

CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

A. Finding

1. Description of data

In this chapter, the researcher wants to present the data descriptions of the eleventh grade students of M.A Darul Imad Kabupaten Banjar Academic Year 2017 about using jigsaw strategy in teaching reading comprehension. The purpose of this research is to find out the students' reading comprehension that use jigsaw strategy and that is not by using test as an instrument and data measurement. Before doing test, the researcher had consulted with the English teacher, Mrs. RI, about the materials, the classes and students characteristic. This below is the result of the data collected which the researcher wants to describe.

The research was done from 14 November 2017 to 13 January 2018 which meeting with the Head Master and consulting with the English teacher is done about two weeks before this research was conducted.

Before the researcher did the research, the instrument must be analyzed to measure whether it was valid and reliable or not by using SPSS 23.0 program which then shared to the sample.



Table 4.1 Analysis of Validity

No. Item of Reading Comprehensio	Validity value of each item for Reading	R table	Status
---	--	----------------	---------------

n Test	Comprehension Test		
1	618**	0,239	Valid
2	526**	0,239	Valid
3	362**	0,239	Valid
4	531**	0,239	Valid
5	437**	0,239	Valid
6	459**	0,239	Valid
7	390**	0,239	Valid
8	465**	0,239	Valid
9	488**	0,239	Valid
10	389**	0,239	Valid
11	407**	0,239	Valid
12	462**	0,239	Valid
13	535**	0,239	Valid
14	390**	0,239	Valid
15	515**	0,239	Valid
16	531**	0,239	Valid
17	407**	0,239	Valid
18	489**	0,239	Valid
19	425**	0,239	Valid
20	448**	0,239	Valid

Based on the validity table 4.1 above, it is showed that the instrument is valid from item one to twenty by using SPSS 23.0 and also the table showed that r_{count} was higher than r_{table} (0,239) which mean the instrument went through the validity standard.

Table 4.2 Analysis of reliability

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,726	21

The result of reliability by using SPSS 23.0 program based on the table is 0,726 which means the value of Cronbach's Alpha this instrument is higher than 0,70 and the interpretation is in high category.

After validity and reliability, then the next step is to analyze the data, whether the data distributes normal and homogen or not and also it is aimed to test the hypothesis whether using t test or u test formula. These below are the table analysis result by using SPSS 23.0 program.

Table 4.3 Analysis of Normality Pre-test (Experiment and Control)

Tests of Normality						
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
pre_con	,110	29	,200	,970	29	,549
pre_ex	,157	29	,067	,959	29	,317

Based on the table 4.3 consists of Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk. Kolmogorov-Smirnov's significant is used for the sample that is more than 50 samples (>50) and Shapiro-Wilk's significant is used for the sample that is under 50 samples (<50). Therefore, in this research the researcher had Shapiro-Wilk for each sample is under 50 and it showed that the significance of pre-test in the control class is 0,549 and the significance of pre-test in the experiment class is 0,317 after calculate by using SPSS 23.0. The researcher found that the significance of each variable is higher than significance standard. The result of pre-test in control class is $0,549 > 0,05$

and the result of pre test in experiment class is $0,317 > 0,05$ and as a consequence the pre-test data was normally distributed.

Table 4.4 Analysis of Normality Post-test (Experiment and Control)

Tests of Normality						
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
post_con	,135	29	,188	,931	29	,060
post_ex	,187	29	,011	,963	29	,395

Based on the table 4.4 above, the researcher compared the post-test of control and experiment class which had been calculated by using SPSS 23.0 program and found the significance result in the Shapiro-Wilk. The result consists the significancy for post-test in the control class is 0,060 and the significancy for post-test in the experiment class is 0,395. Then, the researcher compared each of them to the significance standard which are the result of post-test in the control class is $0,060 > 0,05$ and the result of post-test in the experiment class is $0,395 > 0,05$ and as a consequence the post-test data was normally distributed.

Table 4.5 Analysis of Homogeneity Pre-test (Experiment and Control)

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	312,802	7	44,686	,245	,968
Within Groups	3833,750	21	182,560		

Total	4146,552	28			
-------	----------	----	--	--	--

Based on the table 4.5 above, the researcher put the data of pre-test and post-test for experiment and control class and conducted by using SPSS 23.0 program to find the homogeneity of the test. It showed that the homogeneity of pre-test for experiment and control class has 0,968, compared with significance standard $0,05 < 0,968$ means that the data was homogeneous distributed.

Table 4.6 Analysis of Homogeneity Post-test (Experiment and Control)

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3257,174	12	271,431	,661	,763
Within Groups	6566,964	16	410,435		
Total	9824,138	28			

Based on the table 4.6 above, it shows that the significance value is 0,763 and the significance standard is 0,05. If we compared both of them $0,763 > 0,05$ which means that the data was homogenous distributed.

Table 4.7 The Result of T-test for Experiment and Control Class
Independent Samples 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
nilai	1,150	,288	-1,434	57	,157	-6,368	4,439	-15,258	2,522
Equal variances assumed									
Equal variances not assumed			-1,439	55,938	,156	-6,368	4,426	-15,235	2,499

Based on the table 4.7 above, the result of post-test datas are conducted and analyzed by using t-test formula shows the t_{count} is -1,434 with df is 57, the t_{count} then compared with t_{table} . In case, $t_{count} > t_{table}$ means H_a is accepted and H_o rejected but in case it shows the opposite $t_{count} < t_{table}$ means H_a is rejected and H_o accepted. And in this data, t_{table} shows 1,672. The result of t_{count} -1,434 < -1,672 from t_{table} . Therefore, H_a is rejected and H_o is accepted which means there is no significant difference in the students' reading comprehension who were taught by using jigsaw strategy and between students who were taught without it.

2. The researcher makes a conclusion
 - a. Mean of students' pre-test who use jigsaw strategy to improve reading comprehension:
 $M_x = 53,27$

b. Mean of students' pre-test who do not use jigsaw strategy to

improve reading comprehension:

$$M_y = 49,67$$

c. Mean of students' post-test who use jigsaw strategy to improve

reading comprehension:

$$M_x = 66,03$$

d. Mean of students' post-test who do not use jigsaw strategy to

improve reading comprehension:

$$M_y = 59,67$$

The last is to analyze the frequency percentage of students' score after

doing post-test for both classes to know how many percent students get the

higher and lower score which refer to Harris' interpretation on the chapter 3

Table 3.1

Based on the result of the test, it is found that the categories of the reading comprehension of students who use jigsaw strategy at post-test by using SPSS 23.0 program are categorized in:

Table 4.8 Students' Post-test categorization (Experimental Class)

Category	Student	Score
Excellent category	5 students (17,1%)	80-100
Good category	12 students (41,3%)	70-79
Fair category	5 students (17,2%)	60-69
Low category	3 students (10,3%)	50-59
Poor category	5 students (13,7%)	0-49

Based on the categorizations above, there are many students who get good category about 41,3%. Unfortunately, there are still many students who get low and poor category as it was seen. For the detail, see on the appendix VII.

The second categorization is from students who were not taught by using Jigsaw strategy to improve their reading comprehension at post-test is categorized in:

Table 4.9 Students' Post-test categorization (Control Class)

Category	Student	Score
Excellent category	8 students (26,6%)	80-100
Good category	1 student (3,3%)	70-79
Fair category	5 students (16,7%)	60-69
Low category	9 students (30,0%)	50-59
Poor category	7 students (23,3%)	0-49

In this categorization above, it was showing that many students get excellent category with 26,6%. For the reader it may make confused because that is the highest level category but if it is looked back, there are also many students who get low and poor category more than in the experimental class. The categories are maldistribution which cannot be compared with the students who were taught by using jigsaw strategy. For the detail, see on the appendix VIII.

B. Discussion

Based on statistical measurement above shows that H_0 (Null Hypothesis) is accepted and H_a (Alternative Hypothesis) is rejected because $t_{count} < t_{table}$ or t_{count} is lower than t_{table} , which means :

1. There is no significant difference in the students' reading comprehension between students who were taught by using jigsaw strategy in the eleventh grade of student class of B accountancy at M.A Darul Imad Kabupaten.Banjar Academic Year 2017/2018.

2. There is no effectiveness in using jigsaw strategy to improve reading comprehension because improving result which can be seen on post-test score of experimental class is not far with control class.

Based on the result of the test, there are different highest and lowest scores of the test. The highest score for the experimental class is 95 and the highest score for the control class is 90. While the lowest score for the experimental class is 30 and the lowest score for control class is 35 also the average of experimental class is 66,03 and the average of control class is 55,67. It means that there is no significant improvement, even though both classes' score shows increased.

The researcher interprets the students' score for pre-test and post-test and compared the mean of both. Based on the category which is submitted by David p, Harris (1969, p.134), the researcher finds that the mean score for experimental class the interpretation is Fair and the interpretation for control class is low. Therefore, both classes have under Good interpretation for mean score and the distribution of each score on the students is maldistribution. Some students have highest score and some students have the lowest. In conclusion, there is no significant difference in reading comprehension between students who were taught by jigsaw strategy for reading comprehension and those who were not taught by jigsaw.

According to the result of the research, the students who taught by jigsaw can increase their reading comprehension besides the students who were not taught by jigsaw also increase. It was because students who taught by jigsaw was not focus the objective of the study, but they were just fun with the strategy which the strategy requires them to communicate each other. As the result there is no differences between students who were taught by using jigsaw and who were not

or just given the monotonous strategy like the teacher was mostly given. According to Sadiman (2009, p.81), there are some weaknesses of it such as: 1. Because of fun, students just play and do not pay attention to the rules. 2. In stimulating, almost all of students get the wrong impression. 3. Only involved few students, besides the involvement of all students are important to make the teaching process can be more effective and efficient.

Based on the result of the research, the researcher gives interpretation that jigsaw strategy is not effective to improve their reading comprehension in the eleventh grade of student class of B accountancy at MA. Darul Imad Kabupaten Banjar Academic Year 2017/2018 with Fair Category. There was a marked improvement in reading comprehension which was taught by Jigsaw. It is because Jigsaw for reading comprehension is not suitable with the theme on teaching process in this class. Roy Killen (1996) states there are some constraints in applying this strategy in the field.

1. The main topic in this strategy is 'peer teaching' which is the process of the lesson is taught by their friend and can be crucial because of perception differences in comprehending a concept that will be discussed together with the other students.
2. It will be hard to convince the students that they can discuss to explain the material with their friend if they do not have a self-confident.
3. The students' track record must had by the teacher and this usually needs a long time to know the type, the characteristic of the students in the group deeper.
4. And sometime, to teach the students which has much population is difficult.

Teaching and learning process by using jigsaw strategy is not always going well. Consequently, there are some problems appear, and the most appear frequently is the students are not really familiar with the strategy even the teacher often use the similar strategy with jigsaw. The researcher and the students were often brought by conventional teaching strategy which only one-way material is given. The other problem is timeless, this strategy must done in many times which adapted with the curriculum.

On the other hand, many problems appeared such as described at the disadvantages of jigsaw in chapter two. For example, several problems that appear; 1) There are some students who feel confused during jigsaw activity, if the teacher can not explain it to the students it will be harmful in the class, because if the students felt hard to understand, it might produce less productivity at some groups. 2) There are some students who are unable to handle their reading material in jigsaw activity. 3) The students who do not have a self confidence in discussing will be difficult to deliver the material. 4) The active students will dominate the discussion and will control the discussion process. 5) The students who are not familiar in competition will be difficult to follow the learning process. 6) A member who becomes a representative is usually not appropriate between skill and the material they have to be learned. 7) A crowd condition makes the students cannot be concentrated and deliver the material they have learned in expert group. 8) The unbalance of the number of member in the group. 9)

The support of good class condition such as; large room and hard method and material, because the students have to be moved on one group to others.

Based on the final result that the researcher did in teaching reading comprehension by using jigsaw were only some students who familiar what does the jigsaw strategy look like and it made the other students who did not familiar confuse. In addition, the researcher condition itself as their teacher made them awkward and it was observably along the material, only some students looked active and it was influentially for the result of the test result. Beside that, many problems happened during the process as already mention on the previous text.

