

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

A. Findings

To get the data of students mastery on past tenses and their ability in speaking English at the fourth semester students in IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin, the writer has studied directly to the research location. Data X (Students mastery on past tenses) was acquired from grammar multiple choice, completion and conversion. The test that had been performed three times for about 60 minutes. Meanwhile data Y (students ability in speaking English) was acquired from the analysis of available document from speaking I course.

Based on the result of mastery on past tenses test of the fourth semester students in the English Department of IAIN Antasari academic year 2012/2013, it is found the data that the highest score is 94 and the lowest score is 39. The accumulated score is 3326. The result can be seen in the table below:

Table 4.1. Students Mastery on Past tenses

Student's Code Number	Students' Mastery on Past Tenses (X)
1.	63
2.	55
3.	60
4.	82
5.	49
6.	57

Continuing Table of 4.1. Students Mastery on Past Tenses

Student's Code Number	Students' Mastery on Past Tenses (X)
7.	59
8.	75
9.	88
10.	64
11.	69
12.	50
13.	53
14.	55
15.	68
16.	70
17.	56
18.	50
19.	39
20.	58
21.	75
22.	80
23.	73
24.	60
25.	53
26.	57
27.	71
28.	77
29.	94
30.	72
31.	76
32.	66
33.	70
34.	80
35.	54
36.	62
37.	67
38.	69
39.	39
40.	59
41.	61
42.	90
43.	49
44.	43
45.	77
46.	59
47.	50
48.	50

Continuing Table of 4.1. Students Mastery on Past Tenses

Student's Code Number	Students' Mastery on Past Tenses (X)
49.	59
50.	68
51.	75
52.	71
N=52	$\Sigma X = 3326$

While, from the result of Speaking I course of the fourth semester students in the English Department of IAIN Antasari academic year 2012/2013, it is found the data that the highest score is 85 and the lowest score is 72. The accumulated score is 3918. The test result can be seen in the table below:

Table 4.2. Students Ability in Speaking English

Student's Code Number	Students Ability in Speaking English (Y)
1.	76
2.	74
3.	72
4.	76
5.	75
6.	74
7.	73
8.	80
9.	79
10.	77
11.	75
12.	74
13.	73
14.	74
15.	72
16.	74
17.	73
18.	76
19.	72
20.	74
21.	79

Continuing Table of 4.2. Students Ability in Speaking English

Student's Code Number	Students Ability in Speaking English
22.	73
23.	76
24.	77
25.	76
26.	75
27.	77
28.	80
29.	77
30.	75
31.	75
32.	74
33.	73
34.	80
35.	78
36.	74
37.	74
38.	77
39.	73
40.	73
41.	76
42.	78
43.	74
44.	75
45.	85
46.	73
47.	72
48.	75
49.	74
50.	80
51.	73
52.	74
N=52	$\Sigma Y = 3918$

1. Data Presentation about Students' Mastery on Past Tenses

To know the students level at the test, the writer classifies the data to 5 criteria, namely excellent, Good, Sufficient, poor and very poor.

Table 4.3. Classification level of Students' Mastery Past Tenses

Level	Score	Sum of Students Mastery On Past Tenses	
		F	%
Excellent	80 - 100	6	11.53 %
Good	70 - <80	12	23.08%
Sufficient	60-<70	12	23.08%
Poor	50-<60	17	32.69%
Very poor	0-<50	5	9.62%
Total		52	100%

The table above shows the students mastery on past tenses. Most of students are in poor level 32.69% or 17 students and 23.08% or 12 students are in good and sufficient level. 9.62% or 5 students are in very poor level. The students who get the excellent level are only 11.53% or 6 students.

From the result of the test, the writer has identified that most of students did the mistakes in some cases including making the pattern of past tenses, whether it is about simple past tense, past progressive tense, past perfect tense, and past perfect progressive tense. In specific, that is about the mistake of using verb in past form (verb II) for instance verb "water", some of them made the second verb as "waters", verb in past participle (verb III) form such as changing verb "operated", some of them forget the formula of it that should be "operating". From that, it proved they could not understand the changing of verb, it can be caused the lack

of knowledge about the formation of formula and also about regular and irregular verb. The lack of knowing part of speech which is the verb, adjective or it is a noun for instance, water. Some considered that it was an adjective, so they added the auxiliary verb “was”. The mistake of changing auxiliary verb from present to past or from the past to past participle (was/were/had) in singular or plural subject (many people was enjoying. that should be “were”). In addition. they could not identify and make the time marker in past or perfect tense (yesterday, last summer, while and when, in 2000, before and after or all day).

2. Data Presentation about Students’ Ability in Speaking English

To know the students level at the test. the writer classifies the data to 5 criteria. namely excellent. good. sufficient. poor and very poor.

Table 4.4. Classification of Students level in Speaking English

Level	Score	Sum of Students Ability in Speaking English	
		F	%
Excellent	80 – 100	5	9.62%
Good	70 - <80	47	90.38%
Sufficient	60-<70	-	-
Poor	50-<60	-	-
Very poor	0-<50	-	-
Total		52	100%

For students ability in speaking English also can be seen from the table above. There are 90.38 % or 47 students are in good level. There is no students who get sufficient. poor and very poor score. Only 9.62% or 5 students are in excellent level.

From the score of Speaking I course, the writer assumes that many students have good ability in speaking English. They are mostly in good level. Even the score of speaking is in good level, they cannot reach the score better, they mostly gained B score or it is about 70-79. While, From the result of interview from the lecturer of Speaking I, she told that during the teaching learning process, in general her students had bad pronunciation, it proved when they presented the past experience. For instance, the pronunciation of the names of countries. i.e. Europe, australia, etc. The use auxiliary verb that is 'was' and vowel or consonant (with and there). For their fluency, they had less preparation. For all the materials they get and present, they should remember without text, of course. Some of them hesitate of uttering the words it can be caused that they are not active or as a passive students. About grammar, they had sufficient grammar. They sometimes ignore to speak as correct as possible. They did not pay attention about the proper past tenses when they speak up even the past perfect and past perfect continuous tense is rarely used in speaking. They had lack of vocabulary for example, in general they mention the word "*kayu manis*" as sweet wood not as "cinnamon", they had less references about the right word, the way of choosing the proper word that is acceptable. About comprehension, over all they are good. Their performance is good as general but they have to speak as natural as possible and need practice more whether it is from Tv, movie or listening to English song that can improve their speaking as well to be better.

B. Discussion

1. Data Analysis

1) To define the degree of students mastery on past tense and their ability in speaking English

From the result of the test, it can be defined the mean (M) of students score by using the formula below:

$$M_x: \Sigma X/N$$

$$M_y: \Sigma Y/N$$

Thus, based on the table score it can be known that:

$$\Sigma X : 3326$$

$$\Sigma Y : 3918$$

$$M_x = 3326/52 = 63.96$$

From the Mean (M) 63.96. So, the degree of students' mastery on past tenses is in sufficient level.

$$M_y = 3918/52 = 75.35$$

From the Mean (M) 75.35. So, the degree of students ability in speaking English is in good level.

After the mean of data X and Y are defined. the writer makes working table of the final score as in this table below:

Table 4.5. Working Table of Analyzing the Correlation

No	X	Y	x	y	Xy	x^2	y^2
1.	63	76	-0.96	0.65	-0.624	0.923	0.423
2.	55	74	-8.96	-1.35	12.096	80.282	1.823
3.	60	72	-3.96	-3.35	13.266	15.682	11.223
4.	82	76	18.04	0.65	11.726	325.442	0.423
5.	49	75	-14.96	-0.35	5.236	223.802	0.123
6.	57	74	-6.96	-1.35	9.396	48.442	1.823
7.	59	73	-4.96	-2.35	11.656	24.602	5.523
8.	75	80	11.04	4.65	51.336	121.882	21.623
9.	88	79	24.04	3.65	87.746	577.922	13.323
10.	64	77	0.04	1.65	0.066	0.0016	2.723
11.	69	75	5.04	-0.35	-1.764	25.402	0.123
12.	50	74	-13.96	-1.35	18.846	194.882	1.823
13.	53	73	-10.96	-2.35	25.756	120.122	5.523
14.	55	74	-8.96	-1.35	12.096	80.282	1.823
15.	68	72	4.04	-3.35	-13.534	16.322	11.223
16.	70	74	6.04	-1.35	-8.154	36.482	1.823
17.	56	73	-7.96	-2.35	18.706	63.362	5.523
18.	50	76	-13.96	0.65	-9.074	194.882	0.423
19.	39	72	-24.96	-3.35	83.616	623.002	11.223
20.	58	74	-5.96	-1.35	8.046	35.522	1.823
21.	75	79	11.04	3.65	40.296	121.882	13.323
22.	80	73	16.04	-2.35	-37.694	257.282	5.523
23.	73	76	9.04	0.65	5.876	81.722	0.423
24.	60	77	-3.96	1.65	-6.534	15.682	2.723
25.	53	76	-10.96	0.65	-7.124	120.122	0.423
26.	57	75	-6.96	-0.35	2.436	48.442	0.123
27.	71	77	7.04	1.65	11.616	49.562	2.723
28.	77	80	13.04	4.65	60.636	170.042	21.623
29.	94	77	30.04	1.65	49.566	902.402	2.723
30.	72	75	8.04	-0.35	-2.814	64.642	0.123
31.	76	75	12.04	-0.35	-4.214	144.962	0.123
32.	66	74	2.04	-1.35	-2.754	4.162	1.823
33.	70	73	6.04	-2.35	-14.194	36.482	5.523
34.	80	80	16.04	4.65	74.586	257.282	21.623
35.	54	78	-9.96	2.65	-26.394	99.202	7.023
36.	62	74	-1.96	-1.35	2.646	3.842	1.823
37.	67	74	3.04	-1.35	-4.104	9.242	1.823
38.	69	77	5.04	1.65	8.316	25.402	2.723

Continuing Table 4.5. Working Table of Analyzing the Correlation

No	X	Y	x	y	Xy	x^2	y^2
39.	39	73	-24.96	-2.35	58.656	623.002	5.523
40.	59	73	-4.96	-2.35	11.656	24.602	5.523
41.	61	76	-2.96	0.65	-1.924	8.762	0.423
42.	90	78	26.04	2.65	69.006	678.082	7.023
43.	49	74	-14.96	-1.35	20.196	223.802	1.823
44.	43	75	-20.96	-0.35	7.336	439.322	0.123
45.	77	85	13.1	9.65	126.415	171.61	93.123
46.	59	73	-4.96	-2.35	11.656	24.602	5.523
47.	50	72	-13.96	-3.35	46.766	194.882	11.223
48.	50	75	-13.96	-0.35	4.886	194.882	0.123
49.	59	74	-4.96	-1.35	6.696	24.602	1.823
50.	68	80	4.04	4.65	18.786	16.322	21.623
51.	75	73	11.04	-2.35	-25.944	121.882	5.523
52.	71	74	7.04	-1.35	-9.504	49.562	1.823
N= 52	3326	3918			831,271	8017,513	353,796

Then, the writer determines the degree of r_{xy} by implementing formula as follows:

$$r_{xy} = \frac{\sum xy}{\sqrt{(\sum x^2)(\sum y^2)}}$$

Where:

r_{xy} : Coefficient correlation variables x and y

$\sum xy$: The amount of multiplication between variable x and y

$\sum x^2$: Deviation of x

$\sum y^2$: Deviation of y

Finally, from the working table. it can be known that:

$$\sum xy = 831.271$$

$$\sum x^2 = 8017.513$$

$$\sum y^2 = 353.796$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{So, } r_{xy} : &= \frac{831.271}{\sqrt{(8017.513)(353.796)}} \\
 &= \frac{831.271}{1684.211} \\
 &= \mathbf{0.493}
 \end{aligned}$$

2). To test hypothesis

After presenting the data, the writer analyzes all obtained data to give some consideration on the research.

a. Students mastery on past tenses of the fourth semester students in IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin

The presented data on the previous subchapter show that the most of students are in poor level 32.69% or 17 students and 23.08% are in good and sufficient level or 12 students. There are 9.62% or 5 students are in very poor level. The students who get the excellent level are only 11.53% or 6 students.

Thus, the total score of students mastery on past tenses are 3326 of 52 students and the mean score is 63.96.

b. Students ability in speaking English of the fourth semester students in IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin

The presented data on the previous subchapter also shows that there are 90.38 % or 47 students in good level. Only 9.62% or 5 students are in excellent level.

Thus, the total scores of students ability in speaking English are 3918 of 52 students and the mean score is 75.35.

c. Correlation between students mastery on past tenses and their ability in speaking English

Based on the counting above, r_{xy} is 0.493. By looking at table of coefficient correlation degree of Pearson Product Moment, it can be known whether there is a significant correlation or not. For the formula d.b = $N - 2$. So. d.b = $52 - 2 = 50$. For $N = 50$ r table in 5% is 0.279 and r table in 1% is 0.361.

So, It appears the result that $0.279 < r_{xy} > 0.361$. It means that the hypothesis null (H_o) is denied and the hypothesis alternative (H_a) is accepted. So, it can be concluded that there is a significant correlation between students mastery on past tenses and their ability in speaking English. According to Standard Classification of Correlation, the degree of correlation is positive and occurs in 0.40 - 0.60 level. It can be stated that the correlation between students mastery on past tenses and their ability in speaking English is in fair category.