

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Data of Experimental and Control Class

To collect the data of this research, the writer observed the eleventh grade students of SMK Sinar Husni Medan. There were two classes namely XI OTKP 2 and XI AKL 2. XI AKL is the experimental class that was taught by using presentation, practice, production by Jeremy Harmer. The control class of this study is XI OTKP 2 that was taught by using conventional method. Then the writer gave the test to the students to get the data about the reading text. 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 experimental group by using PPP, the writer gave paper test, to test the students' ability. The test was divided into pre-test and post-test. The purpose of this study is to find out the effect of presentation, practice, production (PPP) learning model on students' reading ability in SMK Sinar Husni Medan. There was a significant difference between the reading ability of the students who were taught using presentation, practice, production (PPP) model learning and those who were taught without it. In experimental class taught by using presentation, practice, production (PPP) the mean of the pre-test was 65.15, while in control class, the mean was 57,66. In post-test, after the treatments in the experimental class were applied, the mean of

the experiment class was 84,66, and the mean of the control class was 70,55. It shows that in experimental class were getting increased from 65.15 to 84,66. While in the control class; the mean were getting increased from 57,66 to 70,55. It means that there were significant difference between reading ability of the students who are taught using the presentation, practice, production (PPP) Model learning and those who are taught without it. The result of this study in experimental and control group that can be seen in the following tables:

Table 4.1

The Score of Pre-Test and Post-test of Experimental Group

No	Students' initial	Pretest	Posttest	Gained Score
1	NI	85	100	15
2	YS	85	100	15
3	RA	85	100	15
4	MS	80	95	15
5	CA	80	95	15
6	NJ	75	90	15
7	PA	75	95	20
8	MM	75	95	20
9	SP	75	90	15
10	DF	70	90	20
11	AUD	70	90	20
12	PI	70	90	20
13	IS	70	85	15
14	VA	70	85	15

15	R	65	85	20
16	CH	65	85	20
17	NF	5	85	20
18	SN	60	80	20
19	LA	60	80	20
20	AD	60	80	20
21	I	55	80	25
22	NA	55	80	25
23	JS	55	75	20
24	CD	55	75	20
25	RN	55	75	20
26	VN	50	75	25
27	WS	50	75	25
28	VR	50	70	20
29	PA	45	70	25
30	SB	45	70	25
	Total Score	1955	2540	585
	Mean	65,16	84,66	19,50

Table 4.2**The Score of Pre-Test and Post-test of Control Group**

No	Students' initial	Pretest	Posttest	Gained Score
1	NAL	70	80	10
2	SR	70	80	10
3	SR	70	80	10
4	EC	70	80	10
5	LN	70	80	10
6	ZS	70	75	5
7	AN	65	75	10
8	EN	65	75	10
9	MR	65	75	10
10	FA	65	75	10
11	SS	65	70	5
12	RA	60	70	10
13	SAN	60	70	10
14	DD	60	70	10
15	EC	60	70	10
16	ZL	55	70	15
17	MD	55	70	15
18	A	55	70	15
19	DP	55	70	15
20	RM	55	70	15
21	AUD	50	65	15
22	GA	50	65	15
23	DP	50	65	15
24	NZ	50	65	15
25	DF	50	65	15

26	HF	45	65	20
27	SW	45	65	20
28	MS	45	60	15
29	PZ	45	60	15
30	HD	40	60	20
	Total Score	1730	2110	380
	Mean	57,66	70,33	12,66

4.2 Fulfillment of Statistical Assumptions

Before conducting the research, the writer tested the validity and reliability. The writer 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 that to find out the significant level. There were 20 questions that was tested which consist of twenty items that to measured students' reading ability and to tested the validity of the data pre-test and post-test.

4.2.1 Validity Test

Table 4.3
Validity Pre-Test

No	R-Count	R-Table (N-2)	Interpretation
1	381	0,361	VALID
2	432	0,361	VALID
3	373	0,361	VALID
4	366	0,361	VALID
5	430	0,361	VALID
6	459	0,361	VALID
7	384	0,361	VALID
8	412	0,361	VALID
9	448	0,361	VALID
10	441	0,361	VALID
11	380	0,361	VALID
12	498	0,361	VALID
13	456	0,361	VALID
14	542	0,361	VALID
15	386	0,361	VALID
16	521	0,361	VALID
17	443	0,361	VALID
18	684	0,361	VALID
19	443	0,361	VALID
20	463	0,361	VALID

Table 4.4
Validity Post-Test

NO	R-COUNT	R-TABLE (N-2)	INTERPRETATION
1	442	0,361	VALID
2	464	0,361	VALID
3	369	0,361	VALID
4	372	0,361	VALID
5	397	0,361	VALID
6	372	0,361	VALID
7	530	0,361	VALID
8	531	0,361	VALID
9	478	0,361	VALID
10	397	0,361	VALID
11	618	0,361	VALID
12	478	0,361	VALID
13	530	0,361	VALID
14	385	0,361	VALID
15	442	0,361	VALID
16	450	0,361	VALID
17	369	0,361	VALID
18	369	0,361	VALID
19	372	0,361	VALID
20	426	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 is t-count $\geq r$ -table (0,361). It can be concluded that the instrument used in this study pre-test and post-test was valid.

4.2.2 Reliability Test

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

Table 4.5
The Result of Reliability of Pre-Test

Reliability Statistic	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
0,802	20

Table 4.6
The Result of Reliability of Post-Test

Reliability Statistic	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
0,994	20

From the result of the analysis, there were significant result in pre-test and post-test where the reliability of KR-20 Formula had to higher than 0,70. Based on the table above, the result of reliability tests of pre-test and post-test showed 0,782 in table 4.5 and 0,994 in table 4.6. it meant that the data from each pre-test and post-test were reliable.

Table 4.7
The Result of Normality Pre-Test and Post-Test
Test of Normality

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.
Experiment	135	30	.182	.950	30	.168
Control	126	30	.200	.941	30	.097
	152	30	.073	.921		.029
	188	30	.008	.913		.018

Based on the data above, that could be seen the data of pre-test from exsperimental and control were normal. The writer used the data from Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk to find out the normality. And the result was the higher that the α (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 $0,182 \geq 0,05$. From Saphiro Wilk was $0,168 \geq 0,05$ and for control class was $0,073 \geq 0,05$ and from Saphiro Wilk was $0,29 \geq 0,05$. It could be concluded the data from Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk, pre-test exsperimental and control class were normally distributed. While, the significant value of post-test from Colmogorov-Smirnov for exsperimental

class was $0,200 \geq 0,05$. From Saphiro Wilk was $0,097 \geq 0,05$ and for control class was $0,008 \geq 0,05$ and from Saphiro Wilk was $0,018 \geq 0,05$. It could be concluded the data from Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk, post-test experimental and control class were normally distributed.

4.2.3 Homogeneity Data

After doing the test of the normality, the writer conducted the homogeneity of the test to find out the similarity of the value for both classes. The writer used *spss* statistic test to calculate the homogeneity test. The result are presented as follows

Table 4.9
Homogeneity Test

Test of Homogeneity of Variance					
		Levene Statistic	Df1	Df2	Sig
Hasil Belajar Siswa	Based on Mean	6.656	1	58	012
	Based on Median	6.617	1	58	013
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	6.617	1	55.185	013
	Based on trimmed mean	6.656	1	58	012

Based on the data above, the significant obtained from the two pre-test and pos-test classes. The significant was $0,012 \geq 0,005$. Therefore, the data to was homogeneous. From the result of the analysis above, the value obtained from pre-test to contribute the normality. And the homogeneity test the value 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 that the strategy namely result data of students' test that were taught by using Presentation, Practice, Production (PPP). The hypotheses testing was aimed to know whether there was a significant effect between students who teach by using Presentation, Practice, Production (PPP) in experimental class and conventional method in control class. The data was calculated by using mean score of experiment and control class students. The significance value or alpha (α) was 5% or 0,05. The result of data hypotheses that can be seen in the following table 4.10.

Table 4.10
T-test
Independent Sample T-test

Independent Samples T-Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
The result of the test	Equal variances assumed	6.656	.012	7.053	58	.000	14.333	2.032	10.265	18.401
	Equal variances not assumed			7.053	50.356	.000	14.333	2.033	10.252	18.415

Based on the data above, it was obtained the sig. (2-tailed) was $0,000 < 0,05$. So that, it can be concluded that there is a significant differences between students score were taught by using presentation, practice, production (PPP) and students were taught by using conventional method. To see how much difference in student learning outcoes based on the mean score. Look at the following table:

Table 4.11
Group Statistic

Group Statistics					
	Kelas	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
HasilBelajarSi swa	Experimental Post-test	30	84.67	9.27	1.694
	Control Post-test	30	70.33	6.14	1.123

After looking on the table of group statistic above, it has been obtained the value mean of exspermental class from post-test was $84.67 > 70.33$ in post-test control class. It denotes that T-test is higher than T-table.

Hence: The null hypotheses (Ho) is rejected

The alternative hypotheses (Ha) is accepted

It means that there is a significant difference between the students' ability in experimental group by using presentation, practice, production (PPP) and the students' ability in control group by using conventional method.

4.4 Research Finding

In this research, there were two classes that the writer used as the samples of the research. There were two classes namely XI AKL 2 is the experimental class that was taught by using PPP model learning. The control class of this study is XI OTKP 2 that was taught by using conventional method. In this research, the Writer found many differences in results between score pre-test and post-test for

both experimental 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 experimental class students was higher than Gained score average of control class. ($19.50 > 12.66$).it showed that there was significant differences between for both classes.

From the result of the mean score it has been obtained the value mean of experimental class from post-test was $19.50 > 12.66$ in post-test control class. It means that there is An affect of presentation, practice, production (PPP) model learning on students; reading ability in experimental group and the students' ability in control group by using conventional method.

4.5 Discussion

In teaching learning process, teaching model can influence the result of teaching. Actually, many learning models can be applied in the classroom. The teacher should be able to choose an appropriate learning model that can make their students understand about the material. The model learning that can be used is presentation, practice, production.

Presentation, practice, production is one of the common teaching methodologies .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 shows that the data of the sample group of the students' ability in experimental group by using presentation, practice, production shows that mean score is 34.30. And the data of sample group of the students' ability in control

group by conventional method shows the mean is 22.10. It means that there is differences effect between using PPP model learning and using conventional method on the students' ability. And the students' ability in presentation, practice, production is better than the students' ability by using conventional method.