

## CHAPTER IV

### FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

#### A. Finding

##### 1. Description of Data

In this chapter, the researcher presented the data description of VIII grade of Mts Kebun Bunga Banjarmasin about using comics to improve students speaking ability in story retelling . 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 Mts Kebun Bunga Banjarmasin. The researcher did the research from November, 20<sup>th</sup> 2017, until December, 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 22 Program.

Table 4.1 Analysis of Validity from VIII MTs. Nurul Iman

<b>Case Processing Summary</b>		
	N	%
Valid	18	100
Total	18	100

<b>Item-Total Statistics</b>		
	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alfa If Item Deleted
First Test	0,644	0,777
Second Test	0,740	0,682
Third Test	0,637	0,790

Based on the table above, the standard validity which stated a valid test if more than 0,308. Then, the validity test by using SPSS 22 showed that the first test got 0,777, the second test got 0,682 and the third test got 0,790, 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 MTs Nurul Iman

<b>Reliability Statistics</b>	
N of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
3	0,818

Based on table 2 reliability coefficient (r) which stated that a reliability test is high if Cronbach's Alfa more than 0.70. Then, the researcher did reliability test by using SPSS 22 and got 0,818. Thus, the interpretation for Cronbach's Alfa 0,818 is very high. (See Appendix 3).

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

<b>Test of Normality</b>		
Pre-Test	Shapiro-Wilk	
	Df	Significant
Experiment Class	20	0,86
Control Class	20	0,78

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 22. From table 4.3 significant of normality test consists of Kolmogorov-Smirnov 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 0,69 with significant 0.05. It means that the result of pre-test of experiment class was higher than the significant ( $0,069 > 0.05$ ). Then, the result of control class was 0,078 with significant 0.05. It means that the result of pre-test of control class was higher than the significant ( $0,078 > 0.05$ ). 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)

<b>Test of Normality</b>		
Post-Test	Shapiro-Wilk	
	Df	Significant
Experiment Class	20	0,122
Control Class	20	0,133

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 22. The researcher used Shapiro-Wilk as the standard for normality test. The result of Experiment class was 0,122 with significant 0.05. It means that the result of post-test of experiment class was higher than the significant ( $0,122 > 0,05$ ). Then, the result of control class was 0,113 with significant 0.05. It means that the result of post-test of control class was higher than the significant ( $0,113 > 0,05$ ). 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	0,648

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 0,648. 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 ( $0,648 > 0,05$ ). It means the data was homogeny. (See Appendix 9).

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

Significant
-------------

Post-Test	0,984
-----------	-------

Based on table 4.6 above, the result of homogeneity test in post-test from experiment class and control class who calculated by SPSS 22 was 0,984. 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 ( $0,984 > 0,05$ ). 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	62,70	70,75
Median	63,00	69,00
Mode	63	69
Minimum	50	56
Maximum	75	81
Sum	1254	1415

Table 4.8 Pre-test Frequency of Experiment Class

Score	Frequency
50	2
56	4
63	7
69	6
75	1

<b>Total</b>	20
--------------	----

Table 4.9 Post-test Frequency of Experiment Class

<b>Score</b>	<b>Frequency</b>
56	1
63	4
69	6
75	6
81	3
<b>Total</b>	20

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 (70.75) was higher than the mean score of pre-test (62.70). In addition, the mode of post-test (69) was higher than mode of pre-test (63). However, the median of post-test (69) was higher than pre-test (63). Then, sum of pre-test was 1254 with the minimum score was 50 and the frequency is 2 and the maximum score was 75 and the frequency is 1. The sum of post-test was 1415 with the minimum score was 56 and the frequency is 1 and the maximum was 81 and the frequency is 3. (See Appendix 11).

Table 4.10 The Result of Control Class (Pre-test and Post-test)

	<b>Control Class</b>	
	<b>Pre-Test</b>	<b>Post-Test</b>
Mean	65,20	64,25
Median	63,00	63,00
Mode	63	63
Minimum	50	50

Maximum	75	75
Sum	1304	1285

Table 4.11 Pre-test Frequency of Control Class

Score	Frequency
50	1
56	3
63	5
69	7
75	4
<b>Total</b>	20

Table 4.12 Post-test Frequency of Control Class

Score	Frequency
50	1
56	4
63	7
69	5
75	3
<b>Total</b>	20

Based on table 4.10 above, the result of pre-test and post-test from control class was little difference. (See Appendix 6). The mean score of post-test (64.25) was lower than the mean score of pre-test (65.20). In addition, the mode of post-

test (63.00) was the same with mode of pre-test (63.00). Then, the median of post-test was (63.00) same with pre-test. Then, sum of pre-test was 1304 with the minimum score was 50 and the frequency is 1 and the maximum score was 75 and the frequency is 4. The sum of post-test was 1285 with the minimum score was 50 and the frequency is 1 and the maximum was 75 and the frequency is 3. (See Appendix 12).

Table 4.13 The Result of Experiment Class and Control Class (Post-test)

	Post-Test	
	Experiment Class	Control Class
Mean	70,75	64,25
Median	69,00	63,00
Mode	69	63
Minimum	56	50
Maximum	81	75
Sum	1415	1285

Based on table 4.13 above, the result of post-test from experiment class and control class was difference. The mean score of experiment class (70.75) was higher than the mean score of control class (64.25). In addition, the mode of experiment class (69) was higher than mode of control class (63). Then, the median of experiment class was (69.00) and control class was (63.00). Then, sum of experiment class was 1415 with the minimum score was 56 and the frequency is 1 and the maximum score was 81 and the frequency is 3. The sum of control

class was 1285 with the minimum score was 50 and the frequency is 1 and the maximum was 75 and the frequency is 3. (See Appendix 13).

Table 4.14 Levene test for Homogeneity of variance of Post-test Score

Based	df	Significant
Mean	38	0,648
Median	38	0,753
Median and with Adjusted df	37,716	0,735

Based on table 4.14 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 post-test from experiment class and control class are homogenous. Then t-test can be applied. (See Appendix 14).

Table 4.15 The Result of t-test of Experiment Class and Control Class for Post-test.

Independent t-test				
	Significant	T	Df	Critical t-value
Equal variance assumed	0,984	2,949	38	1,6905

Based on table 4.15, the t count is 2,949 with df38. To get the critical t value (t-table) at significant 0,05 with df38 is using interpolation computation which this computation for searching the data who didn't t-table. Then the researcher took the closest df with df38 from the table. The closest df with df38 is df30 and below from df38 is df40. (See Appendix 1). After that df30 minus df40, if df30 is 1,6905 minus df40 is 1,684 equals 0,013. Then 0,013 times 1 divided 2 equals 0,0065. Next, 1,6905 (df30) minus 0,0065 equals 1,6905. So, the critical t value is 1,6905. (See Appendix 17). Because t count (2,949) is higher than t table (1,6905). It means the mean difference from experiment class and control class (post-test) is significant. Then, if t value > t table, it means Ho is rejected and Ha is accepted.

The last. From the descriptions above the mean score pre-test of experiment class was 62,70 it changed in post-test after the researcher gave treatment about free translation was 70,75. The mean score pre-test of control class was 65,20 it changed in post-test was 64,25. 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. There are some factors that influenced the students in story retelling after they got the treatment using comics. After conducting the research, the researcher found that the students in the experiment group really

looked excited with the use of comics as medium to teach speaking. So, they followed the teaching and learning process enthusiastically. The existence of the pictures helped the students to understand the story and to get the meaning of a certain words. Thus, comics would not be really difficult for the students. It had not happened to the control group that got little improvement in speaking test.

Before conducting the test by the instrument, the researcher should get validity and reliability. Based on table 4.1, analysis of validity of MTs Nurul Iman 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 tested, 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, p.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  $\mu$  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 homogeny. Also, table 4.6 showed homogeneity test of post-test of experiment class and control class was homogeny.

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 using comics in story retelling was effective in teaching speaking. 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.

Based on table 4.13, the experiment class was given comics in story retelling in teaching speaking and it was more effective than without comics in story retelling in teaching speaking. Thus, Chaney in Kayi (2006), speaking is the

process of building and sharing meaning through the use of verbal and nonverbal symbols in a variety of contexts.

Based on table 4.14, 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 4.15 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 researcher doing this research, treatment of using comics in story retelling methods was increasing students mean in teaching speaking compared without treatment. According the result of another researcher in previous studies, like Renyta Okfiani Klau (2015) stated that using speaking method in *using comics strips to improve the speaking skills* discussed about the methods that is used by her. She used the actions implemented, were using comic strips in the teaching and learning process of speaking, establishing rapport, conducting pre-communicative activities, giving handouts as daily materials, giving tangible rewards to active students. As a whole, the result of this research indicated that “using comics in story retelling” used by the researcher was effective. Then, Fika Megawati and Mirjam Anugerahwati (2012) studied about

*Comic Strips A Study on the Teaching of Writing Narrative Texts to Indonesia EFL Students.* Discussed about teaching writing using comic strips through Process-Genre Based Approach (PGBA) showed that it could improve students' ability in writing narrative text successfully

There was a difference between experiment class and control class before using comics in story retelling. Then, after experiment class is used comics in story retelling in teaching the mean was increasing and higher than control class without using comics in story retelling. This research was supported the conclusion reached by several researchers in earlier studies Renyta Okfiani Klau (2015); Fika Megawati and Mirjam Anugerahwati (2012)