

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **REPORT OF RESEARCH RESULT**

#### **A. General Description about the Place of Study**

##### **1. The Brief History of MAN 2 Marabahan**

Madrasah Aliyah Negeri 2 Marabahan located at Darmawan street Pulau Sugara Alalak Barito Kuala District of South Kalimantan. At first this Marabahan MAN 2 private status with a Madrasah Aliyah Private "Al Azhar" was founded in 1987 by community leaders with self-help and swadananya. 1997, MA Al-Azhar being country by the name MAN 2 Marabahan. The vision of MAN 2 Marabahan which learners make a faithful and devoted, accomplished and independent. While MAN 2 Marabahan mission is to create a religious school environment, implementing an optimal PBM, build an environment conducive to student learning in boosts morale and encourages students to be creative in addressing the progress of the age. Since the establishment of MA Al-Azhar in 1987 until now the MAN 2 Marabahan in 1997, has undergone some change of Chairman / Head of School by three periods:

- a. Drs. Horni, (1992-1997) (MA Al-Azhar)
- b. Drs. Misran Ariyadi, (1997-2001) (MAN 2 Marabahan)
- c. H. Asmuri CH, (2001-2004) (MAN 2 Marabahan)
- d. Drs. M. Thahir, S.Pd., (2004-2009)
- e. Dra. Naini Pristiani (2009- Until now)

Based on the function of MAN 2 Marabahan as a builder of private schools at Group of School Work / Kelompok Kerja Madrasah (KKM). So MAN 2 Marabahan was believed to cultivate two MA private, namely:

1. MA Nurul Khair Jelapat
2. MA Nurul Aziz Tamban Mekarsari

## **2. The Implementation of Curriculum at MAN 2 Marabahan**

The implementation of curriculum at MAN 2 Marabahan, there is a curriculum which used by this school, that is curriculum KTSP. Meanwhile, the instructional activities are implemented every morning from Monday until Saturday, while Sunday is holiday.

The time instructional activities since 07.30 am until 14.00 pm, except on Friday just until 11.05 am. From Monday until Saturday before begin the lesson, the students be obligated to read praying and recite Koran together for 30 minutes from 07.30 am until 08.00 am.

Beside the implementation of instructional, the evaluation is also implemented at this school. It is twice in a year. Those are twice for state evaluation.

The evaluation contained on each rapport (boarding rapport and state rapport) and at the last step of education, will be given two diplomats (ijazah) they are swats diplomat.

### 3. Facilities of MAN 2 Marabahan

MAN 2 Marabahan was be builded with the permanent construction building that since was established at 1987 has do many changing and development, importantly from the facilities of education that be provided in MAN 2 Marabahan still not enough for suppose implementing process of teaching and learning.

Well condition of building and facilities of MAN 2 Marabahan can be seen on the table:

Table 4.1. Condition of teacher and administration staff at MAN 2 Marabahan

No	Kinds of Facilities	Position	Education
1.	Dra. Naini Pristiani	Headmaster	S1 TAR IAIN
2.	Nurul Miliyani, S.Pd	Civil Servant	S1 UNLAM
3.	Rabiatul Adawiyah, S.Pd	Civil Servant	S1 UNLAM
4.	Juairiah, S.Pd	Civil Servant	S1.STKIP
5.	Ali Parhan, S.Ag	Civil Servant	S1 IAIN
6.	Hj. Raudah, S.Pd.I	Civil Servant	S1 IAIN
7.	Ruspita Eneyati, S.Pd	Civil Servant	S1 UNLAM
8.	Nurhasanah, S.Pd	Civil Servant	S1 STKIP
9.	Aulia Irani, S.Pd	Civil Servant	S1 UNLAM
10.	Arbainah, S.Ag	Civil Servant	S1.IAIN
11.	Arpiah, S.Pd	Civil Servant	S1.UNLAM
12.	Hj.Khairunnisawati, S.Ag	Civil Servant	S1.IAIN
13.	Horiansyah, A.Md	Civil Servant	D3 IAIN
14.	Desy Arnita Dewi, S.Pd, M.Sc	Civil Servant	S2.UGM
15.	Syaifuddin Ghozali, M.Pd	Civil Servant	S2.UGM
16.	Mujibburrahman, S.Ag	Civil Servant	S1.IAIN

No	Kinds of Facilities	Position	Education
1.	Drs. Horni	Private Servant	S1 IAIN
2.	Rusmiati, SE	Private Servant	S1 ECONOMY
3.	Erfika, S.Pd.I	Private Servant	S1 IAIN
4.	Hasnawati Erlisa, SE	Private Servant	S1 STIENAS
5.	Nalahayati, S.Pd.I	Private Servant	S1 IAIN

Table 4.2. Condition of Building and Facilities of MAN 2 Marabahan

NO	Kinds of Room	Amount	Wide/m2	Condition
1	Classroom	1	192	Good Enough
2	Headmaster's room	1	12	Good Enough
3	Teacher's room	1	54	Good Enough
4	Administration room	2	40	Good Enough
5	Library	1	64	Good Enough
6	Concealing room	1	15	Good Enough
7	Laboratory	1	120	Good Enough
8	Musholla	1	64	Good Enough
9	Canteen	1	42	Good Enough
10	Teacher's toilet	1	4	Good Enough
11	Student's toilet	1	4	Good Enough

Meanwhile amount and condition of administration facilities can be seen on the table below:

Table 4.3. Condition of administration and facilities of MAN 2 Marabahan

NO	Kinds of Facilities	Amount	Condition
1	Type writer	3	Good Enough
2	Computer	2	Good Enough
3	Printer	2	Good Enough
4	Filling Cabinet	3	Good Enough
5	visual	1	Good Enough

## 5. Condition of students at MAN 2 Marabahan

Amount of students at MAN 2 Marabahan academic year 2009/2010 are 161 people. Each class to make clearer, it can be seen on the table below.

Table 4.4. Condition of Students at MAN 2 Marabahan Academic year 2009/2010

No	Class	Sex		Total
		Male	Female	
1.	XA	5	10	15
2.	XB	7	8	16
3.	XC	6	9	15
4.	XI IPA	3	13	16
5.	XI IPS	8	15	23
6.	XI AGAMA	9	9	18
7.	XII IPA 1	10	16	26
8.	XII IPA 2	9	8	17
9.	XII IPS	10	5	15
TOTAL		67	94	161

From the table above, it can be seen that amount of students from the first grade up to the third grade are 161 people.

## B. Implementation of English Learning in Experiments Class and Control Class

Implementation of the learning in this study carried out in six weeks starting on October 25<sup>th</sup>, 2009 until the date December 25<sup>th</sup>, 2009. The subject matter is taught during the study period is “My Family” of class X with curriculum that includes a standard of competence is divided into several basic competencies and indicators. All the material presented to the subject recipients treated with XA and XB graders MAN 2 Marabahan. Each class is subject to treatment as determined in research methods. Materials which being touch are:

a. Family Life

b. Birth Control

To provide a detailed description of the implementation of the treatment to each group will be explained as follows:

### **1. English Learning was given without performing post-test**

The process of teaching and learning English for class XB held on the day:

- Wednesday, the third hour and the fifth hour (09.30- 11.05 o'clock)
- Thursday, the first hour and third hour (08.00-09.30 o'clock)

The implementation process of learning is same as usual that begins with apperception, then explanation of course material and ends with exercises and regular tasks. During the treatment, learning in each meeting, the post-test is not given at all.

After one material has finished, written test will be done. The questions of the test for class XB is material from a chapter who has taught which adjusted with basic competencies and indicators to be achieved from the subject.

### **2. Learning English with performing of post-test**

As explained in the description above that the groups of students who receive English learning which performing post-test were being done in class XA, in class XA English subjects was held on the day:

- Friday, the second hour and the fifth hour (09.10-11.00 o'clock)
- Thursday, the fourth hour, the fifth hour (10.25-11.05 o'clock)

The implementation process of learning is same as usual that begins with apperception, then explanation of course material, it's only different in performing of post-test in learning which be given each meeting. During treatment, the implementation of post-test was given four times.

After one material has finished, written test will be done. The test was carried out on 14 December 2009. The questions of the test for class XB is material from one subject who has been taught which adjusted with basic competencies and indicators to be achieved from the subject. Questions for XA same as question which being given in class XB (Complete data about the test question can be seen in appendix)

### **C. Data Presentation**

Based on the writer's test, interview and document, so can be collected the data about the students' learning achievement through performing post-test and non-performing post-test in English teaching learning at MAN 2 Marabahan.

Data processing was being determined based on basic ability which be found from the score of English pre-test of students class XA and XB at second semester. Data processing of basic ability is intended to prove that the object of this study has basic ability that really no different

### **D. Description of Student Basic Ability**

Data for the basic ability of students in class XA and class XB is the value of Pre-test of English subjects. Here are descriptions of student ability.

Table 4. 5. Description of Student Basic Ability

	Experimental Class	Control Class
Highest Score	94	92
The lowest value	45	40
Mean	69.46	69.13
Standard Deviation	122.34	105.63

The table above shows that the average of preliminary ability in the control class and experimental class are not much different when viewed from the difference which only worth 0.33. For more details would be tested with testing of different.

#### **E. Testing the different of Student Basic Ability**

Picture 4. 1. Condition of implemented pre-test



Before the treatment is implemented, the researcher do the pre-tests for both classes to known that both of them are parallel. After be managed until there aren't different skills of all class, it can be taken two classes which act as experiment group and control group are class XA and class XB. The numbers of



class XA are 15 students, and class XB is 15 students. The score results of student answers are as follows:

Table 4.6. Result of Pre-test in Experiment Class **XA**

No.	Respondent	Score
1	E1	52
2.	E2	88
3.	E3	60
4.	E4	59
5.	E5	57
6.	E6	80
7.	E7	92
8.	E8	90
9.	E9	80
10.	E10	92
11.	E11	90
12.	E12	80
13.	E13	79
14.	E14	86
15.	E15	40
TOTAL=		1037
MEAN =		69.13

Table 4.7. Result of Pre-test in Control Class **XB**

No.	Respondent	Score
1	E1	90
2.	E2	68
3.	E3	63
4.	E4	58
5.	E5	72
6.	E6	94
7.	E7	63
8.	E8	83
9.	E9	67
10.	E10	65
11.	E11	70
12.	E12	89
13.	E13	45
14.	E14	68
15.	E15	47
TOTAL=		1042
MEAN =		69.46

### 1. Normality Test

Normality test conducted to determine the normality of data distribution by using Liliefors test.

Table 4. 8. The Summary of Normality Test of two groups

Class	$L_{critic}$	$L_{table}$	Conclusion
Experiment	0,3540	0,220	Abnormal
Control	0,2705	0,220	Abnormal

$\alpha = 0,05$

Based on the above table is known in the experimental class  $L_{count}$  price greater than  $L_{table}$  at significance level  $\alpha = 0.05$ . This shows that the distribution data is not normal. Similarly, the control class  $L_{count}$  price greater than  $L_{table}$  on significance level  $\alpha = 0.05$  so that the data not normally distributed. Calculation details are in appendix

## 2. U-Test

Data from the two classes are not normally distributed, and then different test that used is the U-test

Table 4. 9. The Distribution Score of two groups by U-Test

No	Score in Experiment Class	Rank	Score in Control Class	Rank
1	45	2	40	1
2	47	3	52	4
3	58	7	55	5
4	63	12.5	57	6
5	63	12.5	59	8.5
6	65	14	59	8.5
7	67	15	60	10
8	68	16.5	60	10.5
9	68	16.5	79	19
10	70	17	80	20.5
11	72	18	80	20.5
12	83	21	86	22
13	89	24	88	23
14	90	25.5	90	25.5
15	94	28	92	27
	R1	232.5	R2	212.5

Table 4. 10. Summary of U-Test from two groups

Source	R <sub>1</sub>	R <sub>2</sub>	$\sigma_U$	Z <sub>critic</sub>	Z <sub>table</sub>
Each of Class	232.5	212.5	24.49	0.1633	1,96

$$\alpha = 0,05$$

Based on the above table is known at the level of significance  $\alpha = 0.05$  price of  $Z_{\text{critic}}$  less than  $Z_{\text{tabel}}$  and over  $-Z_{\text{tabel}}$ , it means that there is no significant difference between the ability of students, classroom experiments with the control class. The calculation can be seen in appendix

#### **F. The Data of Student Learning Achievement after Applying Treatment**

Picture 4.2. Activity of Students in doing Achievement Test



After one subject material has taught in experimental class which being given treatments by performing post-test, while control class maintaining conditions of learning by using the system as usual learning, that begins with apperception, then the explanation of materials and ending with post-test, then in the last, both of class that receive treatment (class XA and XB class) was given a test with the same type and shape about the material which has taught. The data of student learning achievement after applying treatment are as follows:

Table 4.11. Student Learning Result of Experiment Class (XA)

No.	Respondent	Score
1	E1	50
2.	E2	56
3.	E3	56
4.	E4	60
5.	E5	60
6.	E6	60
7.	E7	60
8.	E8	70
9.	E9	73
10.	E10	73
11.	E11	76
12.	E12	83
13.	E13	90
14.	E14	96
15.	E15	96
TOTAL=		1059
MEAN =		70.6

Table 4.12. Student Learning Result of Control Class (**XB**)

No.	Respondent	Score
1	E1	76
2.	E2	60
3.	E3	53
4.	E4	86
5.	E5	53
6.	E6	70
7.	E7	70
8.	E8	86
9.	E9	80
10.	E10	53
11.	E11	70
12.	E12	73
13.	E13	66
14.	E14	60
15.	E15	63
TOTAL=		953
MEAN =		67.06

Tests conducted to determine the end result of learning in the experiment class and control class. Tests conducted at the seventh meeting. All students can take the test. Distribution of the number of students who follow the test can be seen in the table below:

Tabel 4. 13. Distribution of Students who Attended Final Test

	EC	CL
Final test of the teaching program	15 person	15 person
Number of students	15 person	15 person

Based on the above table it is known that the implementation of the final test in the experimental class was attended by 15 students or 100%, and in the control class was attended by 15 persons or 100 %.

#### a. Student Learning Achievement in Experiment Class

Students' Learning achievement of experiment class is presented in the following distribution table.

Tabel 4. 14. Frequency Distribution of Student Learning Achievement in Experiment Class

Score	Frequency	Percentage (%)
91,0-96,0	2	13,33
84,0-90,0	2	13,33
77,0-83,0	1	6,67
70,0-76,0	4	26,67
63,0-69,0	2	13,33
56,0-62,0	3	20,0
49,0-55,0	1	6,67

The highest score is 100 and the lowest is 0. The writer interprets students' score in the following categories:

80-100 : Very good

60-<80 : Good

40-<60 : Enough

20-<40 : Poor

0-<20 : Very poor

According the table above, can be known that in experiment class there are 33, 33% which be included very good classification, and 50 % have good classification, 26,67 % was enough, and it hasn't low classification. Mean of this result is 67, 06 and has good classification.



### b. Student Learning Achievement in Control Class

Students' Learning achievement of control class is presented in the following distribution table

Tabel 4. 15. Frequency Distribution of Student Learning Achievement in Control Class

Score	Frequency	Percentage (%)
82,0-86,0	1	6,67
77,0-81,0	1	6,67
72,0-76,0	3	20,0
67,0-71,0	3	20,0
62,0 -66,0	2	13,33
57,0 -61,0	2	13,33
52,0 -56,0	3	20,0

According the table above, from 15 students who following this learning, there are 6,67 % have very good classification, 60 % was good classification, then 33,33 % was enough classification. Mean of this result is 70, 6 and have a good classification.

### G. Testing the differentiate of student learning achievement

Summary of student learning achievement from the final tests are given can be seen in the table below.

Table 4. 16. Description of Student Learning Achievement

	Experiment class	Control class
Highest Score	96	86
The lowest value	50	53
Mean	70.6	67.06
Standard deviation	14.32	10.06

### 1. Normality Test

. Normality test conducted to determine the normality of data distribution by using Liliefors test.

Table 4. 17. The Summary of Normality Test of Two Groups

Class	$L_{critic}$	$L_{table}$	Conclusion
Experiment	0.0083	0.220	Normal
Control	0,2168	0.220	Normal

$$\alpha = 0,05$$

The table above shows that, price of  $L_{critic}$  for an experimental class is smaller than  $L_{table}$  at significance level  $\alpha = 0.05$ . This means that the distribution of learning results of experiments class in this learning is normal. Likewise, for the control class  $L_{critic}$  less than the price of  $L_{table}$ , it means that distribution of learning result in control class is normal. It can be stated that at the level of significance  $\alpha = 0.05$  that both of those classes have normal distribution. More calculations shown in Appendix

### 2. Homogeneity test

After known that distribution of data was normal, testing can proceed with the test of homogeneity of variance. This test aims to determine whether the learning results of controls and experiment class is homogeneous or not.

Table 4.18. Summary of Homogeneity Test of Variance Student Learning Achievement

Class	Variance	$F_{critic}$	$F_{table}$	Conclusion
Experiment	205,171	2,032	2,48	Homogen
Control	100,932			Homogen

$$\alpha = 0,05$$

According to the table above is known that at the level of significance  $\alpha = 0.05$  be obtained that  $F_{\text{critic}}$  was less than  $F_{\text{table}}$ . That means the learning results of the two-class is homogeneous. The calculation can be seen in appendix

### 3. T-Test

a. Determined the value of  $t_{\text{table}}$  :

$$n_1 = 15 \quad n_2 = 15 \quad df = n_1 + n_2 - 2 = 15 + 15 - 2 = 28$$

$$t_{\text{tabel}} = 2.048$$

b. Value of  $t_{\text{critic}}$

$$t = \frac{\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{(n_1 - 1)S_1^2 + (n_2 - 1)S_2^2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2} \left( \frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2} \right)}}$$

$$t = \frac{70,6 - 67,06}{\sqrt{\frac{14.(205,171) + 14.(100,923)}{28} \left( \frac{1}{15} + \frac{1}{15} \right)}}$$

$$t = \frac{3,54}{\sqrt{18,36}} = \frac{3,54}{4,28} = 0,827$$

$$t_{\text{critic}} = 0,827$$

Data has normal distribution and homogeneous, so the testing of different used was t test .Based on calculations contained in appendix, obtained  $t_{\text{critic}} = 0.827$ , while  $t_{\text{tabel}} = 2.048$  at significance level  $\alpha = 0.05$  with degrees of freedom (df) = 28.

To test the hypothesis, the research hypotheses stated earlier with the research hypotheses are stated with statistical hypothesis with the following formula:

$H_0$ = No significant difference is significant influence English learning between post-test given to English language learning without the provision of post-test of student achievement.

"To accept or reject the null hypothesis of whether there is any difference in the two samples Mean significantly, we must acknowledge the criticism t like the price calculation that has been done.

Price of  $t_{\text{critic}}$  smaller than  $t_{\text{table}}$ , and greater than  $-t_{\text{table}}$  then  $H_0$  is accepted. So, it can be concluded that there were not significant differences between students learning in the experiments class with students of control class

#### **D. Explanation of Research Results**

Before doing the experiment, the writer divides two classes into two groups by doing Pre-test. The Score result of Pre-test in both classes must parallel and not different each other. From the table, it shows that the mean of class XA is 69.46 and XB is 69.13. There are not different score each class.

Next, to know the normality of the distribution, it using Normality test to determine the normality of data distribution by using Liliefors test. From the table, it can conclude that the distribution of frequency is abnormal, so she use U-Test to know there is different ability of both of classes. Based on the table is known at the level significance 0.05, price of  $Z_{critic}$  is 0.1633 and  $Z_{table,}$  is 1.96, from the result,  $Z_{critic}$  is less than  $Z_{table}$  and over  $-Z_{table}$ . It means that there is no significant different between both of class, and, and the experiment can be implemented.

After the writers divided the class into two group, then experiment is provided continuously in the subject that are being agreed with the subject of implementing the experiment which began the beginning to the end of the subject material at every meeting. After the material which taught has finished, and then at the last meeting held the written test.

According the table above, it shows that the mean of XA is 70.6 and the mean of XB is 67.06. It can be concluded that class which be performed post-test is get more better result than class which being performed without post-test.

After be known that the distribution of data was normal and homogeneous, to compare both of classes to know are there different result, she use t-Test. Based on the table, obtained  $t_{critic} = 0.827$ , while  $t_{tabel} = 2.048$  at significance level  $\alpha = 0.05$  with degrees of freedom (df) = 28. Because  $t_{critic}$  is smaller than  $t_{tabel}$  so, it means that there were no significant differences between students learning in the experiments class with students of control class

Based on the description of the research findings as mentioned above, can be known that can be obtained info that there were not significant differences between students learning in the experiments class with students of control class but if be look at mean of the achievement result, it shows that students with performing post-test has better achievement than students without performing post-test. By post-test, students get more understanding about the lesson which be taught because as often as they be given exercise, they can remember the material better.