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**Abstract**

This research is aimed to know the reading ability in understanding report text between science students and social students at the eleventh grade students of SMA N 5 Purworejo in the academic year of 2012/2013. First, to describe the students’ reading ability in understanding report text between science students and social students. Second, to find out whether there is a significant difference or not between science students and social students in understanding report text. Reading is one of the language components that have to be taught to the students in learning foreign language. The mean score of the science students is 71.81 and the mean score of social students is 64.45. The result of t-test value is 3.933. The t-test value is higher than t-table. It means that the hypothesis is accepted.
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1. **Background**

Patel and Jain (2008: 113) stated that reading means to understand the meaning of printed words i.e. written symbols. Reading is an active process which consists of recognition and comprehension skill. Reading is an important activity in life with which one can update his/ her knowledge. Reading skill is an important tool for academic success. Richards and Schmidt (2002:443) stated that reading is perceiving a written text in order to understand its contents. Reading can be done silently and loudly. The result of silent reading is called reading comprehension. There are a number of factors that cause success or failure in reading ability. One of them is the students’ mastery in vocabulary, grammar, mechanics, and organization. In this research, the researcher focuses on students’ reading ability in understanding report text between science students and social students at the eleventh grade students of SMA N 5 Purworejo.

1. **Research Method**

This research is non-experimental quantitative research. It was conducted in SMA N 5 Purworejo on April 24th, 2013. According to Arikunto (2010:173), population is the whole subject in the research. In this research, the population is the eleventh grade students of SMA N 5 Purworejo consisting of 7 classes. The total of population is 223 students. Moreover, Nunan (1992: 232) stated that sample is subset of individuals or cases from within a population. The researcher took two classes as the sample that each class consists of 32 and 31 students. To get the sample accurately, the researcher used purposive sampling, because of the limitation of time. Besides, the reason of the researcher chooses this sampling because of the certain criteria and characteristics of population. In collecting the data, the researcher used multiple choice tests as instrument. The test is intended to find out whether there is a significant difference or not between science students and social students in understanding report text.

In this research, the researcher used descriptive analysis and inferential analysis to analyze the data. The descriptive analysis is to describe the students’ reading ability in understanding report text. The descriptive analysis consists of the computation of mean, median, mode, standard deviation, and variance. Meanwhile, the inferential analysis consists of test of normality, test of homogeneity, and test of hypothesis.

1. **Finding and Discussion**

The description of the data are aimed to describe the students’ reading ability in understanding report text between science students and social students, and to find out whether there is a significant difference or not between science students and social students in understanding report text. From the computation, the highest score of science students is 93 and the lowest score is 56. The mean is 71.81, the median is 71.5, the mode is 66, the standard deviation is 7.438, and the variance is 55.319. The highest score of science students is 83 and the lowest score is 53. The mean is 64.45, the median is 63, the mode is 63, the standard deviation is 7.415, and the variance is 54.989.

Furthermore, in the inferential analysis, the researcher computed test of normality, test of homogeneity, and test of hypothesis. The result of normality test that calculated by using SPSS formula are 0.685 and 0.092. From the result of normality test, the data is normal because the score was higher than 0.05. Then, the result of homogeneity test that calculated by dividing the highest variance with the lowest variance is 1.006. It showed that the data is homogeneous because f-obtained is lower than f-table (1.006<1.815). To make the analysis more reliable, the researcher computed the data by using t-test formula. The result of t-test is 3.933. It showed that t-test value is higher than t-table (3.933>2.000).

Based on the descriptive analysis above, the researcher concluded that the students’ reading ability of science students belonged to good category and the students’ reading ability of social students belonged to sufficient category. Moreover, to find out whether there is a significant difference or not between science students and social students in understanding report text, the researcher compared the mean score result. In fact, the mean score of science students was higher than the mean score of social students. It means that there is a significant difference between science students and social students in understanding report text. The significant difference is also proven by the result of t-test. The result of t-test is higher than t-table (3.933>2.000). Based on the hypothesis testing, it means that Ho (Null Hypothesis) is rejected and Ha (Alternative Hypothesis) is accepted. Therefore, the hypothesis in this research (Ha) stated that “There is a significant difference on students’ reading ability in understanding report text between science students and social students at the eleventh grade students of SMA N 5 Purworejo in the academic year of 2012/2013”.

1. **Conclusion and Recommendation**

Based on the research finding which has been discussed, the researcher makes the conclusions as follow:

1. The reading ability of science students better than reading ability of social students. It can be found in the mean score. The mean score of science students is 71.81 and the mean score of social students is 64.45. It means that
2. There is a significance difference on students’ reading ability in understanding report text between science students and social students. The evidence is based on the result and discussion of the data analysis, it showed that the t-value is higher than t-table (3.933>2.000). From those fact, the researcher concluded that the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted. The hypothesis in this research (Ha) stated that “there is a significance difference on students’ reading ability in understanding report text between science students and social students at the eleventh grade students of SMA N 5 Purworejo in the academic year of 2012/2013”.
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