

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

A. Finding

1. Description of Data

In this chapter, the researcher presented the data description of XI science grade of SMAN 1 Marabahan about using free translation in teaching reading. The purposes are to find out students score who used free translation in teaching reading and to find out the effectiveness of using free translation. The instrument that is used by the researcher to get the data is test. The researcher collected the data and then described about the research result of XI Science grade SMAN 1 Marabahan. The researcher has consulted with the teacher who taught at XI Science grade Mrs. IAS to know the materials. Then, the researcher can make questions from the material which is given by the teacher of XI Science grade Mrs. IAS.

The researcher did the research from January, 14th 2017, until February, 18th 2017.

Before doing this research in experiment class and control class, the researcher analyzed the instrument whether it is valid and reliable or not

before using the instrument to experiment class and control class by using SPSS 23 Program.

Table 4.1 Analysis of Validity from XI MIA 2

Case Processing Summary

	N	%
Valid	28	100
Total	28	100

I

Item	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alfa If Item Deleted
First Test	0,824	0,808
Second Test	0,810	0,821
Third Test	0,729	0,892

al Statistics

Based on table 4.1 above, the standard validity which stated a valid test if more than 0,70. Then, the validity test by using SPSS 23 showed that the first test got 0,824, the second test got 0,810 and the third test got 0,729, it can be

stated that the test is valid because validity test score more than standard validity. (See Appendix 2).

Table 4.2 Analysis of Reliability from XI MIA 2

Reliability Statistics	
N of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
3	0,89

Based on table 4.2 reliability coefficient (r) which stated that a reliability testis high if Cronbach's Alfa more than 0.70. Then, the researcher did reliability test by using SPSS 23 and got 0,890. Thus, the interpretation for Cronbach's Alfa 0,890 is very high. (See Appendix 3).

Table 4.3 Normality from Experiment and Control Class (Pre-Test)

Pre-test	Test of Normality	
	Shapiro-Wilk	
	df	Significant
Experiment Class	25	0,144
Control Class	29	0,068

Based on table 4.3 above, the researcher compared the normality test in pre-test from experiment class and control class which is calculated by SPSS

23. From table 4.3 significant of normality test consists of Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk. Kolmogorov-Smirnov significant is used if the sample more than 30 and Shapiro-Wilk significant is used if the sample less than 30. In this research, the researcher had sample less than 30. It means that the researcher using Shapiro-Wilk to be the standard of normality test. The result of Experiment class was 0,144 with significant 0.05. It means that the result of pre-test of experiment class was higher than the significant ($0,144 > 0.05$). Then, the result of control class was 0,068 with significant 0.05. It means that the result of pre-test of control class was higher than the significant ($0,068 > 0.05$). So, the data pre-test of experiment class and control class was normal distribution. (See Appendix 7).

Table 4.4 Normality from Experiment and Control Class (Post-Test)

Post-test	Shapiro-Wilk	
	Df	Significant
Experiment Class	25	0,104
Control Class	29	0,068

Based on table 4.4 above, the researcher compared the normality test of post-test from experiment class and control class who calculated by SPSS 23. The researcher used Shapiro-Wilk as the standard for normality test. The result of Experiment class was 0,104 with significant 0.05. It means that the result of post-test of experiment class was higher than the significant

(0,104>0.05). Then, the result of control class was 0,066 with significant 0.05. It means that the result of post-test of control class was higher than the significant (0,066>0.05). Thus, the data post-test of experiment class and control class was normal distribution. (See Appendix 8).

Table 4.5 Homogeneity from Experiment and Control Class (Pre-Test)

	Significant
Pre-test	0,184

Based on table 4.5 above, the result of homogeneity test in pre-test from experiment class and control class who calculated by SPSS 23 was 0,184. Which the significant of homogeneity test is 0,05. So, the result of homogeneity test in pre-test from experiment class and control class was higher than the significant (0,184>0,05). It means the data was homogeny. (See Appendix 9).

Table 4.6 Homogeneity from Experiment and Control Class (Post-Test)

	Significant
Post-test	0,405

Based on table 4.6 above, the result of homogeneity test in post-test from experiment class and control class who calculated by SPSS 23 was 0,405. Which the significant of homogeneity test is 0,05. So, the result of homogeneity test in post-test from experiment class and control class was higher than the significant ($0,405 > 0,05$). It means the data was homogeny. (See Appendix 10).

Table 4.7 the Result of Experiment Class (Pre-test and Post-test)

	Experiment Class	
	Pre-test	Post-test
Mean	68,40	74,00
Median	70,00	70,00
Mode	70	80
Minimum	40	50
Maximum	90	100
SUM	1710	1850

Pre-test Frequency of Experiment Class

Score	Frequency
40	1
50	2
60	6
70	9

80	5
90	2
Total	25

Post-test Frequency of Experiment Class

Score	Frequency
50	1
60	4
70	8
80	9
90	2
100	1
Total	25

Based on table 4.7 above, the result of pre-test and post-test from experiment class was difference. (See Appendix 5). The mean score of post-test (74.00) was higher than the mean score of pre-test (68.40). In addition, the mode of post-test (80) was higher than mode of pre-test (70). However, the median of post-test and pre-test was same 70.00. Then, sum of pre-test was 1710 with the minimum score was 40 and the frequency is 1 and the maximum score was 90 and the frequency is 2. The sum of post-test was 1850

with the minimum score was 50 and the frequency is 1 and the maximum was 100 and the frequency is 1. (See Appendix 11).

Table 4.8 the Result of Control Class (Pre-test and Post-test)

	Control Class	
	Pre-test	Post-test
Mean	61,03	62,76
Median	61,25	62,35
Mode	70	60
Minimum	40	40
Maximum	90	90
SUM	1770	1820

Pre-test Frequency of Control Class

Score	Frequency
40	3
50	7
60	7
70	9

80	2
90	1
Total	29

Post-test Frequency of Control Class

Score	Frequency
40	1
50	7
60	9
70	8
80	3
90	1
Total	29

Based on table 4.8 above, the result of pre-test and post-test from control class was little difference. (See Appendix 6). The mean score of post-test (62.76) was higher than the mean score of pre-test (61.03). In addition, the mode of post-test (60) was lower than mode of pre-test (70). Then, the median of post-test was (62.35) and pre-test was (61.25). Then, sum of pre-test was 1770 with the minimum score was 40 and the frequency is 3 and the

maximum score was 90 and the frequency is 1. The sum of post-test was 1820 with the minimum score was 40 and the frequency is 1 and the maximum was 90 and the frequency is 1. (See Appendix 12).

Table 4.9 the Result of Experiment Class and Control Class (Post-test)

	Post-test	
	Experiment Class	Control Class
Mean	74,00	62,76
Median	74,12	62,35
Mode	80	60
Minimum	50	40
Maximum	100	90
SUM	1850	1820

Based on table 4.9 above, the result of post-test from experiment class and control class was difference. The mean score of experiment class (74.00) was higher than the mean score of control class (61.03). In addition, the mode of experiment class (80) was higher than mode of control class (60). Then, the

median of experiment class was (74.12) and control class was (62.35). Then, sum of control class was 1850 with the minimum score was 50 and the frequency is 1 and the maximum score was 100 and the frequency is 1. The sum of control class was 1820 with the minimum score was 40 and the frequency is 1 and the maximum was 90 and the frequency is 1. (See Appendix 13).

Table 4.10 Levene test for Homogeneity of variance of Pre-test Score

Test of Homogeneity of Variance		
Based	df	Significant
Mean	52	0,648
Median	52	0,581
Median and with adjusted df	51,517	0,581

Based on table 4.10 significant value of based on mean is 0,648. If the significant table 0,05, so the significant value 0,648 higher than 0,05. It means the difference between variances is not significant. As the result of pre-test

from experiment class and control class are homogenous. Then t-test can be applied. (See Appendix 14).

Table 4.11 The Result of t-test of Experiment Class and Control Class for Pre-test.

	Independent t-test			Critical t-value
	Significant	T	df	
Equal variances assumed	0,648	2,175	52	1,6775

Based on table 4.11, the t value is 2,175 with df52. To get the critical t value (t-table) at significant 0,05 with df52 is using interpolation computation which this computation for searching the data who didn't t-table. Then the researcher took the closest df with df52 from the table. The closest df with df52 is df40 and below from df52 is df60. (See Appendix 18). After that df40

minus df60, if df40 is 1,684 minus df60 is 1,671 equals 0,013. Then 0,013 times 1 divided 2 equals 0,0065. Next, 1,684 minus 0,0065 equals 1,6775. So, the critical t value is 1,6775. Because t value (2,175) is higher than critical t value (1,6775) so the experiment class and control class are significantly different in teaching reading before experiment. (See Appendix 15).

Table 4.12 Levene test for Homogeneity of variance of Post test Score

Test of Homogeneity of Variance		
Based	df	Significant
Mean	52	0,784
Median	52	0,938
Median and with adjusted df	51,993	0,938

Based on table 4.12 significant value of based on mean is 0,787. If the significant table 0,05, so the significant value 0,787 higher than 0,05. It means the difference between variances is not significant. As the result of post-test

from experiment class and control class are homogenous. Then t-test can be applied. (See Appendix 16).

Table 4.13 The Result of t-test of Experiment Class and Control Class for Post-test.

	Independent t-test			Critical t-value
	Significant	T	df	
Equal variances assumed	0,787	3,607	52	1,6775

Based on table 4.13, the t count is 3,607 with df52. To get the critical t value (t-table) at significant 0,05 with df52 is using interpolation computation which this computation for searching the data who didn't t-table. Then the researcher took the closest df with df52 from the table. The closest df with

df52 is df40 and below from df52 is df60. (See Appendix 18). After that df40 minus df60, if df40 is 1,684 minus df60 is 1,671 equals 0,013. Then 0,013 times 1 divided 2 equals 0,0065. Next, 1,684 minus 0,0065 equals 1,6775. So, the critical t value is 1,6775. (See Appendix 17). Because t count (3,607) is higher than t table (1,6775). It means the mean difference from experiment class and control class (post-test) is significant. Then, if t value > t table, it means H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted.

The last. From the descriptions above the mean score pre-test of experiment class was 68,40 it changed in post-test after the researcher gave treatment about free translation was 74,00. The mean score pre-test of control class was 61,03 it changed in post-test was 62,76. Then, from pre-test and post test score to get a normality and homogeneity.

B. Discussion

From observation, the researcher got the results in experiment and control classes. For experiment class, it was given treatment meanwhile for control class without the treatment. It can be concluded that the experiment class was more effective than control class.

Based on table 4.9, the experiment class was given free translation in teaching reading and it was more effective than without free translation in

teaching reading. Thus, free translation can increase students' skill in teaching reading than without free translation. Landers (2001: 55) states that the goal behind translation is not to render what the SL author writes but what he/she meant. Some proverbs cannot be rendered free because they tend to have a figurative image meaning and in order to render it free, the translator must understand this figurative meaning. On the other hand, Newmark (1988: 45) states that in free translation, the translators usually paraphrase the original text but the SL manner, content, and form are not used. In the free translation product, the texts do not maintain the content of the original anymore and use the forms that are easier to understand and usually shorter than the original ones. According to (Hall; 1977), there are two basic approaches to organizational effectiveness- the goal model and the resource acquisition model. (Etzioni; 1964, p. 8) states in in simple version that effectiveness has been defined as "the degree to which (an organization) realizes its goals".

Before conducting the test by the instrument, the researcher should get validity and reliability. Based on table 4.1, analysis of validity of XI MIA 2 showed the test was valid. According to Cronbach (1990), to the question "what is a good validity coefficient?" the only sensible answer is "the best you can get", and it is unusual for a validity coefficient to rise above 0.60, though that is far from perfect prediction. Arikunto (2012), a test will be called to be valid if there is sufficient evidence that test score correlated fairly highly with

actual ability in the skills being tasted, and then we may feel reasonably safe in assuming that the test is valid for our purpose. Based on table 4.2, it showed that the test was reliable. Sugiyono (2013: 121) "Reliability is the instrument when used several times to measure same object who will generate same data. Gay (1987) Reliability is the degree to which a test consistently measures whatever it measures. Errors of measurement that affect reliability are random errors and errors of measurement that affect validity are systematic or constant errors.

After getting the validity and reliability, the next was about normality. Based on the table 4.3, it showed the data of pre-test of experiment class and control class which was normal in distribution. Also, table 4.4, showed the data of experiment class and control class of post-test was normal. The Shapiro–Wilk test (Shapiro and Wilk, 1965) is a test of the composite hypothesis that the data are i.i.d. (independent and identically distributed) and normal, i.e. $N(\mu, \sigma^2)$ for some unknown real μ and some $\sigma > 0$. If the p-value is less than, say, the conventional level 0.05, then one rejects the normality hypothesis, otherwise one doesn't reject it.

Based table 4.5, it showed the data of pre-test of experiment class and control class was homogeneity. Also, table 4.6 showed homogeneity test of post-test of experiment class and control class was homogeneity.

Table 4.7 showed the result of pre-test and post-test of experiment class where the mean of experiment class was increased after treatment. It means that the free translation was effective in teaching reading. According to Schillinger (2010) "Effectiveness refers to the intervention's ability to do many good than harm for the target population in real world setting". (Hall; 1977), there are two basic approaches to organizational effectiveness- the goal model and the resource acquisition model. (Etzioni; 1964, p. 8) defined in simple version, effectiveness has been defined as "the degree to which (an organization) realizes its goals". While, table 4.8, showed of control class of pre-test and post-test. The mean of control class was little increased without treatment.

Table 4.10, showed the pre-test of experiment class and control class. The result was homogenous but variances are not significant. Thus, the researcher must apply $t_{\text{-test}}$. Meanwhile table 4.11 showed the result of $t_{\text{-test}}$ of pre-test of experiment class and control class. Then, it was indicated that the means of experiment class and control class were significantly different in teaching reading before the researcher doing treatment in experiment class.

Based on table 4.12, the result of post-test of experiment class and control class was homogenous. Also, the variance between experiment and control class was different. Thus, $t_{\text{-test}}$ can be applied. Table 4.13 showed $t_{\text{-count}}$ was higher than $t_{\text{-table}}$ it means post-test of experiment class and control class was

significant difference in the means. H_0 was rejected and H_a was accepted. W. S. Gosset (1908). The T-test is used to test differences in the means of two groups. The grouping variable is categorical and data for the dependent variable is interval scaled. The following table showed alternative statistical techniques that can be used to analyze this type of data when different levels of measurement are available.

Consequently, after the writer doing this research, treatment of free translation methods was increasing students mean in teaching reading compared without treatment. According the result of another researcher in previous studies, like MustikaShifa (2011) which stated that using translation method in “a walk to remember” novel translated into “kankukenangselalu” discussed about the methods that is used by her. She used 4 kinds of methods like word-for-word, free translation, faithful translation and idiomatic translation. Free translation is the method with high presentence used by her. Then, Windawati (2015) studied about the translation methods and meaning equivalence of idiomatic phrasal verbs in X-Men First Class movie discussed about the methods were used in her research. Which the result of her research was focused more on the reader and target language. Then, Abdul Rosyid (2011) did the analysis of the English-Indonesian translation method in a novel “a study in scarlet Sherlock Holmes” by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle and

discussed the methods used by translator to get the translation in novel and the translator tried to find the closest natural meaning in TL.

As a whole, the result of this research indicated that free translation used by the researcher was effective. There was a difference between experiment class and control class before using free translation. Then, after experiment class is used free translation in teaching the mean was increasing and higher than control class without using free translation. This research was supported the conclusion reached by several researchers in earlier studies (MustikaSyifa, 2011; Windawati, 2015; Abdul Rosyid, 2011).