# CHAPTER IV

# RESEACH FINDING AND DISCUSSION

## 4.1. The Data

The data were obtained from the result of study directed to the two classes separately. In this research, the sample was divided into groups, namely experimental group and control group. Pre-test was administrated to both of groups. Treatment by using RAFT was only given to the experimental group. Post-test was given to the both of groups. The two groups were given in the same test.

### 4.1.1. The Score of Students' Pre-Test and Post-Test in Control Class

The control class in this study was students from Class VIII-C of SMP Tarbiyah Islamiyah TP. 2020/2021. This class consisted of 38 students. The pre-test was given to students of control class in multiple choices. It was administered to know their reading comprehension. The pre-test mean score was 60.13. The lowest score was 40 while the highest score was 75.

After pre-test was conducted, the researcher taught the class using conventional way. After that the post-test was conducted. The mean score of students was increased to 61.18. The lowest score in post-test was 40 while the highest score was 75. The finding showed that the students' post-test score were higher than students' pre-test score. The following table shows the students' scores for both tests, pre-test and post-test.

**Table 4.1**
**The Score of Pre Test and Post Test for Control Class**

| No. | Students' Code | Gender | Pre-Test | Post-Test | Gained Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | AP | Female | 55 | 55 | 0 |
| 2. | AIR | Male | 45 | 50 | 5 |
| 3. | A | Female | 70 | 70 | 0 |
| 4. | AP | Female | 60 | 60 | 0 |
| 5. | ASD | Female | 55 | 55 | 0 |
| 6. | AHG | Male | 50 | 60 | 10 |
| 7. | AKA | Female | 45 | 50 | 5 |
| 8. | GC | Female | 60 | 60 | 0 |
| 9. | HFA | Female | 55 | 55 | 0 |
| 10. | JN | Female | 50 | 50 | 0 |
| 11. | KADN | Female | 40 | 45 | 5 |
| 12. | LW | Male | 50 | 55 | 5 |
| 13. | L | Female | 55 | 55 | 0 |
| 14. | MAP | Male | 60 | 60 | 0 |
| 15. | MAA | Male | 75 | 75 | 0 |
| 16. | MF | Male | 70 | 70 | 0 |
| 17. | MYH | Male | 55 | 55 | 0 |
| 18. | MS | Male | 65 | 65 | 0 |
| 19. | MW | Female | 70 | 70 | 0 |
| 20. | MZR | Male | 75 | 75 | 0 |
| 21. | MA | Male | 45 | 50 | 5 |
| 22. | MF | Male | 70 | 70 | 0 |
| 23. | NZ | Female | 65 | 65 | 0 |
| 24. | NF | Male | 70 | 70 | 0 |
| 25. | NAD | Male | 70 | 70 | 0 |
| 26. | OR | Female | 60 | 60 | 0 |
| 27. | PS | Male | 70 | 70 | 0 |
| 28. | PA | Male | 65 | 65 | 0 |
| 29. | PAM | Female | 60 | 60 | 0 |
| 30. | RA | Male | 40 | 40 | 0 |
| 31. | RAD | Male | 55 | 60 | 5 |
| 32. | RDR | Female | 70 | 70 | 0 |
| 33. | RB | Male | 60 | 60 | 0 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 34. | RK | Male | 65 | 65 | 0 |
| 35. | RH | Male | 55 | 55 | 0 |
| 36. | SW | Female | 70 | 70 | 0 |
| 37. | SAW | Female | 70 | 70 | 0 |
| 38. | T | Female | 65 | 65 | 0 |
| **Total Score** | | | **2280** | **2605** | **40** |
| **Mean Score** | | | **60.13** | **61.18** | **1.05** |

### 4.1.2. The Score of Students' Pre-Test and Post-Test in Experimental Class

The experimental class in this study was students from class VIII-B of SMP Tarbiyah Islamiyah TP. 2020/2021. This class consisted of 38 students. The pre-test was given to students of experimental class multiple choices. It was administered to know their reading comprehension. The pre-test mean score was 61.84. The lowest score was 40 while the highest score was 80.

After pre-test was conducted, the writer conducted the treatment of Raft (Role, Audience, Format, Topic) Then the post-test was conducted after the treatment, mean score of students increased to 70.26 the lowest score in post-test was 50 while the highest score was 90. The finding showed that the students' post-test score were higher than students' pre-test score. It means that the increasing score between pre-test and post-test was quite significant. The following table shows the students' scores for both tests, pre-test and post-test.

**Table 4.2**
**The Score of Pre Test and Post Test for Experimental Class**

| No. | Students' Code | Gender | Pre-Test | Post-Test | Gained Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | APA | Female | 60 | 70 | 10 |
| 2. | AZP | Female | 40 | 50 | 10 |
| 3. | CO | Female | 80 | 90 | 10 |
| 4. | DA | Male | 55 | 60 | 5 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5. | FS | Female | 75 | 80 | 5 |
| 6. | F | Male | 65 | 75 | 10 |
| 7. | FP | Male | 65 | 75 | 10 |
| 8. | FHS | Male | 65 | 70 | 5 |
| 9. | GR | Male | 65 | 70 | 5 |
| 10. | I | Female | 55 | 65 | 10 |
| 11. | MAP | Male | 65 | 70 | 5 |
| 12. | MA | Male | 70 | 75 | 5 |
| 13. | MAH | Male | 60 | 75 | 15 |
| 14. | MJF | Male | 60 | 65 | 5 |
| 15. | MRDR | Male | 55 | 70 | 15 |
| 16. | MA | Male | 70 | 75 | 5 |
| 17. | MAZ | Male | 65 | 70 | 5 |
| 18. | MS | Male | 60 | 70 | 10 |
| 19. | MY | Male | 45 | 55 | 10 |
| 20. | MN | Female | 50 | 65 | 15 |
| 21. | NT | Female | 60 | 65 | 5 |
| 22. | NIW | Male | 65 | 75 | 10 |
| 23. | RRS | Male | 75 | 85 | 10 |
| 24. | RE | Male | 55 | 65 | 10 |
| 25. | RAS | Male | 60 | 70 | 10 |
| 26. | RR | Male | 70 | 85 | 15 |
| 27. | RA | Male | 65 | 70 | 5 |
| 28. | RE | Male | 75 | 80 | 5 |
| 29. | RI | Female | 70 | 75 | 5 |
| 30. | RDA | Female | 55 | 65 | 10 |
| 31. | SH | Female | 50 | 60 | 10 |
| 32. | SKN | Female | 50 | 55 | 5 |
| 33. | SSFR | Female | 60 | 75 | 15 |
| 34. | VCA | Female | 65 | 70 | 5 |
| 35. | YS | Male | 70 | 75 | 5 |
| 36. | ZP | Male | 65 | 75 | 10 |
| 37. | RA | Male | 60 | 65 | 5 |
| 38. | A | Female | 55 | 65 | 10 |
| **Total Score** | | | **2350** | **2670** | **320** |
| **Mean Score** | | | **61.84** | **70.26** | **8.42** |

## 4.2. The Fulfillment of Statistical Assumptions

The fulfillment of statistical assumption consisted of the test of reliability validity, normality and homogeneities of students' score.

### 4.2.1. The Result of Reliability and Validity

The research used SPSS (Statistical Package for The Social Sciences) of version 20 to analyze the reliability and validity test of pre-test and post-test in control class and experimental class. This test was conducted to know whether the instrument from both classes had reliable and valid.

**Table 4.3**
**The Result of Validity for Pre-test**

| No. Items | R Count | R table | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | 0,201 | ≤ 0,312 | Not Valid |
| 2. | 0,409 | ≥ 0,312 | Valid |
| 3. | 0,167 | ≤ 0,312 | Not Valid |
| 4. | - 0,089 | ≤ 0,312 | Not Valid |
| 5. | 0,044 | ≤ 0,312 | Not Valid |
| 6. | - 0,015 | ≥ 0,312 | Not Valid |
| 7. | - 0,025 | ≤ 0,312 | Not Valid |
| 8. | 0,342 | ≥ 0,312 | Valid |
| 9. | 0,622 | ≥ 0,312 | Valid |
| 10. | 0,622 | ≥ 0,312 | Valid |
| 11. | 0,603 | ≥ 0,312 | Valid |
| 12. | 0,635 | ≥ 0,312 | Valid |
| 13. | 0,620 | ≥ 0,312 | Valid |
| 14. | 0,620 | ≥ 0,312 | Valid |
| 15. | 0,523 | ≥ 0,312 | Valid |
| 16. | 0,603 | ≥ 0,312 | Valid |
| 17. | 0,635 | ≤ 0,312 | Valid |
| 18. | 0,620 | ≥ 0,312 | Valid |
| 19. | 0,402 | ≥ 0,312 | Valid |
| 20. | 0,402 | ≥ 0,312 | Valid |

**Table 4.4**
**The Result of Validity for Pos-test**

| No. Items | R Count | R table | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | 0,849 | ≥ 0,312 | Valid |
| 2. | 0,894 | ≥ 0,312 | Valid |
| 3. | 0,837 | ≥ 0,312 | Valid |
| 4. | 0,777 | ≥ 0,312 | Valid |
| 5. | 0,623 | ≥ 0,312 | Valid |
| 6. | 0,623 | ≥ 0,312 | Valid |
| 7. | 0,913 | ≥ 0,312 | Valid |
| 8. | 0,894 | ≥ 0,312 | Valid |
| 9. | 0,984 | ≥ 0,312 | Valid |
| 10. | 0,894 | ≥ 0,312 | Valid |
| 11. | 0,984 | ≥ 0,312 | Valid |
| 12. | 0,894 | ≥ 0,312 | Valid |
| 13. | 0,984 | ≥ 0,312 | Valid |
| 14. | 0,623 | ≥ 0,312 | Valid |
| 15. | 0,913 | ≥ 0,312 | Valid |
| 16. | 0,554 | ≥ 0,312 | Valid |
| 17. | 0,864 | ≥ 0,312 | Valid |
| 18. | 0,864 | ≥ 0,312 | Valid |
| 19. | 0,864 | ≥ 0,312 | Valid |
| 20. | 0,913 | ≥ 0,312 | Valid |

Based on the table above, there were 20 items testing multiple choice questionsfor post-test and pre-test with the same test subject, 38 students. The result of the data analysis from each score of the test can be obtained with the total score. This value was then compared with the value of $r_{table}$. $r_{table}$ on 5% significant table with 2 tailed test n = 38 and r table can be 0,312. The result showed that there were 20 questions valid in pre-test and 20 questions valid in post-test. It can be concluded that the instrument used in this study was valid.

**Table 4.5**
**The Result of Reliability for Pre-test**

**Reliability Statistics**

| Cronbach's Alpha | Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items | N of Items |
|---|---|---|
| .818 | .823 | 20 |

Source: 20 SPSS Processing

**Table 4.6**
**The Result of Reliability for Pos-test**

**Reliability Statistics**

| Cronbach's Alpha | Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items | N of Items |
|---|---|---|
| .978 | .978 | 20 |

Source: 20 SPSS Processing

From the result of the analysis, there were significant result in pre-test and post-test where the reliability of cronbach's Alpha was to higher than 0.60. Based on the table 4.5 and 4.6, the result of reliability tests of pre-test and post-test showed that from 20 items Cronbach's Alpha were 0,818 in table 4.5 and 0,978 in table 4.6. It means that the data from each of the pre-test and post-test were reliable. After testing the validity and reliability, the researcher had to test normality and homogeneity of the data before testing hypothesis.

### 4.2.2. The Result of Normality and Homogeneity

The writer tested normality test after students' the pre-test and post-test in reading comprehension were obtained. This test used SPSS (Statistical Package for The Social Sciences) of version 20.

**Table 4.7**
**The Result of Normality for Pre-test**

**One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test**

| | | Unstandardized Residual |
|---|---|---|
| N | | 38 |
| Normal Parameters[a,b] | Mean | 0E-7 |
| | Std. Deviation | 1.31181397 |
| Most Extreme Differences | Absolute | .216 |
| | Positive | .173 |
| | Negative | -.216 |
| Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z | | 1.333 |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | | .057 |

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

Source: 20 SPSS Processing

Based on the table above, it could be seen that the data of pre-test of experimental and control class were normally. The researcher calulated the data by using Kolmogrove-Smirnov and the result of the calculation had to be higher than alpha 0.05 to become distributed data. Based on the table above, it showed that significant value of pre-test from Kolmogrov-Smirnov for experimental and control class was $0.057 \geq 0.050$. It can be concluded that from Kolmogrov-Smirnov, Pre-test of experimental and control class were normally distributed.

**Table 4.8**
**The Result of Normality for Pos-test**

**One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test**

| | | Unstandardized Residual |
|---|---|---|
| N | | 38 |
| Normal Parameters[a,b] | Mean | 0E-7 |
| | Std. Deviation | .71618655 |
| Most Extreme Differences | Absolute | .136 |
| | Positive | .136 |
| | Negative | -.085 |
| Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z | | .838 |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | | .484 |

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

Source: 20 SPSS Processing

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.

d. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

From the data above, it could be seen that the data of post-test of experimental and control class were normally. The researcher calulated the data by using Kolmogrove-Smirnov and the result of the calculation had to be higher than alpha 0.05 to become distributed data. Based on the table above, it showed that significant value of post-test from Kolmogrov-Smirnov for experimental and control class was $0.484 \geq 0.05$. It can be concluded that from Kolmogrov-Smirnov, Post-test of experimental and control class were normally distributed.

**Table 4.9**
**The Result of Homogeneities for Pre-Test**

**Test of Homogeneity of Variances**

Pretes

| Levene Statistic | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|
| .019 | 1 | 36 | .891 |

Source: 20 SPSS Processing

From the data above, it could be seen that the result of pre-test of experimental and control class were 0,891 $\geq$ 0.05, so it could be concluded that the sample of pre-test in experimental and control class were homogeneous.

**Table 4.10**
**The Result of Homogeneities Pos-Test**

**Test of Homogeneity of Variances**

Postes

| Levene Statistic | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|
| .012 | 1 | 36 | .914 |

Source : 20 SPSS Processing

From the data above, it could be seen that the result of pos-test of experimental and control class were 0,914 $\geq$ 0.05, so it could be concluded that the sample of pre-test in experimental and control class were homogeneous.

### 4.3. Hypotheses Testing

Normally and Homogeneity test were the first step before hypothesis test. Then, the next step was to test the hypothesis. This test was conducted to know if there was significance different in the result of post test after the treatment was given. This hypotheses test was analyzed using SPSS (Statistical Package for The Social Sciences) of version 20. The formulation was from experimental score both pre-test score and post-test score. The significant value or alpha that used for this

test was0.050. Hypothesis stated that if sig.2 tailed value ≥ alpha, $H_0$ was accepted and $H_a$ was rejected, there is no positive effect of using RAFT on students reading comprehension, while if sig. 2 tailed value ≤ alpha, $H_0$ was rejected and$H_a$ was accepted it means that there was positive effect of using RAFT Strategy on students' reading comprehension.

**Table 4.11**
**The Result Independent Samples T-test**

Independent Samples Test

| | | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| | | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | Lower | Upper |
| Hasil_Postes | Equal variances assumed | .712 | .402 | -4.690 | 74 | .000 | -9.079 | 1.936 | -12.936 | -5.222 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -4.690 | 73.919 | .000 | -9.079 | 1.936 | -12.936 | -5.222 |

Source: 20 SPSS Processing

Based on the table above, it can be seen (2-tailed) significance point 0,000. There was a significance effect on students' comprehension ability on post-test. Significance value (2-tailed) lower than significance level (0.000 ≤ 0,050) than Alternative Hypothesis ($H_a$) was accepted and Null Hypothesis ($H_0$) was rejected. It meant "There was a significant effect of the Role, Audience, Format, Topic (RAFT).

## 4.4. Research Findings

There were two classes that used as research subject. The first was VIII-C as the control class and the second was VIII-B as experimental class. They were

choosen by cluster random sampling. The experimental class applied Role, Audience, Format, Topic (RAFT) to teach reading the control class was given the conventional teaching. The findings were obtained from the result of study directed to the two classes separately. There were two parameters to determine the different findings from both classes (Control and Experimental classes). Firstly, both classes were determined and obtained from their meaningful difference between the score of students in pre-test and post-test of control and experiment classes. Secondly, both classes were determined from their meaningful difference between treatments directed to the two classes.

The mean score of pre-test for control class was 60,13 and for post-test was 61,18. While the means score of pre test for experimental class was 61.84 and for post test was 70.26. The mean score showed that Role, Audience, Format, Topic (RAFT) had positive effect for students' comprehension. The impact of this study had also been carried out by students who had successfully applied Role, Audience, Format, Topic (RAFT).

### 4.5. Discussions

Based on research finding, it was found that the students who were taught using Role, Audience, Format, Topic (RAFT) had increased their ability in reading comprehension. The result of the pre-test before Role, Audience, Format, Topic (RAFT) was used, the ability of students' comprehension was lower. After Role, Audience, Format, Topic (RAFT) was used, students' to the text reading comprehension was better. After getting treatment and Post-test was conducted, it was found that there was significance difference between the experimental class and control class where the Post-test score of the experimental class higher. It could

be seen from the mean score of pre-test and post-test, The mean score of pre-test in control class was 60.13 and in post-test was 61.18 while the mean score of pre-test in experimental class was 61.84 and in post-test was 70.26. It means that the most improvement was in experimental class.

The result also related to the research of according to Maria Hidayati (2012) in her thesis with the title Raft Strategy To Improve The Students' Reading Comprehension. Role, Audience, Format, Topic (RAFT) helped the students to realize the need for both information in the text and information from their own background knowledge. Role, Audience, Format, Topic (RAFT) was used in the process of teaching reading. The Strategy made students interested in reading lesson. And then students were easier to comprehend English text.

Based on the analysis of the data and the testing of hypotheses, the result of calculation by SPSS version 20 stated that the null hypotheses $H_0$ was rejected and the alternative hypotheses $H_a$ was accepted. It showed that the use of Role, Audience, Format, Topic (RAFT) in teaching effective for the students' reading comprehension.