## CHAPTER IV

## RESEARCH FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

## A. Description of the Result Research

Findings of this research described that there were different result between experimental classes which was taught by using Course Review Horay (CRH) and without taught by using CRH to improve students' achievement in teaching reading narrative text. The research was conducted in MTs N Sumber Rembang which is located at Polbayem Street Sumber Rembang at the eighth grade in the academic year 2015/2016.

## 1. Preliminary

The activity of the reseach started on $9^{\text {th }}$ January 2016 by choosing the sample used random sampling technique. The researcher chooses random sampling because in order to prevent the unfairness. To get the representative sample, the researcher wrote the name of the classes on small piece of paper. At last, the researcher got class IX A which consisted of 40 students as try-out group, class VIII A which consisted of 40 students was experimental group, and class VIII C which consisted of 34 students was as control group. The two classes would be given the same material but with different way. The number of students was gained from the documentation of the school by the help of the English teacher.

Before items were given to the students, the researcher gave tryout test for try-out class on $9^{\text {th }}$ January 2016 to analyze validity, reliability, difficulty level and the discrimination power of each item. The researcher prepared 30 items as the instrument of the test. Test was given to know the validity, reliability, degree of test difficulty, and discriminate the power of test items of try-out test in control class that was provided by the writer.

In this research finding of try out test, the researcher used point biseral correlation formula to analyze validity. The researcher applied the Kuder and Richardson formula which was combined with K-R 20 formula to analyze reliability instrument. The degree of test difficulty used difficulty level formula by considered five levels of difficulty. The last analysis of try-out test was discriminate of power by divided into two groups; lower group and upper group which consist of 19 students in upper groups and 18 students in lower groups.

The researcher gave pre-test on $16^{\text {th }}$ January 2016 in control group and $18^{\text {th }}$ January 2016 in experimental students. The questions consisted of 15 items were stated valid according to try-out analysis. After giving pre-test, the writer determined the materials and lesson plans of learning activities. Pre-test was conducted to both groups to know that two groups were normal and homogeny.

After knowing the control group and experimental group had same variant. Before giving the treatment and conventional method, the researcher prepared lesson plan and material to learning activity. The researcher conducted treatment in control class on $21^{\text {st }}$ and $25^{\text {th }}$ January 2016. The control group was not taught using Course Review Horray, but the teacher explained the material using conventional method without giving variation or special treatment in learning process.

The treatment for experimental group conducted on $28^{\text {th }}$ and $30^{\text {th }}$ January 2016 by using Course Review Horray which is appropriate to teach Reading Narrative Text because it is memorable and understandable easily by the students.

After giving treatments in experimental group and orthodox teaching in control group, the researcher gave posttest which consisted 15 test items which approximately finished on 40 minutes. The researcher gave posttest on $4^{\text {th }}$ and $7^{\text {th }}$ February 2016 to both experimental group and control group.

From the post-test, it could be known that there was significant result between control group and experimental group by hypothesis test which showed the value of $t$-test is higher than $t$-table. It could be seen on the value of $t$-test is 16.804 while the critical value on $t_{(0.95)(72)}$ is 1.99 , so the hypothesis is accepted. It meant that Using Course Review

Horray to improve students' achievement in Teaching Reading Narrative Text is effective and gave good result in teaching and learning process because the students felt more exited, cooperative, and responsible in learning process.

## B. The Data Analysis and Test of Hypothesis

## 1. The Data Analysis

## a. The Data Analysis of Try-out Finding

This discussion covered validity, reliability, level of difficulty and discriminating power.

1) Validity of Instrument

In this study, item validity was used to know the index validity of the test. To know the validity of instrument, the writer used the point biseral correlation formula to analyze each item. It was obtained that from 30 test items; there were 15 test items which were valid and 15 test items which were invalid. They were on number $1,2,3,5,6,7,8,10$, $12,13,15,25,27,29$, and 30 . Those were invalid with the reason the computation result of their $r_{p b i s}$ value was lower than their $\mathrm{r}_{\text {table }}$ value.

Table 4.1
Validity of Each Item

| Criteria | $\boldsymbol{r}_{\text {table }}$ | Number of questions | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Valid |  | $4,9,11,14,16,17$, |  |
|  | 0.325 | $18,19,20,21,22,23$, | 15 |
|  |  | $24,26,28$ |  |


| Invalid | $1,2,3,5,6,7,8,10$, <br> $12,13,15,25,27,29$, <br> and 30. | 15 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |

The following was the example of item validity computation for item number 4 and for the other items would use the same formula.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{N}=37 \\
& \sum \mathrm{X}=16 \\
& \sum Y^{2}=24990 \\
& \sum \mathrm{Y}=954 \quad \sum \mathrm{XY}=444 \\
& r_{p b i s}=\frac{M_{p}-M_{t}}{S_{t}} \sqrt{\frac{p}{q}} \\
& M_{p}=\frac{\sum \mathrm{XY}}{\sum \mathrm{X}}=\frac{444}{16}=27.75 \\
& M_{t}=\frac{\sum \mathrm{Y}}{N}=\frac{954}{37}=25.7837 \\
& p=\frac{\sum \mathrm{X}}{N}=\frac{16}{37}=0.432 \\
& q=1-p=1-0.432=0.567 \\
& S_{t}=\sqrt{\frac{\sum Y^{2} \frac{(\Sigma \mathrm{Y})^{2}}{N}}{N}} \\
& =\sqrt{\frac{24990 \frac{(954)^{2}}{37}}{37}}=3.256
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
r_{p b i s} & =\frac{M_{p-M_{t}}}{S_{t}} \sqrt{\frac{p}{q}} \\
& =\frac{25.69-25.78}{3.26} \sqrt{\frac{0.43}{0.56}} \\
& =0.527
\end{aligned}
$$

From the computation above, the result of computing validity of the item number 4 was 0.527 . After that, the researcher consulted the result to the table of $r$ Product Moment with the number of subject $(N)=37$ and significance level $5 \%$ it was 0.325 . Since the result of the computation was higher than $r$ in table, the index of validity of the item number 4 was considered to be valid.
2) Reliability

A good test must be valid and reliable. To get the coefficient of correlation, the researcher applied the formula Kuder and Richardson with the K-R 20. The formula is:

$$
\mathrm{r}_{11}=\left(\frac{\mathrm{k}}{\mathrm{k}-1}\right)\left(\frac{\mathrm{S}^{2}-\sum \mathrm{pq}}{\mathrm{~S}^{2}}\right)
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{k}=30 \\
& \begin{aligned}
\sum \mathrm{pq} & =p q_{1}+p q_{2}+p q_{3}+\cdots+p q_{30} \\
& =0.0262+0.1533+0.0511+\ldots+0.0262 \\
& =2.764
\end{aligned}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
S^{2} & =\frac{\sum Y^{2} \frac{\left(\sum \mathrm{Y}\right)^{2}}{N}}{N} \\
& =\frac{24990 \frac{(954)^{2}}{37}}{37} \\
& =10.601 \\
r_{11} & =\left(\frac{k}{k-1}\right)\left(\frac{S^{2}-\sum p q}{S^{2}}\right) \\
& =\left(\frac{30}{30-1}\right)\left(\frac{10.601-2.76}{10.6019}\right) \\
& =0.7647
\end{aligned}
$$

From the computation above, it was found out that $r_{11}$ (the total of reliability test) was 0.7647 whereas the number of subjects was 37 and the critical value for r-table with significance level 5\% was 0.325 . Thus, the value resulted from the computation was higher than its critical value. It could be concluded that the instrument used in this research was reliable.
3) Degree of test difficulty

The following is the computation of the level difficulty for item number 4 and for the other items would use the same formula.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{B}=13+3=16 \\
& \mathrm{JS}=37
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
P & =\frac{B}{J S} \\
P & =\frac{16}{37} \\
P & =0.4324
\end{aligned}
$$

It is proper to say that the index difficulty of the item number 4 above can be said as the medium category, because the calculation result of the item number 4 is in the interval $0.30 \leq p \leq 0.70$. After computing 30 items of the try-out test, there were 26 items were considered to be easy, 3 items were considered to be medium, and there were only 1 difficult test.

Table 4.2
Degree of Difficulty of Each Item

| Criteria | Number of questions | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Easy | $1,2,3,6,8,9,10,11,12$, |  |
|  | $13,14,15,16,17,18,19$, <br> $20,22,23,24,25,26,27$, <br> $28,29,30$ | 26 |
|  | $4,5,21$ | 3 |
| Medium | 7 | 1 |
| Difficult |  |  |

4) The Discriminating Power

The following is the computation of discriminating power of item number 4. To do this analysis, the number of try-out subjects was divided
into two groups, upper and lower groups. They were upper and lower group.

Table 4.3
The Discriminating Power of item number 4

| No. | Upper group |  | No. | Lower group |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Code | Score |  | Code | Score |
| 1 | T-18 | 1 | 1 | T-6 | 0 |
| 2 | T-8 | 1 | 2 | T-15 | 1 |
| 3 | T-10 | 1 | 3 | T-20 | 0 |
| 4 | T-16 | 1 | 4 | T-22 | 0 |
| 5 | T-19 | 1 | 5 | T-3 | 0 |
| 6 | T-24 | 1 | 6 | T-9 | 0 |
| 7 | T-26 | 1 | 7 | T-21 | 1 |
| 8 | T-34 | 1 | 8 | T-35 | 0 |
| 9 | T-36 | 1 | 9 | T-14 | 0 |
| 10 | T-2 | 1 | 10 | T-29 | 0 |
| 11 | T-7 | 0 | 11 | T-32 | 0 |
| 12 | T-12 | 0 | 12 | T-33 | 0 |
| 13 | T-13 | 0 | 13 | T-37 | 1 |
| 14 | T-17 | 0 | 14 | T-11 | 0 |
| 15 | T-23 | 0 | 15 | T-25 | 0 |
| 16 | T-28 | 0 | 16 | T-31 | 0 |
| 17 | T-1 | 1 | 17 | T-30 | 0 |
| 18 | T-4 | 1 | 18 | T-5 | 0 |
| 19 | T-27 | 1 |  | Sum | 3 |
| Sum | 13 |  |  |  |  |

T = Try Out Students
This was the analysis of discriminating power for item number 1 :

$$
\begin{gathered}
\mathrm{JA}=19 \\
\mathrm{JB}=18 \\
\mathrm{BA}=13 \\
\mathrm{BB}=3 \\
\mathrm{DP}=\frac{\mathrm{BA}}{\mathrm{JA}}-\frac{\mathrm{BB}}{\mathrm{JB}} \\
\mathrm{D}=\frac{13}{19}-\frac{3}{18} \\
=0.5175
\end{gathered}
$$

According to the criteria, the item number 4 above was good category, because the calculation result of the item number 4 was in the interval $0.40 \leq$ $D \leq 0.70$. After computing 30 items of try -out test and after being consulted to the discriminating power category, there were 4 items which considered being good, 7 items were satisfied and 19 items were poor.

Table 4.4
Discriminating Power of Each Item

| Criteria | Number of questions | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Poor | $1,2,3,6,8,10,12,13,14$, <br> $15,16,19,20,24,25,26$, <br> $27,29,30$ | 19 |
| Satisfied | $5,7,9,17,22,23,28$ | 7 |
| Good | $4,11,18,21$ | 4 |

Based on the analysis of validity, reliability, difficulty level, and discriminating power, finally 15 items of test, there were 15 items were accepted to be
used in pre-test and post-test. They were number 4, 9, $11,14,16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23,24,26$, and 28.
b. The Data Analysis of Pre-test Score of the Experimental class and the Control Class.

| Control Class |  |  | Experimental Class |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. | Code | Score | No. | Code | Score |
| 1 | C-1 | 13.33 | 1 | E-1 | 46.67 |
| 2 | C-2 | 46.67 | 2 | E-2 | 46.67 |
| 3 | C-3 | 26.67 | 3 | E-3 | 53.33 |
| 4 | C-4 | 20 | 4 | E-4 | 26.67 |
| 5 | C-5 | 20 | 5 | E-5 | 40 |
| 6 | C-6 | 26.67 | 6 | E-6 | 40 |
| 7 | C-7 | 20 | 7 | E-7 | 60 |
| 8 | C-8 | 40 | 8 | E-8 | 53.33 |
| 9 | C-9 | 46.67 | 9 | E-9 | 26.67 |
| 10 | C-10 | 26.67 | 10 | E-10 | 40 |
| 11 | C-11 | 46.67 | 11 | E-11 | 66.67 |
| 12 | C-12 | 53.33 | 12 | E-12 | 13.33 |
| 13 | C-13 | 20 | 13 | E-13 | 33.33 |
| 14 | C-14 | 46.67 | 14 | E-14 | 46.67 |
| 15 | C-15 | 40 | 15 | E-15 | 33.33 |
| 16 | C-16 | 26.67 | 16 | E-16 | 26.67 |
| 17 | C-17 | 40 | 17 | E-17 | 66.67 |
| 18 | C-18 | 20 | 18 | E-18 | 40 |
| 19 | C-19 | 33.33 | 19 | E-19 | 60 |
| 20 | C-20 | 53.33 | 20 | E-20 | 66.67 |
| 21 | C-21 | 33.33 | 21 | E-21 | 26.67 |
| 22 | C-22 | 53.33 | 22 | E-22 | 40 |
| 23 | C-23 | 46.67 | 23 | E-23 | 40 |
| 24 | C-24 | 46.67 | 24 | E-24 | 46.67 |
| 25 | C-25 | 46.67 | 25 | E-25 | 60 |
| 26 | C-26 | 26.67 | 26 | E-26 | 26.67 |
| 27 | C-27 | 20 | 27 | E-27 | 60 |


| Control Class |  |  | Experimental Class |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. | Code | Score | No. | Code | Score |
| 28 | C-28 | 6.67 | 28 | E-28 | 53.33 |
| 29 | C-29 | 26.67 | 29 | E-29 | 40 |
| 30 | C-30 | 33.33 | 30 | E-30 | 53.33 |
| 31 | C-31 | 26.67 | 31 | E-31 | 40 |
| 32 | C-32 | 26.67 | 32 | E-32 | 46.67 |
| 33 | C-33 | 26.67 | 33 | E-33 | 66.67 |
| 34 | C-34 | 20 | 34 | E-34 | 60 |
|  |  |  | 35 | E-35 | 33.33 |
|  |  |  | 36 | E-36 | 33.33 |
|  |  |  | 37 | E-37 | 33.33 |
|  |  |  | 38 | E-38 | 53.33 |
|  |  |  | 39 | E-39 | 53.33 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sum | 1106.7 | 40 | E-40 | 40 |  |
| n |  | 34 | n |  | 1793.34 |
| $\bar{x}$ | 32.55 | $\bar{x}$ |  | 44.8335 |  |
| $S^{2}$ |  | 160.97723 | $S^{2}$ |  | 180.035962 |
| S | 12.6876803 | S |  | 13.417748 |  |

1) The Normality of the Experimental Class Pre-test

The normality test was used to know whether the data obtained was normally distributed or not. Based on the table above, the normality test:

Hypothesis:
Ha: The distribution list was normal.
Ho: The distribution list was not normal
Test of hypothesis:
The formula was used:

$$
X^{2}=\sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{\left(O_{i}-E_{i}\right)^{2}}{E_{i}}
$$

The computation of normality test:

| Maximum score | $=66.67$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| N | $=40$ |
| Minimum score | $=13.33$ |
| Range | $=53.34$ |
| K $/$ Number of class | $=6$ |
| Length of the class | $=11$ |
| S | $=12.91$ |
| $\bar{x}$ | $=45.005$ |

Table 4.5
Frequency Distribution of the Experimental Class Pre-Test

| Kelas |  | $f i$ | $X_{\mathrm{i}}$ | $X_{\mathrm{i}}^{2}$ | $f_{i} \cdot X_{\mathrm{i}}$ | $f_{i} \cdot X_{\mathrm{i}}^{2}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 13.33 | - | 23.33 | 1 | 18.33 | 335.9889 | 18.33 | 335.9889 |
| 24.33 | - | 34.33 | 10 | 29.33 | 860.2489 | 293.3 | 8602.489 |
| 35.33 | - | 45.33 | 9 | 40.33 | 1626.509 | 362.97 | 14638.58 |
| 46.33 | - | 56.33 | 11 | 51.33 | 2634.769 | 564.63 | 28982.46 |
| 57.33 | - | 67.33 | 9 | 62.33 | 3885.029 | 560.97 | 34965.26 |
| 68.33 | - | 78.33 | 0 | 73.33 | 5377.289 | 0 | 0 |
| Sum |  | 40 |  |  | 1800.2 | 87524.78 |  |

Table 4.6
The Frequency Distribution of the Experimental Class Pre-Test

| Kelas |  | Bk | $Z_{i}$ | $P\left(Z_{i}\right)$ | Luas <br> Daerah | Ei | Oi | $\frac{\left(o_{i}-E_{i}\right)^{2}}{E_{i}}$ |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 12.83 | -2.490 | -0.493 |  |  |  |  |
| 13.33 | - | 23.33 |  |  |  | 0.044 | 1.767 | 1 | 0.333 |
|  |  | 23.83 | -1.639 | -0.449 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24.33 | - | 34.33 |  |  |  | 0.164 | 6.594 | 10 | 1.759 |
|  |  | 34.83 | -0.787 | -0.284 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 35.33 | - | 45.33 |  |  |  | 0.310 | 12.401 | 9 | 0.933 |
|  |  | 45.83 | 0.063 | 0.025 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 46.33 | - | 56.33 |  |  |  | 0.294 | 11.782 | 11 | 0.051 |
|  |  | 56.83 | 0.915 | 0.320 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 57.33 | -67.33 |  |  |  | 0.141 | 5.654 | 9 | 1.979 |  |
|  |  | 67.83 | 1.767 | 0.461 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 68.33 | -78.33 |  |  |  | 0.006 | 0.242 | 0 | 0.242 |  |
|  |  | 68.83 | 1.844 | 0.467 |  |  |  |  |  |

$$
\chi^{2}{ }_{\text {count }}=5.229
$$

For $\mathrm{a}=5 \%, \mathrm{dk}=6-1=5, \chi^{2}$ table $=11.07$


With $\alpha=5 \%$ and $\mathrm{dk}=6-1=5$, from the chi-square distribution table, obtained $\chi^{2}$ table $=$ 11.07. Because $\chi^{2}$ count was lower than $\chi^{2}$ table (5.229 < 11.07). So, the distribution list was normal.
2) The Normality of the Control Class Pre-test

## Hypothesis:

Ho: The distribution list was normal.
Ha: The distribution list was not normal.

## Test of hypothesis:

The formula was used:

$$
X^{2}=\sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{\left(O_{i}-E_{i}\right)^{2}}{E_{i}}
$$

The computation of normality test:

| Maximum score | $=53.33$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| N | $=34$ |
| Minimum score | $=6.67$ |
| Range | $=46.66$ |
| $\mathrm{~K} /$ Number of class | $=6$ |
| Length of the class | $=9$ |
| S | $=12.773$ |
| $\bar{x}$ | $=33.434$ |

Table 4.7
The Frequency Distribution of the Control
Class Pre-Test

| Kelas |  |  | fi | $X_{\text {i }}$ | $X_{\mathrm{i}}{ }^{2}$ | $f_{i} \cdot X_{\text {i }}$ | $f_{i} \cdot X_{\mathrm{i}}{ }^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6.67 | - | 14.67 | 2 | 10.67 | 113.848 | 21.34 | 227.6978 |
| 15.67 | - | 23.67 | 7 | 19.67 | 386.90 | 137.69 | 2708.362 |
| 24.67 | - | 32.67 | 9 | 28.67 | 821.96 | 258.03 | 7397.72 |
| 33.67 | - | 41.67 | 6 | 37.67 | 1419.02 | 226.02 | 8514.173 |
| 42.67 | - | 50.67 | 7 | 46.67 | 2178.08 | 326.69 | 15246.62 |
| 51.67 | - | 59.67 | 3 | 55.67 | 3099.14 | 167.01 | 9297.447 |
| Jumlah |  |  | 34 |  |  | 1136.78 | 43392.02 |

## Table 4.8

The Frequency Distribution of Control
Class Pre-Test

| Kelas |  | Bk | $\mathrm{Z}_{\mathrm{i}}$ | $\mathrm{P}\left(\mathrm{Z}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)$ | Luas <br> Daerah | Ei | Oi | $\frac{\left(O_{i}-E_{i}\right)^{\prime}}{E_{i}}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 6.17 | -2.134 | -0.483 |  |  |  |  |
| 6.67 | - | 14.67 |  |  |  | 0.059 | 2.038 | 2 | 0.000745 |
|  | - |  | 15.17 | -1.429 | -0.423 |  |  |  |  |
| 15.67 | - | 23.67 |  |  |  | 0.157 | 5.363 | 7 | 0.49915 |
|  | - |  | 24.17 | -0.725 | -0.265 |  |  |  |  |
| 24.67 | - | 32.67 |  |  |  | 0.257 | 8.758 | 9 | 0.006653 |
|  | - |  | 33.17 | -0.020 | -0.008 |  |  |  |  |
| 33.67 | - | 41.67 |  |  |  | 0.261 | 8.882 | 6 | 0.93523 |
|  | - |  | 42.17 | 0.683 | 0.252 |  |  |  |  |
| 42.67 | - | 50.67 |  |  |  | 0.164 | 5.594 | 7 | 0.353362 |
|  | - |  | 51.17 | 1.388 | 0.417 |  |  |  |  |
| 51.67 | - | 59.67 |  |  |  | 0.011 | 0.383 | 3 | 2.282223 |
|  |  |  | 52.17 | 1.466 | 0.428 |  |  |  |  |

$$
\begin{aligned}
& x^{2}=4.0773 \\
& \chi^{2}{ }_{\text {count }}=4.0073
\end{aligned}
$$

For $\mathrm{a}=5 \%, \mathrm{dk}=6-1=5, \chi_{\text {table }}^{2}=11.0705$


With $\alpha=5 \%$ and $\mathrm{dk}=6-1=5$, from the chisquare distribution table, obtained $\chi^{2}$ table $=11.0705$. Because $\chi^{2}$ count was lower than $\chi^{2}$ table $(4.0073<$ 11.0705). So, the distribution list was normal.

## Hypothesis

$H_{0}: \sigma_{1}{ }^{2}=\sigma_{2}{ }^{2}$
$\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{a}}: \sigma_{1}{ }^{2} \neq \sigma_{2}{ }^{2}$

## The Calculation

Formula:

$$
\mathrm{F}=\frac{\mathrm{Vb}}{\mathrm{VK}}
$$

Ho is accepted if $\mathrm{F} \leq \mathrm{F}_{(1-a)(n b-1):(n k-1)}$


Table 4.9
Result of pre test

| Variation Source | Experimental | Control |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N | 40 | 34 |
| $\bar{X}$ | 44.8335 | 32.55 |
| Variants $\left(\mathrm{s}^{2}\right)$ | 180.0359 | 160.9772 |
| Standard deviation (s) | 13.4177 | 12.6876 |

According to the formula above, it is obtained that:
$\mathrm{F}=\frac{\mathrm{Vb}}{\mathrm{VK}}$
$\mathrm{F} \quad=\frac{180.0359}{160.9772}$
$=1.1184$
For a $=5 \%$ with:
df1 $=\mathrm{n}-1=40-1=39$
df2 $=\quad \mathrm{n}-1=34-1=33$
$\mathrm{F}_{(0.025)(39: 33)}=1.7596$


Since F count < F table, the experimental and control group had the same variance. With $\alpha=5 \%$ and $\mathrm{dk}=(40-1=39):(34-1=33)$, it is obtained that $F_{\text {table }}=1.7596$. Because $F_{\text {count }}$ was lower than $F_{\text {table }}$ (1.1184 < 1. 7596). So, Ho was accepted and the two groups had the same variant/ homogeneous.

## The Hypothesis Test

In this research, because $\sigma_{1}{ }^{2}=\sigma_{2}{ }^{2}$ (has same variant), the $t$-test formula was as follows:


$$
S^{2}=\frac{\left(n_{1}-1\right) S_{1}^{2}+\left(n_{2}-1\right) S_{2}^{2}}{n_{1}+n_{2}-2}
$$

## Table 4.10

| Variation Source | Experimental | Control |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N | 40 | 34 |
| $\bar{X}$ | 44.8335 | 32.55 |
| $\left(\mathrm{~S}^{2}\right)$ | 180.0359 | 160.9772 |
| $(\mathrm{~S})$ | 13.4177 | 12.6876 |

According to the formula above, it is obtained that:

$$
\begin{aligned}
S & =\sqrt{\frac{(34-1) 160.98+(40-1) 180.04}{34+40-2}} \\
& =13.09
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
t & =\frac{44.83-32.55}{13.09 \sqrt{\frac{1}{34}+\frac{1}{40}}} \\
& =4.0234
\end{aligned}
$$

For $\alpha=5 \%$ and $\mathrm{dk}=34+40-2=72, \mathrm{t}_{(0.95)(72)}=1.99$


With $\alpha=5 \%$ and $\mathrm{dk}=34+40-2=72$, obtained $t_{\text {table }}=1.99$. Because $t_{\text {count }}$ was higher than $t_{\text {table }}(4.0234>1.99)$. So, Ha was accepted and there was no difference of the pre-test average value from both groups.
c. The Data Analysis of Post-test Score of the Experimental Class and the Control Class.

Table 4.11
The list of the Experimental and Control Class Post-test score

| Control Class |  |  | Experimental Class |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. | Code | Score | No. | Code | Score |
| 1 | C-1 | 33.33 | 1 | E-1 | 66.67 |
| 2 | C-2 | 40 | 2 | E-2 | 80 |
| 3 | C-3 | 40 | 3 | E-3 | 73.33 |
| 4 | C-4 | 33.33 | 4 | E-4 | 66.67 |


| Control Class |  |  | Experimental Class |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. | Code | Score | No. | Code | Score |
| 5 | C-5 | 26.67 | 5 | E-5 | 86.67 |
| 6 | C-6 | 46.67 | 6 | E-6 | 80 |
| 7 | C-7 | 33.33 | 7 | E-7 | 73.33 |
| 8 | C-8 | 33.33 | 8 | E-8 | 66.67 |
| 9 | C-9 | 40 | 9 | E-9 | 73.33 |
| 10 | C-10 | 33.33 | 10 | E-10 | 66.67 |
| 11 | C-11 | 53.33 | 11 | E-11 | 86.67 |
| 12 | C-12 | 53.33 | 12 | E-12 | 80 |
| 13 | C-13 | 26.67 | 13 | E-13 | 73.33 |
| 14 | C-14 | 26.67 | 14 | E-14 | 66.67 |
| 15 | C-15 | 60 | 15 | E-15 | 66.67 |
| 16 | C-16 | 46.67 | 16 | E-16 | 80 |
| 17 | C-17 | 20 | 17 | E-17 | 73.33 |
| 18 | C-18 | 26.67 | 18 | E-18 | 80 |
| 19 | C-19 | 40 | 19 | E-19 | 73.33 |
| 20 | C-20 | 33.33 | 20 | E-20 | 73.33 |
| 21 | C-21 | 40 | 21 | E-21 | 86.67 |
| 22 | C-22 | 40 | 22 | E-22 | 66.67 |
| 23 | C-23 | 66.67 | 23 | E-23 | 93.33 |
| 24 | C-24 | 60 | 24 | E-24 | 80 |
| 25 | C-25 | 40 | 25 | E-25 | 60 |
| 26 | C-26 | 33.33 | 26 | E-26 | 80 |
| 27 | C-27 | 26.67 | 27 | E-27 | 73.33 |
| 28 | C-28 | 33.33 | 28 | E-28 | 66.67 |
| 29 | C-29 | 53.33 | 29 | E-29 | 73.33 |
| 30 | C-30 | 33.33 | 30 | E-30 | 86.67 |
| 31 | C-31 | 26.67 | 31 | E-31 | 80 |
| 32 | C-32 | 33.33 | 32 | E-32 | 86.67 |
| 33 | C-33 | 46.67 | 33 | E-33 | 73.33 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Control Class |  |  | Experimental Class |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. | Code | Score | No. | Code | Score |
| 34 | C-34 | 33.33 | 34 | E-34 | 80 |
|  |  |  | 35 | E-35 | 73.33 |
|  |  |  | 36 | E-36 | 66.67 |
|  |  |  | 37 | E-37 | 86.67 |
|  |  |  | 38 | E-38 | 80 |
|  |  |  | 39 | E-39 | 66.67 |
|  |  |  | 40 | E-40 | 80 |
| Sum |  | 1313.32 | Sum |  | 3026.68 |
| $\bar{X}$ |  | 34 | N |  | 40 |
| $\bar{X}$ | 38.627 | $\bar{X}$ |  | 75.667 |  |
| $S^{2}$ | 131.863 | $S^{2}$ |  | 60.51 |  |
| $S$ |  | 11.483 | $S$ |  | 7.778 |

1) The Normality of the Experimental Class Posttest

Based on the table above, the normality test:

## Hypothesis:

Ho : The distribution list was normal.
На : The distribution list was not normal.

## Test of hypothesis:

The formula was used:

$$
\chi^{2}=\sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{\left(O_{i}-E_{i}\right)^{2}}{E_{i}}
$$

The computation of normality test:

| Maximum score | $=93.33$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| N | $=40$ |
| Minimum score | $=60$ |
| Range | $=33.33$ |


| K/ Number of class | $=6$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Length | $=5$ |
| S | $=6.975$ |
| $\bar{x}$ | $=75.6125$ |

Table 4.12
The Frequency Distribution of the Experimental Class Post-Test

| Class |  | $f i$ | $X_{\mathrm{i}}$ | $X_{\mathrm{i}}^{2}$ | $f_{i} \cdot X_{\mathrm{i}}$ | $f_{i} \cdot X_{\mathrm{i}}^{2}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 60 | - | 64 | 1 | 62 | 3844 | 62 | 3844 |
| 65 | - | 70 | 10 | 67.5 | 4556.25 | 675 | 45562.5 |
| 71 | - | 76 | 11 | 73.5 | 5402.25 | 808.5 | 59424.75 |
| 77 | - | 82 | 11 | 79.5 | 6320.25 | 874.5 | 69522.75 |
| 83 | - | 88 | 6 | 85.5 | 7310.25 | 513 | 43861.5 |
| 89 | - | 94 | 1 | 91.5 | 8372.25 | 91.5 | 8372.25 |
| Sum |  |  |  | 40 |  |  | 3024.5 |
| 230587.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 4.13
The Frequency Distribution of the Experimental Class Post-Test

| Class |  | Bk | $\mathrm{Z}_{\mathrm{i}}$ | $\mathrm{P}\left(\mathrm{Z}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)$ | Wide <br> Range | Ei | Oi | $\frac{\left(O_{i}-E_{i}\right)^{2}}{E_{i}}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 59.5 | -2.309 | -0.489 |  |  |  |  |
| 60 | - | 64 |  |  |  | 0.045 | 1.805 | 1 | 0.648145 |
|  |  |  | 64.5 | -1.593 | -0.444 |  |  |  |  |
| 65 | - | 70 |  |  |  | 0.176 | 7.049 | 10 | 1.235108 |
|  |  |  | 70.5 | -0.732 | -0.268 |  |  |  |  |
| 71 | - | 76 |  |  |  | 0.318 | 12.75 | 11 | 0.27919 |
|  |  |  | 76.5 | 0.127 | 0.05 |  |  |  |  |
| 77 | - | 82 |  |  |  | 0.287 | 11.50 | 11 | 0.022241 |
|  |  |  | 82.5 | 0.987 | 0.338 |  |  |  |  |
| 83 | - | 88 |  |  |  | 0.129 | 5.175 | 6 | 0.113215 |
|  |  |  | 88.5 | 1.847 | 0.467 |  |  |  |  |


| 89 | - | 94 |  |  |  | 0.009 | 0.363 | 1 | 0.40505 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  | 89.5 | 1.990 | 0.476 |  |  |  |  |

$\chi^{2}=2.702949$
$\chi^{2}$ count $=2.7029$

For $\mathrm{a}=5 \%, \mathrm{dk}=6-1=5, \chi_{\text {table }}^{2}=11.0705$


With $\alpha=5 \%$ and $\mathrm{dk}=6-1=5$, from the chisquare distribution table, obtained $\chi^{2}$ table $=11.07$. Because $\chi^{2}$ count was lower than $\chi^{2}$ table $(2.7029<$ 11.07). So, the distribution list was normal.
2) The Normality of the Control Class Post-test

## Hypothesis:

Ho : The distribution list was normal
Ha : The distribution list was not normal

## Test of hypothesis:

The formula was used:
$\chi^{2}=\sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{\left(O_{i}-E_{i}\right)^{2}}{E_{i}}$
The computation of normality test:

| Maximum score | $=66.67$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| N | $=34$ |


| Minimum score | $=20$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Range | $=46.67$ |
| K / many class interval | $=6$ |
| Length of the class | $=8$ |
| S | $=12.421$ |
| $\bar{x}$ | $=37.852$ |

The computation of normality test:
Table 4.14
The Frequency Distribution of the Control Class
Post-test

| Class |  |  | $f i$ | $X_{\mathrm{i}}$ | $X_{\mathrm{i}}^{2}$ | $f_{i} \cdot X_{\mathrm{i}}$ | $f_{i} \cdot X_{\mathrm{i}}^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20 | - | 27 | 7 | 23.5 | 552.25 | 164.5 | 3865.75 |
| 28 | - | 35 | 11 | 31.5 | 992.25 | 346.5 | 10914.75 |
| 36 | - | 43 | 7 | 39.5 | 1560.25 | 276.5 | 10921.75 |
| 44 | - | 51 | 3 | 47.5 | 2256.25 | 142.5 | 6768.75 |
| 52 | - | 59 | 3 | 55.5 | 3080.25 | 166.5 | 9240.75 |
| 60 | - | 67 | 3 | 63.5 | 4032.25 | 190.5 | 12096.75 |
| Sum |  |  |  | 34 |  |  | 1287 |
| 5 | 53808.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 4.15
The Frequency Distribution of the Control Class Post-Test

| Class |  | Bk | $\mathrm{Z}_{\mathrm{i}}$ | $\mathrm{P}\left(\mathrm{Z}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)$ | Wide <br> Range | Ei | Oi | $\frac{\left(O_{i}-E_{i}\right)^{2}}{E_{i}}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 19.5 | -1.477 | -0.430 |  |  |  |  |
| 20 | - | 27 |  |  |  | 0.132521 | 4.505 | 7 | 0.888 |
|  |  |  | 27.5 | -0.833 | -0.297 |  |  |  |  |
| 28 | - | 35 |  |  |  | 0.222589 | 7.568 | 11 | 1.07 |
|  | - |  | 35.5 | -0.189 | -0.075 |  |  |  |  |
| 36 | - | 43 |  |  |  | 0.250427 | 8.514 | 7 | 0.269 |
|  |  |  | 43.5 | 0.454 | 0.175 |  |  |  |  |


|  | - | 51 |  |  | 0.188734 | 6.416 | 3 | 1.819 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 51.5 | 1.098 | 0.364 |  |  |  |  |
| 52 | - | 59 |  |  |  | 0.095266 | 3.239 | 3 | 0.019 |
|  |  |  | 59.5 | 1.742 | 0.459 |  |  |  |  |
| 60 | - | 67 |  |  |  | 0.006557 | 0.222 | 3 | 2.57 |
|  |  |  | 60.5 | 1.823 | 0.465 |  |  |  |  |

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \chi^{2}=6.6381 \\
& \chi_{\text {count }}^{2}=6.6381
\end{aligned}
$$

For $\mathrm{a}=5 \%, \mathrm{dk}=6-1=5, \chi_{\text {table }}^{2}=11.0705$


Square distribution table, obtained $\chi^{2}$ table $=11.0705$.
Because $\chi^{2}$ count was lower than $\chi^{2}$ table $(6.6381<$
11.0705). So, the distribution list was normal.

## Hypothesis

$\mathrm{H}_{0}: \sigma_{1}{ }^{2}=\sigma_{2}{ }^{2}$
$\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{a}}: \sigma_{1}{ }^{2} \neq \sigma_{2}^{2}$

## The Calculation

Formula:

$$
\mathrm{F}=\frac{\mathrm{Vb}}{\mathrm{VK}}
$$

Ho is accepted if $\mathrm{F} \leq \mathrm{F}_{1 / 2 \mathrm{a}(\mathrm{nb}-1):(\mathrm{nk}-1)}$


Table 4.16

| Variation Source | Experimental | Control |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N | 40 | 34 |
| $\bar{X}$ | 75.667 | 38.627 |
| $\left(\mathrm{~S}^{2}\right)$ | 60.51 | 131.863 |
| $(\mathrm{~S})$ | 7.778 | 11.483 |

$$
\begin{aligned}
F & =\frac{131.863}{60.51} \\
& =2.179
\end{aligned}
$$

For $\mathrm{a}=5 \%$ with:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{df} 1 \quad=\mathrm{n}-1=40-1=39 \\
& \mathrm{df} 2 \quad=\mathrm{n}-1=34-1=33 \\
& \mathrm{~F}_{(0.025)(39: 33)}=1.7596
\end{aligned}
$$



Since F count < F table, the experimental and control group have the same variance. With $\alpha=5 \%$ and $\mathrm{dk}=(40-1=39):(34-1=33)$, obtained $F_{\text {table }}=1$.
7596. Because $F_{\text {count }}$ was higher than $F_{\text {table }}(2.1792$
$>1.7596$ ). So, Ho was accepted and the two groups had the same variant/ homogeneous.

## The Hypothesis Test

In this research, because $\sigma_{1}{ }^{2}=\sigma_{2}{ }^{2}$ (has same variant), the $t$-test formula was as follows:

$$
t=\frac{\bar{X}_{1}-\overline{X_{2}}}{S \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_{1}}+\frac{1}{n_{2}}}} S^{2}=\frac{\left(n_{1}-1\right) S_{1}^{2}+\left(n_{2}-1\right) S_{2}^{2}}{n_{1}+n_{2}-2}
$$

Ho is accepted if $\mathrm{t} \leq \mathrm{t}_{(1-\mathrm{a})(\mathrm{n} 1+\mathrm{n} 2-2)}$


Table 4.17

| Variation Source | Experimental | Control |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N | 40 | 34 |
| $\bar{X}$ | 75.667 | 38.627 |
| $\left(\mathrm{~S}^{2}\right)$ | 60.51 | 131.863 |
| $(\mathrm{~S})$ | 7.778 | 11.483 |

According to the formula above, it is obtained that:

$$
S=\sqrt{\frac{(34-1) 131.86+(40-1) 60.51}{34+40-2}}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =9.65 \\
& t=\frac{75.67-38.627}{9.65 \sqrt{\frac{1}{34}+\frac{1}{40}}} \\
& =16.4469
\end{aligned}
$$

For $\mathrm{a}=5 \%$ and $\mathrm{dk}=40+34-2=72, \mathrm{t}_{(0.95)(72)}=1.993$


Since $t$ count $>\mathrm{t}$ table means that there is a significant difference between experimental and control class on the test the experimental is higher than the control one. From the computation above, by $5 \%$ alpha level of significance and $\mathrm{dk}=40+34-2=72$. It was Obtained $t_{\text {table }}$ was 1.993 while $t_{\text {count }}$ was 16.804. So, it can be concluded Ho was rejected because $t_{\text {count }}$ was higher than the critical value on the $t_{\text {table }}(16.804>1.993)$.

From the result, the hypotheses in this research can be concluded that there was a significance difference in teaching reading narrative text achievement score between experimental class
which was taught by using course review horray method and control class which was taught without using course review horray method.

## C. Discussion of the Research Findings

1. The score of initial ability ( Pre-test)

Based on the calculations of normality and homogeneity test from class VIII A as the experimental class and class VIII C as the control class is normal distribution and homogeneous.
2. The score of final ability (Post-test)

The result of this research is obtained the average score of experimental class was 75.667 which were higher than the result of control class 38.627 . The average score of experimental class was 75. 667 and (s) was 7.778. Teaching English Degrees of comparison in experimental class by using Course Review Horray as a medium can encourage the students to be more active and motivated in learning activities. Course Review Horray as a teaching medium can create situation in teaching reading of narrative text interesting and make the students easier to understand the material. It can be seen on average score of experimental class which had better result than control class.

The average score of control class was 38.627 and (s) was 11.483 . Teaching reading of narrative text at control class by using conventional method made the students feel bored
with the material that is being presented because the method is too monotonous. So, the material can't be well-transferred to the students optimally.

Based on the result of calculation t-test is obtained
$t_{\text {count }}: 16.804$ and $t_{\text {table }}: 1.993$. This shows that $t_{\text {count }}>t_{\text {table }}($
$t_{\text {count }}$ higher than $\left.t_{\text {table }}\right)$. So it means that there is a significant difference between reading narrative text's achievement score of students which was taught by using course review horray method and without course review horray method.

## D. Limitations of the Research

The researcher realizes that this research had not been done optimally. There were constraints and obstacles faced during the research process. Some limitations of this research were:

1. The research was limited at MTs N Sumber Rembang in the academic year of 2015/ 2016. When the same researches conducted in other schools, it is still possible that different result will be gained.
2. Relative lack of experience and knowledge of the researcher, makes implementation process of this research was less smooth. But the researcher tried as maximal as possible to do this research.

Considering all those limitations, there is a need to do more research about teaching reading of narrative text using the same or
different medium. The researcher hopes that there will be optimal result.

