 100       | 20           |
| 3  | BA   | 80       | 95        | 20           |
| 4  | BS   | 80       | 95        | 20           |
| 5  | BRKT | 80       | 95        | 20           |
| 6  | CS   | 75       | 90        | 20           |
| 7  | DR   | 75       | 90        | 20           |
| 8  | EA   | 75       | 90        | 20           |
| 9  | EM   | 75       | 90        | 20           |
| 10 | FR   | 75       | 90        | 20           |
| 11 | HAN  | 70       | 90        | 20           |
| 12 | HN   | 70       | 90        | 20           |
| 13 | IA   | 70       | 90        | 20           |
| 14 | IFI  | 70       | 90        | 20           |
| 15 | JASD | 70       | 85        | 20           |
| 16 | KAB  | 65       | 85        | 20           |
| 17 | KCL  | 65       | 85        | 20           |
| 18 | KP   | 65       | 85        | 20           |
| 19 | LM   | 65       | 85        | 20           |
| 20 | LNA  | 65       | 85        | 20           |
| 21 | OAB  | 60       | 80        | 20           |
| 22 | MI   | 60       | 80        | 20           |

| 23 | MISN        | 60   | 80    | 20    |
|----|-------------|------|-------|-------|
| 24 | MRA         | 60   | 80    | 20    |
| 25 | NA          | 60   | 80    | 20    |
| 26 | RAA         | 55   | 70    | 15    |
| 27 | RAL         | 55   | 70    | 15    |
| 28 | RF          | 55   | 70    | 15    |
| 29 | SM          | 55   | 70    | 15    |
| 30 | ZD          | 55   | 70    | 15    |
|    | Total Score | 2025 | 2555  | 575   |
|    | Mean        | 67,5 | 85,16 | 19.16 |

According to the table data, the total score was 2025 from pre-test, 2555 from the post-test and 575 from the gained scored of experimental class. The mean score of pre-test was 67,5 and from the post-tes as 85,16. And the mean of the gained score was 19,16.

Table 4.3 Score of the Control Class

| No | Name | Pre-Test | Post-Test | gained Score |
|----|------|----------|-----------|--------------|
| 1  | AD   | 70       | 80        | 10           |
| 2  | AA   | 70       | 80        | 10           |
| 3  | АН   | 70       | 80        | 10           |
| 4  | DS   | 70       | 80        | 10           |
| 5  | DA   | 65       | 80        | 10           |
| 6  | DA   | 65       | 80        | 10           |

| 7  | ER  | 65 | 80 | 10 |
|----|-----|----|----|----|
| 8  | ES  | 65 | 75 | 10 |
| 9  | FF  | 65 | 75 | 10 |
| 10 | FPS | 65 | 75 | 10 |
| 11 | FAS | 60 | 75 | 10 |
| 12 | GS  | 60 | 75 | 10 |
| 13 | KD  | 60 | 75 | 10 |
| 14 | ISP | 60 | 70 | 10 |
| 15 | IL  | 60 | 70 | 10 |
| 16 | JD  | 60 | 70 | 10 |
| 17 | JF  | 55 | 70 | 10 |
| 18 | KD  | 55 | 70 | 10 |
| 19 | KS  | 55 | 70 | 10 |
| 20 | KLN | 55 | 65 | 10 |
| 21 | LS  | 50 | 65 | 10 |
| 22 | LZ  | 50 | 65 | 10 |
| 23 | LA  | 50 | 65 | 10 |
| 24 | LS  | 50 | 65 | 10 |
| 25 | MD  | 50 | 65 | 10 |
| 26 | MR  | 50 | 60 | 10 |
| 27 | MR  | 50 | 60 | 10 |
| 28 | PA  | 45 | 60 | 15 |
| 29 | RF  | 45 | 60 | 15 |
| 30 | SH  | 45 | 60 | 15 |

| Total Score | 1735  | 2120  | 315  |
|-------------|-------|-------|------|
| Mean        | 57,83 | 70,66 | 10,5 |

According to the table data, the total score was 1735 from pre-test, 2120 from the post-test and 315 from the gained scored of control class. The mean score of pre-test was 57,83 and from the post-tes as 70,66. And the mean of the gained score was 10,5.

### **4.2** Fulfillment of Statistical Assumptions

Before conducting the research, the researcher tested the validity and reliability. The researcher tested validity and reliability by using SPSS 25 (Statistical Package for the Social Science).

The validity of the test was measured from t-table of Correlation Pearson Product Moment to find out the significant level. There were 20 questions that was tested which consisted of twenty items that to measure students' reading comprehension ability and to test the validity of the data of pre-test and post-test.

### 4.2.1 Validity Test

Table 4.4 Validity Pre-Test

| No Item | R. Count | R Table (N-2) | Interpretation |
|---------|----------|---------------|----------------|
| 1       | 517      | 0,361         | Valid          |
| 2       | 477      | 0,361         | Valid          |
| 3       | 458      | 0,361         | Valid          |

| 4  | 549 | 0,361 | Valid |
|----|-----|-------|-------|
| 5  | 419 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 6  | 394 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 7  | 458 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 8  | 419 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 9  | 409 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 10 | 448 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 11 | 379 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 12 | 412 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 13 | 426 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 14 | 570 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 15 | 517 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 16 | 422 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 17 | 380 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 18 | 401 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 19 | 419 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 20 | 419 | 0,361 | Valid |

Table 4.5 Validity Post-Test

| No Item | R. Count | R Table (N-2) | Interpretation |
|---------|----------|---------------|----------------|
| 1       | 715      | 0,361         | Valid          |
| 2       | 813      | 0,361         | Valid          |

| 3  | 658 | 0,361 | Valid |
|----|-----|-------|-------|
| 4  | 488 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 5  | 404 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 6  | 720 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 7  | 908 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 8  | 795 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 9  | 522 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 10 | 388 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 11 | 771 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 12 | 473 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 13 | 493 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 14 | 385 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 15 | 798 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 16 | 643 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 17 | 778 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 18 | 883 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 19 | 716 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 20 | 869 | 0,361 | Valid |

The result of the data analysis from each score of the test can be obtained with the total score. The value was compared with the value of r-table on 5% significant table with 2 tailed test n= and the r table can be seen 0,361. Based on the table above, there were 30 students that had been tested using 20 questions.

And from 20 questions there were 20 valid questions  $\geq$ r-table (0,361), and in the table of post-test, there were 20 valid questions  $\geq$ r-table (0,361). T-table showed that significant level to the validity of the study was t-count  $\geq$  r-table (0,361). It can be concluded that the instrument used pre-test and post-test was valid.

## 4.2.2. Reliability Test

In this research, the esearcherr used SPSS 25 version to find the reliability of test instruments. It can be seen in the following table:

Table 4.6
The Result of Reliability of Pre-Test

| Reliability Statistic       |    |  |  |
|-----------------------------|----|--|--|
| Cronbach's Alpha N of Items |    |  |  |
| .703                        | 20 |  |  |

Table 4.7
The Result of Reliability of Post-Test

| Reliability Statistic       |  |  |  |
|-----------------------------|--|--|--|
| Cronbach's Alpha N of Items |  |  |  |
| .903 20                     |  |  |  |

From the result of the analysis, there were significant result in pre-test and post-test where the reliability of Cronbach's Alpha must be higher than 0,60. Based on the table above, the result of reliability tests of pre-test and post-test showed 0,703 in table 4.5 and 0,903 in table 4.6. it meant that the data from each pre-test and post-test were reliable.

#### 4.2.3 Normality of Data

Table 4.8
The Result of Pre-Test and Post-test
Test of Normality

|            |           | ogorov-Si |      | Shapiro-Wilk |    |       |  |
|------------|-----------|-----------|------|--------------|----|-------|--|
|            | Statistic | Df        | Sig. | Statistic    | Df | Sign. |  |
| Control    | ,168      | 30        | ,031 | ,919         | 30 | ,025  |  |
|            | ,177      | 30        | ,017 | ,895         | 30 | ,006  |  |
| Experiment | ,139      | 30        | ,142 | ,910         | 30 | ,015  |  |
|            | ,160      | 30        | ,018 | ,912         | 30 | ,017  |  |

Based on the data above, that could be seen the data of pre-test from exsperimental and control were normal. The researcher used the data from Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk to find out the normality. And the result was the higher than that the  $\alpha$  (alpha): 0,05, the distributed data become normal. Based on the table above, it showed that significant value of pre-test from Colmogorov-Smirnov for experimental class was 0,142  $\geq$  0,05. From Saphiro Wilk was 0,15  $\geq$  0,05 and for control class was 0,031 $\geq$  0,05 and from Saphiro Wilk was 051  $\geq$  0,25. It could be concluded the data from Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk, pre-test exsperimental and control class were normally distributed. And the result was the higher that the  $\alpha$  (alpha): 0,05, the distributed data become normal. Based on the table above, it showed that significant value of pre-test from Colmogorov-Smirnov for exsperimental class was 0,018  $\geq$  0,05. From Saphiro Wilk was 0,017 $\geq$  0,05 and for control class was 0,017 $\geq$  0,05 and

from Saphiro Wilk was  $006 \ge 0,05$ . It could be concluded the data from Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk, pre-test exsperimental and control class were normally distributed.

### **4.2.4** Homogenity Data

After doing the test of the normality, the researcher conducted the homogeneity of the test to find out the similarity of the value for both classes. The researcher used SPSS statistic test to calculate the homogeneity test. The results were presented as follow

Table 4.9 Homogeneity Test

| Test of Homogenity of Variance |                       |           |     |        |     |  |  |  |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|-----|--------|-----|--|--|--|
|                                |                       | Levene    | Df1 | Df2    | Sig |  |  |  |
|                                |                       | Statistic |     |        |     |  |  |  |
| Hasil                          | Based on Mean         | 656       | 1   | 58     | 421 |  |  |  |
| Belajar                        |                       |           |     |        |     |  |  |  |
| Siswa                          |                       |           |     |        |     |  |  |  |
|                                | Based on Median       | 708       | 1   | 58     | 403 |  |  |  |
|                                | Based on Median and   | 708       | 1   | 51.929 | 404 |  |  |  |
|                                | with adjusted df      |           |     |        |     |  |  |  |
|                                | Based on trimmed mean | 648       | 1   | 58     | 424 |  |  |  |

Based on the data above, the significant value obtained from the two pretest and pos-test classes showed that significant value was  $0.421 \ge 0.005$ . Therefore, the data was homogeneous. From the result of the analysis above, the

value obtained from pre-test to contribute the normality and the homogeneity of the test was homogeneous.

# 4.3 Hypotheses Data

Hypotheses Test is done to answer the hypotheses which was proposed before and to decide whether the hypotheses is accepted or rejected, based on the analysis from the result data of students' test that were taught by using Reading Workshop Model. The hypotheses testing was aimed to know whether there was a significant effect between students were taught by using Reading Workshop way in experimental class and conventional method in control class. The data was calculated by using mean score of experimental and control class students. The significance value or alpha ( $\alpha$ ) was 5% or 0,05. The result of data hypotheses could be seen in the following table 4.10.

Table 4.10 Independent Sample T-test

| Independent Samples T-Test              |                             |        |                              |            |        |                        |                              |                                   |  |                   |
|---|-----------------------------|--------|------------------------------|------------|--------|------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|-------------------|
| Levene's Test for Equality of Variances |                             |        | t-test for Equality of Means |            |        |                        |                              |                                   |  |                   |
| The result of the                       | Equal variances assumed     | F .656 | Sig.<br>.421                 | t<br>8.020 | Df 58  | Sig.<br>(2-<br>tailed) | Mean<br>Difference<br>16.333 | Std. Error<br>Difference<br>2.037 | Confi<br>Interva<br>Diffe<br>Lower<br>12.257 | dence<br>l of the |
| test                                    | Equal variances not assumed |        |                              | 8.020      | 55.018 | .000                   | 16.333                       | 2.037                             | 12.252                                       | 20.415            |

Based on the data above, it was obtained the sig. (2-tailed) was 0,000 < 0,05. So that, it could be concluded that there was a significant differences between students score who taught by using Reading Workshop Model and students were taught by using conventional way. To see how much difference in students' learning outcomes based on the mean score. Look at the following table:

Table 4.11 Group Statistic

| Group Statistics |                 |    |             |           |            |  |  |
|------------------|-----------------|----|-------------|-----------|------------|--|--|
|                  | Kelas           | N  | N Mean Std. |           | Std. Error |  |  |
|                  |                 |    |             | Deviation | Mean       |  |  |
| Hasil Belajar    | Post-Test Kelas | 30 | 85.17       | 8.758     | 1.599      |  |  |
| Siswa            | Experiment      |    |             |           |            |  |  |
|                  | Post-Test Kelas | 30 | 68.83       | 6.909     | 1.261      |  |  |
|                  | Control         |    |             |           |            |  |  |

After looking on the table of group statistic above, it was been obtained the value mean of experimental class from post-test was 85.17 > 68.83 in post-test from control class. It was denotes that T-test was higher than T-table.

Hence: The null hypotheses (Ho) is rejected

The alternative hypotheses (Ha) is accepted

It means that there was a significant difference between the students' ability in English reading comprehension in experimental group by using Reading Workshop Model and the students' ability in English by using Reading Workshop Model in control group by using conventional way.

### 4.4 Research Finding

In this research, there were two classses that the researcher used as the samples of the research. There were two classes namely VIII B was the experimental class that was taught by using Reading Workshop Model. The control class of this study was VIII A that was taught by using conventional method. In this research, the researcher found many differences in result between pre-test and post-test scores for both exsperimental and control class that included score of Gained score test, validity, reliability, normality, homogeneity, and independent sample T-test. The result of Gainedscore average of exsperimental class students was higher than Gained score average of control class. (19.16 > 10.50). It showed that there was significant differences between both classes.

From the result of the mean score it had been obtained the value mean of experimental class from post-test was 19.16 > 10.50 in post-test control class. It meant that there was a significant difference between the students' ability in English reading in exsperimental group by using Reading Workshop Model and the students' ability in English reading comprehension in control group by using conventional way.

#### 4.5 Discussion

In teaching learning process, there were many methods that could teaching. The teacher should be able to choose an appropriate strategy that can make their students understand about the material. The strategy that can be used is Reading Workshop Model.

Reading Workshop Model is one of cooperative learning strategic. By doing this strategy in the classroom, the students will be easy to convey their ideas or some informations in their environment. From the statistic data, it showed that the data of the sample group of the students' ability in English reading comprehension in exsperimental group by using Reading Workshop Model showed that the mean score was 19.16. And the data of sample group of the students' ability in English reading comprehension in control group by conventional way showed the mean was 10.50. It meant that there was differences effect between using Reading Workshop Model and using conventional way on the students' ability in English reading comprehension. And the students' ability in English reading Comprehension by using Reading Workshop Model was better than the students' ability in English ability by using conventional way.