## CHAPTER IV

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

## A. FINDINGS

## 1. Brief History of English Department

Jurusan Tadris Bahasa Inggris was opened in 1984 with the first head was Drs. H. A. Kadir Munsy, Dipl.Ad.Ed and Drs. H. Ahdi Makmur, M.Ag as secretary. The next period was continued by Drs. H. Saifuddin Syukur, MA as the head and the secretary was Drs. H. Ahdi Makmur, M.Ag. But in academic year 1988/1989 Jurusan Tadris Bahasa Inggris was closed because it was waiting for operational permission from the Department of Religious Affairs (DEPAG).

After, in academic year 1997/1998 Tadris Bahasa Inggris was opened again the second time and named Jurusan Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris (English Department) which led by Drs. H. ahdi Makmur, M.Ag. and Dr. Sa'adillah as secretary. Because Drs. Sa'adillah was continuing his study S2, the secretary position was substituted by Drs. H. Husnul Yaqin, M.Ed. Since 2003, the secretary was substituted by Dra. Wardah Hayati with Drs. H. Ahdi Makmur, M.Ag. still the head of the department. Then in September 2005 until 2006, the head of English Department was Drs. Isa Anshari MZ and Dra. Hj Nida Mufidah, M.Pd. as the secretary. Then because of Drs Isa Anshari Anshari passed away, the head of English Department is lead by Drs. Saifuddin Ahmad

Husin, M.A. since January 2007 and Dra. Hj. Nida Mufidah, M.Pd. as the secretary, but in August 2007 Drs. Saifuddin Ahmad Husin, M.A resigned from his position because he continued study in P.h.D in UGM. As the next leader was Dra. Hj. Nida Mufidah, M.Pd. who handled English Department.

Since January 2008 until December 2012 English Department led by Dra. Hj. Nida Mufidah, M.Pd. and Nurlaila Kadariah, S.Ag as secretary. From January until June 2010, Ridha Fadillah, M.Ed. as secretary and lately the secretary of English Department has been Nani Hizriani, M.A. since July 2010 untill now.

Since January 2013 English Department has been led by Drs. Sa’adillah M.Pd. and Nani Hizriani as a secretary.

The main purposes of English Department are producing qualified English Department scholar than can exist in development English ability, linguistic and literature, able to be the professional English teaching, in elementary and middle degree, and makes English Department as the center of occupation and development of English teacher staff.

The curriculum that is used in English Department consists of 155 SKS. That includes institute subject, faculty and English Department subject. The students need 4 years to finish their study in English Department. English Department has 15 permanent lecturers (civil servants) from different educational background.

English Department also worked together with RELO (Regional English Language Office) to invite English teachers were native speakers of English. This cooperation aimed to encourage Indonesian students' quality in English competency. It also aims to encourage teachers' competence of teaching and learning methods, approaches, techniques and materials, especially English Department's lecturers.

This cooperation began since academic year 2007/2008. There were three native English speaking fellows, who were already assigned to teach in English Department, including: Suzannah Mary Schoff, M.A (2007/2008), Andrea Taylor, M.A (2008/2009), and Ashleigh Sayer, M.A (2009/2010).

Table 4.1. the number of English Language Fellows of English Department IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin.

| No | English Fellows | Period | From | Educational Background |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Suzannah Mary Schoff, M.A | September   <br> 2007 until  <br> June $30^{\text {th }}$  <br> 2008   | California, United States | B.A. at Educational of San Fransisco, CA M.A TESOL at Intrax English Institute, Chicago IL |
| 2 | Andrea Taylor, M.A | August $30^{\text {th }}$ <br> 2008 until <br> June $30^{\text {th }}$ <br> 2009  | California, United States | B.A. Drama and Art at San Fransisco State University M.A TESOL Diploma at San Fransisco State University |
| 3 | Ashleigh Sayer, M.A | September $2^{\text {nd }} \quad 2009$ until June $30^{\text {th }} 2010$ | New Hampshire, United States | B.A Biology and Music at Kenyon College, Ohio <br> M.A Literacy of Bilingual, ESL and |


|  |  |  |  | Multicultural |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  | Education | at |
|  |  |  | University | of |
| Massachusetts, |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Amherst. |  |

## 1. Description About Lecturers and Students Condition

There are 15 permanent lecturers (civil servants) from different educational background and 406 students of English Department of Tarbiyah and Teachers Training Faculty of IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin in academic year 2011/2012. The description of lecturers and students can be seen in following table:

Table 4.2. The Number of Lecturers of English Department IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin in Academic Year 2011/2012

| No | Name | Last Graduation | Subject |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Drs. H. Ahdi Makmur, M.Ag, Ph.D | S1 Bahasa Inggris (IKIP Jogjakarta) S2 Islamic Studies Canada dan UIN Jakarta, S3 Universitas Utara Malaysia | Metodologi Penelitian Bahasa |
| 2 | DR. H. Husnul Yaqin, M.Ed | S1 Pendidikan Agama Islam FK. Tarbiyah IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin, S2 Administration of Education Australia, S3 Islamic Studies UIN Jakarta | Dasar-Dasar Administrasi Pendidikan |
| 3 | DR. Saifuddin Ahmad Husin, M.A | S1 Bahasa Inggris FK Tarbiyah IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin, S2 Linguistic USA, S3 Ilmu Budaya dan | Psycholinguistics <br> Morphosyntax <br> Phonology |


|  |  | Humaniora UGM Jogjakarta |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | Drs. Sa'adillah M.Pd | S1 Bahasa Inggris FK <br> Tarbiyah IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin, Managemen Pendidikan UNLAM Banjarmasin | Vocabulary A, B, Dictation, English for Islamic Studies |
| 5 | DR. Dina Hermina, M.Pd | S1 PAI FK Tarbiyah IAIN <br> Antasari Banjarmasin, S2 Evaluasi Pendidikan IKIP Jogjakarta, Jogjakarta | Statistik <br> Pendidikan,, <br> Evaluasi <br> Pendidikan |
| 6 | Dra.  <br> Mufidah, M.Pd | S1 Bahasa Inggris UNLAM, S2 Pendidikan Bahasa Sastra Indonesia dan Daerah UNLAM, sedang S3 UN Malang | Language <br> Assessment, <br> Teaching Media, <br> Seminar <br> Linguistic |
| 7 | Dra. Wardah Hayati, M.Pd | S1 $\quad$ Bahasa Inggris <br> UNLAM, S2 Women <br> Studies Australia  | Intensive Reading II, Translation II |
| 8 | $\begin{array}{ll} \hline \text { Nurlaila } & \text { Kadariah, } \\ \text { S.Ag M.Pd } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { S1 PAI FK Tarbiyah IAIN } \\ & \text { Antasari Banjarmasin, } \\ & \text { sedang S2 FKIP UNLAM } \end{aligned}$ | Grammar I, Grammar II, Bahasa Indonesia, Profesi Keguruan |
| 9 | Nani Hizriani, M.A | S1 Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris UNMUH Malang, S2 TESOL Australia | TEFL, Reading C |
| 10 | Rusnadi, $\quad$ S.Pd.I M.Pd.I M.A | S1 Bahasa Inggris FK <br> Tarbiyah IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin, S2 IAIN Antasari, S2 TESOL Murray, Kentucky USA | TEFL, Reading C, Translation |
| 11 | Ridha Fadillah, M.Ed | S1 Pendidikan Bahasa <br> Inggris Universitas Islam <br> Malang, S2 TESOL | Intro to <br> Linguistic, <br> Extensive |


|  |  | Malaysia, Sedang S3 di UIN Malang | Reading |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12 | Rahmila Murtiana, S. S,M.A | S1 Strata Inggris <br> Universitas Diponegoro  <br> Semarang, S2 TESOL <br> Australia   | Academic <br> Writing, Intro to Literature |
| 13 | Raida Asfihana, M.Pd |   <br> S1 Pendidikan Bahasa <br> Inggris UNLAM <br> Banjarmasin, S2 <br> Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris <br> UN Malang  | Curriculum and Material Development, Grammar III |
| 14 | Puji Sri Rahayu, M.A | S1 Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris UNMUH Malang, S2 Applied Linguistics Australia | Intro <br> Linguistic, <br> Translation II |
| 15 | Hj. Noor Maulidiyah, M.A | S1 Bahasa Inggris  <br> Malaysia, S2 Bahasa <br> Inggris Malaysia   | Intermediate <br> Listening, <br> Academic <br> Writing |

Table 4.3. Description of Staff of English Department IAIN Antasari
Banjarmasin in Academic Year 2011/2012

| No | Name | Graduated | Year |
| ---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 1. | Saidil Imani, S. Pd. I | S1 IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin | 2007 |
| 2. | Hidayah Nor, S. Pd | S1 IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin | 2010 |
| 3. | Nor Izatil Hasanah, S. Pd | S1 IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin | 2011 |
| 4. | Herlena, S. Pd | S1 IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin | 2012 |
| 5. | Hidayah Nor, M. Pd | S2 IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin | 2013 |

Table 4.4. Number of English Department Students

| No | Academic Year | Sex |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\mathbf{M}$ | $\mathbf{F}$ |  |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | $2005 / 2006$ | - | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| 2 | $2006 / 2007$ | 3 | 3 | 6 |
| 3 | $2007 / 2008$ | 13 | 16 | 29 |
| 4 | $2008 / 2009$ | 18 | 43 | 61 |
| 5 | $2009 / 2010$ | 22 | 57 | 79 |
| 6 | $2010 / 2011$ | 37 | 80 | 117 |
| 7 | $2011 / 2012$ | 41 | 73 | 124 |
| 8 | $2012 / 2013$ | 45 | 97 | 142 |
| 9 | $2013 / 2014$ | 58 | 135 | 193 |
|  | Total | 217 | 478 | 695 |

Source: Document of English Department 2014

On this data presentation the writer describes about result of research on the field based on the test result as primary data. This test to know how is the students' ability in reading comprehension, the students' reading comprehension ability in sentence length and the influence of sentence length.

In this test the students will answer 40 questions of multiple choice. Those data consist of 2 categories of passages its will be measured, such as:

1) Passage with long sentences (LS) +20 questions
2) Passage with short sentences (SS) + 20 questions

The purpose of this data is to get better understanding about students' ability in reading comprehension and to know the influence of sentence length at the Fourth Semester of English Education Department IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin. Those data will be presented in the following tables:

Table 4.5. Score of Class A

| No | Students' Name | LS Score | Category | SS Score | Category |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A.1 | 45 | Poor | 35 | Poor |
| 2 | A.2 | 40 | Poor | 45 | Poor |
| 3 | A.3 | 40 | Poor | 55 | Poor |
| 4 | A.4 | 70 | Good | 55 | Poor |
| 5 | A.5 | 35 | Poor | 45 | Poor |
| 6 | A.6 | 55 | Poor | 40 | Poor |
| 7 | A.7 | 55 | Poor | 40 | Poor |
| 8 | A.8 | 40 | Poor | 40 | Poor |
| 9 | A.9 | 40 | Poor | 55 | Poor |
| 10 | A.10 | 55 | Poor | 35 | Poor |
| 11 | A.11 | 60 | Low | 60 | Low |
| 7 | Total | 535 |  | 505 |  |

Table 4.6. Score of Class B

| No | Students' Name | LS Score | Category | SS Score | Category |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | B.1 | 55 | Poor | 70 | Good |
| 2 | B.2 | 80 | Excellent | 85 | Excellent |
| 3 | B.3 | 45 | Poor | 60 | Low |
| 4 | B.4 | 75 | Very <br> Good | 65 | Fair |
| 5 | B.5 | 80 | Excellent | 80 | Excellent |
| 6 | B.6 | 45 | Poor | 45 | Poor |
| 7 | B.7 | 35 | Poor | 55 | Poor |
| 8 | B.8 | 55 | Poor | 40 | Poor |
| 9 | B.9 | 45 | Poor | 55 | Poor |
| 10 | B.10 | 70 | Good | 90 | Very Excellen |
| 11 | B.11 | 55 | Poor | 80 | Excellent |
| 12 | B.12 | 60 | Low | 60 | Low |
| 7 | Total | 700 |  | 785 |  |

Table 4.7. Score of Class C

| No | Students' Name | LS Score | Category | SS Score | Category |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | C. 1 | 50 | Poor | 60 | Low |
| 2 | C. 2 | 50 | Poor | 45 | Poor |
| 3 | C. 3 | 50 | Poor | 60 | Low |


| 4 | C.4 | 50 | Poor | 65 | Fair |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | C. 5 | 45 | Poor | 60 | Low |
| 6 | C.6 | 50 | Poor | 60 | Low |
| 7 | C. 7 | 55 | Poor | 55 | Poor |
| 8 | C. 8 | 30 | Poor | 45 | Poor |
| 9 | C. 9 | 45 | Poor | 55 | Poor |
| 10 | C.10 | 55 | Poor | 55 | Poor |
| 11 | C.11 | 50 | Poor | 60 | Low |
| 12 | C.12 | 60 | Low | 60 | Low |
| Total | 590 |  | 680 |  |  |

Table 4.8. Score of Class D

| No | Students' Name | LS Score | Category | SS Score | Category |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | D.1 | 60 | Low | 30 | Poor |
| 2 | D.2 | 50 | Poor | 45 | Poor |
| 3 | D.3 | 40 | Poor | 55 | Poor |
| 4 | D.4 | 35 | Poor | 55 | Poor |
| 5 | D.5 | 40 | Poor | 45 | Poor |
| 6 | D.6 | 45 | Poor | 45 | Poor |
| 7 | D.7 | 55 | Poor | 55 | Poor |
| 8 | D.8 | 45 | Poor | 60 | Low |
| 9 | D.9 | 40 | Poor | 40 | Poor |


| 10 | D.10 | 40 | Poor | 55 | Poor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11 | D.11 | 60 | Low | 60 | Low |
| 12 | D.12 | 40 | Poor | 50 | Poor |
| Total |  | 550 |  | 595 |  |

Based on the table above, it can be known that the highest score of Long Sentences is 80 and the lowest score is 30 . The highest score of Short Sentences is 90 and the lowest score is 30 .

To better understand about the level of the students' ability in reading comprehension and to know the influence of sentence length at the Fourth Semester of English Education Department IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin Academic Year 2013/2014, the writer uses the mean as follow:

Table 4.8. The final score from all classes:

| No | Class | Total LS Score | Total SS Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 10 students from Class A | 535 | 505 |
| 2 | 11 students from Class B | 700 | 785 |
| 3 | 11 students from Class C | 590 | 680 |
| 4 | 11 students from Class D | 550 | 595 |
| Total 43 students : N=47 |  |  |  |

$$
\begin{array}{rlr}
M x & =\frac{\sum x}{N} & M y=\frac{\square y}{N} \\
=\frac{2375}{47} & =\frac{2565}{47} \\
=50,53 & =54,57
\end{array}
$$

So, the mean score of long sentences at the Fourth Semester of English Education Department is 50,53 . It can be said that the level of long sentences is poor and the mean score of short sentences at the Fourth Semester of English Education Department is 54,57 . It can be said that the level of short sentences is poor.

## 1. Students Mastery in Long Sentences

Table 4.9. The Frequency Distribution of Students' Score in Long Sentences

| No | Score | Category | Frequency | Percentage (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $90-100$ | Very Excellent | - | - |
| 2 | $80-<90$ | Excellent | 2 | $4,25 \%$ |
| 3 | $75-<80$ | Very Good | 1 | $2,12 \%$ |
| 4 | $70-<75$ | Good | 2 | $4,25 \%$ |


| 5 | $65-<70$ | Fair | - | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 | $60-<65$ | Low | 5 | $10,63 \%$ |
| 7 | $0-<60$ | Poor | 37 | $78,72 \%$ |
| Total |  | 47 | $100 \%$ |  |

From the table above, it shows that the students reading comprehension at the Fourth Semester of English Education Department IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin Academic Year 2013/2014 based on its categories there are: 37 students $(78,72 \%)$ get the score $0-<60$ (poor category), 5 students (10,63\%) get the score $60-<65$ (low category), 2 students $(4,25 \%)$ get the score $70-<75$ (good category), 1 student $(2,12 \%)$ get the score $75-<80$ (very good category) and 2 students (4,25\%) get the score $80-<90$ (excellent category) and there is no student in fair or very excellent category.

## 2. Students Mastery in Short Sentences

Table 4.10. The Frequency Distribution of Students' Score in Short Sentences.

| No | Interval | Category | Frequency | Percentage (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $90-100$ | Very Excellent | 1 | $2,12 \%$ |
| 2 | $80-<90$ | Excellent | 3 | $6,38 \%$ |
| 3 | $75-<80$ | Very Good | - | - |
| 4 | $70-<75$ | Good | 1 | $2,12 \%$ |


| 5 | $65-<70$ | Fair | 2 | $4,25 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 | $60-<65$ | Low | 11 | $23,40 \%$ |
| 7 | $0-<60$ | Poor | 29 | $61,70 \%$ |
| Total |  |  | 47 | $100 \%$ |

From the table above, it shows that the students reading comprehension at the Fourth Semester of English Education Department IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin Academic Year 2013/2014 based on its categories there are: 29 students $(61,70 \%)$ get the score $0-<60$ (poor category), 11 students $(23,40 \%)$ get the score $60-<65$ (low category), 2 students ( $4,25 \%$ ) get the score $65-<70$ (fair category), 1 student $(2,12 \%)$ get the score $70-<75$ (good category), 3 students ( $6,38 \%$ ) get the score $80-<90$ (excellent category) and 1 student $(2,12 \%)$ get the score $90-100$ (very excellent category) and there is no student in very good category.

## 3. The Influence of the Students' Reading Comprehension Ability On Sentence Length

The main goal of the study is to find out whether or not there is an influence on sentence length between long sentences and short sentences at the Fourth Semester of English Education Department IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin Academic Year 2013/2014.

To compute the influence, the writer prepared the computation of two variables by Pearson Product Moment Formula. There two variables; long sentences as variable x and short sentences as variable y . the following table shows the calculation result based on the theory;

Table 4.11. The Result of Product Moment Table

| No | X | Y | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{x} \\ (\mathbf{X}-\mathbf{M x}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{y} \\ (\mathbf{Y}-\mathbf{M y}) \end{gathered}$ | xy | $\mathrm{x}^{2}$ | $\mathbf{y}^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 45 | 35 | -5,53 | -19,57 | 108,22 | 30,58 | 382,98 |
| 2 | 40 | 45 | -10,53 | -9,57 | 100,77 | 110,88 | 91,58 |
| 3 | 40 | 55 | -10,53 | 0,43 | -4,52 | 110,88 | 0,18 |
| 4 | 70 | 55 | 19,47 | 0,43 | 8,37 | 379,08 | 0,18 |
| 5 | 35 | 45 | -15,53 | -9,57 | 148,62 | 241,18 | 91,58 |
| 6 | 55 | 40 | 4,47 | -14,57 | -65,12 | 19,98 | 212,28 |
| 7 | 55 | 40 | 4,47 | -14,57 | -65,12 | 19,98 | 212,28 |
| 8 | 40 | 40 | -10,53 | -14,57 | 153,42 | 110,88 | 212,28 |
| 9 | 40 | 55 | -10,53 | 0,43 | -4,52 | 110,88 | 0,18 |
| 10 | 55 | 35 | 4,47 | -19,57 | -87,47 | 19,98 | 382,98 |
| 11 | 55 | 70 | 4,47 | 15,43 | 68,97 | 19,98 | 238,08 |
| 12 | 60 | 60 | 9,47 | 5,43 | 51,42 | 89,68 | 29,48 |
| 13 | 80 | 85 | 29,47 | 30,43 | 896,77 | 868,48 | 925,98 |
| 14 | 45 | 60 | -5,53 | 5,43 | -30,02 | 30,58 | 29,48 |
| 15 | 75 | 65 | 20,94 | 10,43 | 218,40 | 438,48 | 108,78 |
| 16 | 80 | 80 | 24,47 | 25,43 | 622,27 | 598,78 | 646,68 |
| 17 | 45 | 45 | -5,53 | -9,57 | 52,92 | 30,58 | 91,58 |
| 18 | 35 | 55 | -15,53 | 0,43 | -6,67 | 241,18 | 0,18 |
| 19 | 55 | 40 | 4,47 | -14,57 | -65,12 | 19,98 | 212,28 |
| 20 | 45 | 55 | -5,53 | 0,43 | -2,37 | 30,58 | 0,18 |


| 21 | 70 | 90 | 19,47 | 35,43 | 689,82 | 379,08 | 1255,28 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 22 | 55 | 80 | 4,47 | 25,43 | 113,67 | 19,98 | 646,68 |
| 23 | 60 | 60 | 9,47 | 5,43 | 51,42 | 89,68 | 29,48 |
| 24 | 50 | 60 | -0,53 | 5,43 | -2,87 | 0,28 | 29,48 |
| 25 | 50 | 45 | -0,53 | -9,57 | 5,07 | 0,28 | 91,58 |
| 26 | 50 | 60 | -0,53 | 5,43 | -2,87 | 0,28 | 29,48 |
| 27 | 50 | 65 | -0,53 | 10,43 | -5,52 | 0,28 | 108,78 |
| 28 | 45 | 60 | -5,53 | 5,43 | -30,02 | 30,58 | 29,48 |
| 29 | 50 | 60 | -0,53 | 5,43 | -2,87 | 0,28 | 29,48 |
| 30 | 55 | 55 | 4,47 | 0,43 | 1,92 | 19,98 | 0,18 |
| 31 | 30 | 45 | -20,53 | -9,57 | 196,47 | 421,48 | 91,58 |
| 32 | 45 | 55 | -5,53 | 0,43 | -2,37 | 30,58 | 0,18 |
| 33 | 55 | 55 | 4,47 | 0,43 | 1,92 | 19,98 | 0,18 |
| 34 | 60 | 60 | 9,47 | 5,43 | 51,42 | 89,68 | 29,48 |
| 35 | 50 | 60 | -4,06 | 5,43 | -22,04 | 16,48 | 29,48 |
| 36 | 60 | 30 | 9,47 | -24,57 | -232,67 | 89,68 | 603,68 |
| 37 | 50 | 45 | -0,53 | -9,57 | 5,07 | 0,28 | 91,58 |
| 38 | 40 | 55 | -10,53 | 0,43 | -4,52 | 110,88 | 0,18 |
| 39 | 35 | 55 | -15,53 | 0,43 | -6,67 | 241,18 | 0,18 |
| 40 | 40 | 45 | -10,53 | -9,57 | 100,77 | 110,88 | 91,58 |
| 41 | 45 | 45 | -5,53 | -9,57 | 52,92 | 30,58 | 91,58 |
| 42 | 55 | 55 | 4,47 | 0,43 | 1,92 | 19,98 | 0,18 |
| 43 | 45 | 60 | -5,53 | 5,43 | -30,02 | 30,58 | 29,48 |
| 44 | 40 | 40 | -10,53 | -14,57 | 153,42 | 110,88 | 212,28 |
| 45 | 60 | 60 | 9,47 | 5,43 | 51,42 | 89,68 | 29,48 |
| 46 | 40 | 55 | -10,53 | 0,43 | -4,52 | 110,88 | 0,18 |
| 47 | 40 | 50 | -10,53 | -4,57 | 48,12 | 110,88 | 20,88 |
| $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{N}=4 \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \sum_{2375} X= \end{aligned}$ | $\sum_{2565} \mathrm{Y}=$ | $\sum \mathrm{x}=$ | $\sum \mathrm{y}=$ | $\begin{gathered} \sum \mathrm{xy}= \\ 3277,62 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \sum x^{2}= \\ 5748,42 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \sum \mathrm{y}^{2}= \\ 7228,8 \end{gathered}$ |

Then the writer determines the degree of $\mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{xy}}$ by implementing formula as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{xy}} & =\frac{\square \mathrm{xy}}{\sqrt{ }\left(\square \mathrm{x}^{2}\right)\left(\square \mathrm{y}^{2}\right)} \\
& =\frac{3277,62}{\sqrt{ }(5748,42)(7228,8)} \\
& =\frac{3277,62}{\sqrt{41554178,496}} \\
& =\frac{3277,62}{6446,25} \\
& =0,508
\end{aligned}
$$

Then the writer obtains Degree of freedom (df) by using formula as follows;

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{df} & =\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{nr} \\
& =47-2 \\
& =45
\end{aligned}
$$

The result of $\mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{xy}}$ of two variables is 0,508 . It has to consult with df (degree of freedom) is in 45 in 5\% degree significant is 0,294 and at $1 \%$ degree significant is 0,380 .

## A. Discussion

From two tables about the frequency distribution of students' score in long sentences and short sentences above, the writer concludes that many students at the Fourth Semester of English Education Department IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin have poor category in reading comprehension, especially the value in answering questions in sentence length, that's have some factors those are: the students' factors, teacher factors and facilities factors. Students' factors it depend on the students' interest, students' learning activities, and mastery in vocabulary. Teacher factors it depend on the teacher's experience and the teacher's explanation. Facilities factors it depend on facility owned by the students and facilities belong to school. That's all help the teaching and learning process.

Beside that, the other factors can influence the students' ability in reading comprehension especially in sentence length is varying the length of sentences within the body of a paragraph, there are short sentences, medium sentences and long sentences. And not be left out is text leveling. This involves a subjective analysis of reading level that examines vocabulary, format, content, length, illustrations, repetition of words, and curriculum. Text leveling is perhaps the oldest method of grading a text.

Table 4.11. Standard Clarification of Correlation:

| Correlation Coefficient | Relationship |
| :---: | :---: |
| $0,00-0,20$ | Very low |
| $0,20-0,40$ | Low |
| $0,40-0,60$ | Average |
| $0,60-0,80$ | High |
| $0,80-1,00$ | Very high (Murdan, 2005, p. 135) |

Based on the counting above $\mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{xy}}$ is 0,508 . And from the table df (degree of freedom) is in 45 , in $5 \%$ degree significant is 0,294 and at $1 \%$ degree significant is 0,380 .

So, it appears the result that $0,294<\mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{xy}}>0,380$. It means null hypothesis $\left(\mathrm{H}_{0}\right)$ is rejected and alternative hypothesis $\left(\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{a}}\right)$ is accepted, in this research the variable Y has influence the variable X . It can be stated that, there is the influence between long sentences and short sentences in sentence length.

Based on the previous data, standard clarification of correlation is positive and occurs in $0,40-0,60$ level. So, the correlation between long sentences and short sentences in sentence length is in average category. It can be stated that there is a average influence of sentence length in reading comprehension at the

Fourth Semester of English Education Department IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin Academic Year 2013/2014.

