

CHAPTER IV

REPORT OF RESEARCH RESULT

A. Description of Research Location

1. Brief History about English Department of Tarbiyah Faculty IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin

Based on Buku Kenang-kenangan 30 tahun Fakultas Tarbiyah IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin, English Department was found in 1984 with the first head Drs. H. Abdul Kadir Munsyi, Dipl.Ad.Ed and Drs. H. Ahdi Makmur, M.Ag as the secretary, and the next period Drs. H. Syarifuddin Syukur, MA as the head of English Department with Drs. H. Ahdi Makmur, M.Ag as the secretary. But, in academic year of 1988/1989 the English Department was closed because wait for the Operational License from Islamic Department (DEPAG).

Then in academic year 1997/1998 it had been reopened for the second time and named English Department, which was lead at that time by Drs. H. Ahdi Makmur, M.Ag and Drs. Sa'adillah as the secretary of the department. Because, Drs. Sa'adillah continues his S2 program, so the secretary is substituted by Drs. Husnul Yaqin, M.Ed. But, since 2003 2003, the secretary was substituted by Drs. Hj. Wardah Hayati.

Then, in September 2005 until October 2006, the head of English Department is Drs. H. Isa Anshari, MZ. and Dra. Nida Mufidah, M.Pd as the secretary. Because

Drs. H. Isa Anshari, MZ. Passed away, the head master of English Department has been changed by Drs. Anang Syaifuddin, MA. since January 2007, but in September 2007 he resigned from the position. So, there is no head master of English Department. And for that, Dra. Nida Mufidah, M.Pd that should handle many problems in English Department as a secretary of English Department. Then, in January 2008, she was appointed to be the head of English Department with Nurlaila Kadariah, S. Ag as the secretary until now.

The main purpose of this department is to participate in developing this country, especially in education field. It is based on the facts that are still found many Islamic school lack of English Teacher who has education background of English. Thus, Tarbiyah faculty; in this case, English Department has a responsibility to provide English teachers.

Curriculum that is used in this department contains 160 SKS, which covers Institut subjects, faculty subjects, and major subjects. It takes about four until five years in finishing the study. English Department has 18 (eighteen) lectures from many different education backgrounds.

2. Description about Lectures, Staff, students, and Condition of English Department

a. Data about English Department Lectures, Staff and Students

Table 4.1. Description about English Department Lectures

No	Name	Graduated	Subject that was taught 3 years later
1	Drs. H. Ahdi Makmur, M. Ag	S2 IAIN Syahid	Writing A, Academic Writing
2	Drs. H. Syarifuddin Syukur, MA	S2 Pakistan, S2 IAIN Kalijaga	Filsafat Umum, Filsafat Ilmu
3	Dr. Husnul Yaqin, M.Ed.	S3 UIN Jakarta	Structure, Dasar-Dasar Administarsi pendidikan
4	Drs. Anang Syaifuddin, MA	S2 USA	Psikologi Belajar Bahasa, Phonology
5	Drs. Sa'adillah	S1 IAIN Antasari	Vocabulary A, B
6	Drs. Syaiful Bahri Djamarah, M.Ag	S2 IAIN Antasari	Psikologi Umum, Psikologi Pendidikan
7	Dra. Dina Hermina, M.Pd	S2 IKIP Yogyakarta	Statistik Pendidikan, Evaluasi Pendidikan
8	Dra. Nida Mufidah, M.Pd	S2 Unlam	TEFL I, Teaching Media
9	Dra. Hj. Wardah Hayati, MA	S2 Australia	Reading A and Reading C
10	Norlaila Kadariah, S.Ag	S1 IAIN Antasari	Structure A and B
11	M. Nor Effendi, S.Ag, S.S	S1 UI	Structure C, Speaking C
12	Dra. Andi Irlina, M.Hum	S2 Unhas	Listening A and B
13	Nani Hizriani, S.Pd	S1 UMM	Intro to Linguistic, Tel.Kur
14	Rusnadi, S.Pd.I	S1 IAIN Antasari	TEFL II, Speaking A
15	Ridha Fadillah, S.Pd, M.Ed	S2 Malaysia	Intro to linguistic, Extensive Reading
16	Rahmila Murtiana, S.S	S1 Univ. Diponegoro	Academic Writing, Intro to Literature
17	Raida Asfihana, S.Pd	S1 Unlam	Structure A, Vocabulary B
18	Puji Rahayu, MA.	S2 University of Queensland	Intro to Linguistic, Speaking
19	Nor Maulidiyah, MA	S2 Malaysia	Academic Writing

Source: Document (Profil Tadris Bahasa Inggris Fak. Tarbiyah IAIN Banjarmasin Th. 2008

b. Data about Condition of English Department

Table 4.2 Description of English Department Staffs

No	Name	Graduated
1	Saidil Imani, S.Pd.I	S1 IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin

Source: Document (Profil Tadrís Bahasa Inggris Fak. Tarbiyah IAIN Banjarmasin Th. 2008

Table 4.3 Description of English Department Students

No	Generation	Sex		Total
		Male	Female	
1	1999/2000	2	0	2
2	2000/2001	6	3	9
3	2001/2002	8	1	9
4	2002/2003	13	21	34
5	2003/2004	13	52	65
6	2004/2005	17	27	44
7	2005/2006	17	42	59
8	2006/2007	19	48	67
9	2007/2008	27	37	64
10	2008/2009	20	45	65
	Total	142	276	418

Source: Observation and Document (Profil Tadrís Bahasa Inggris Fak. Tarbiyah IAIN Banjarmasin Th. 2008

Table 4.4. Description about Facilities of English Department

No	Facilities	Number	Condition
1	Office	1	Good
2	Computer	1	Good
3	Language Laboratory	1	Good
4	Classroom	5	Good
5	Library	1	Good
6	Tape Recorder	1	Good
7	Overhead Projector	1	Good
8	Laptop	2	Good
9	Cupboard	5	Good

Source: Observation and Document (Profil Tadris Bahasa Inggris Fak. Tarbiyah IAIN Banjarmasin Th. 2008

B. Description of Data Presentation

1. Students' Motivation in Learning.

In this research, students' motivation is ordinal scale which consists of three categories that are high, moderate, and low motivation. To find out the date, the writer uses questionnaire technique. There are 68 questionnaires and every questionnaire consists of 20 items. It was speared out to 68 students of English Department Tarbiyah Faculty IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin in batch 2006. The result of the students' motivation can be seen on the table bellow:

Table 4.5. Frequency Distribution of Students' Motivation in Learning

No	Score	Frequency
1	68	1
2	67	1
3	66	3
4	65	2
5	64	3
6	63	2
7	62	2
8	61	3
9	60	2
10	59	2
11	58	3
12	57	2
13	56	4
14	55	12
15	54	8
16	53	3
17	52	2
18	51	4
19	49	1
20	48	4
21	45	1
22	44	1
23	39	1
24	37	1

From the table above. It is known that the highest score of students' motivation in learning is 68 and the lowest score is 37. From this result, the writer can make the specification of the score of each item. It can be seen on the table below.

Table 4.6. Frequency Distribution of Students' Background in Learning at English Department

No	Category	Score	Frequency	Percentage
1	His self and parent	4	14	20.58 %
2	His self	3	43	63.23 %
3	Parent	2	9	13.23 %
4	By friend	1	2	2.94 %

From the table above. It can be known that from sample, there are 14 students (20.58 %) who are supported by his self and his parent, 43 students (63.23 %) supported by his self, 9 students (13.23 %) supported by parent, and 2 students (2.94 %) supported by his friends. From the frequency above can be known that most of students learn in English Department because of them selves.

Table 4.7. Frequency Distribution of Students' Reason for Choosing English Department

No	Category	Score	Frequency	Percentage
1	To add knowledge	4	40	58.82 %
2	The easy case to get job	3	22	32.35 %
3	The easy case to be public servant	2	5	7.35 %
4	No reason	1	1	1.47 %

From the table above, it can be known that most students learn in English Department to get knowledge. Because the table shows there are 40 students (58.82 %) study here to get knowledge, 22 students (32.35 %) to get job easily, 5 students (7.35 %) to be public servant easily, and 1 student (1.47 %) no reason.

Table 4.8. Frequency Distribution of Student's Facilities in learning that Providing by Parent.

No	Category	Score	Frequency	Percentage
1	Always fulfilling	4	40	58.82 %
2	Often fulfilling	3	22	32.35 %
3	Sometime fulfilling	2	5	7.35 %
4	Never fulfilling	1	1	1.47 %

From the table above, it can be seen that most of students are supported by them parents. There are 40 students (58.82 %) always supported by his parent in facilities, 22 students (32.35 %) are often supported by his parent in facilities, 5 students (7.35 %) are sometime supported by his parent in facilities, and 1 student (1.47 %) is never support by his parent in having facilities for learning.

Table 4.9. Frequency Distribution of Parent's Supporting in Learning

No	Category	Score	Frequency	Percentage
1	Always support	4	36	52.94 %
2	Often support	3	17	25 %
3	Sometime support	2	15	22.05 %
4	Never support	1	-	-

From the table 4.9. Shows that parents always support students in learning. It can be seen on the frequency above. There are 36 students (52.94 %). Parents always support students in learning, 17 students (25 %) often supported by his parent, 15 students (22.05 %) sometime supported by his parent, and no one is never supported by parent.

Table 4.10. Frequency Distribution of the Effect of Friends in Learning

No	Category	Score	Frequency	Percentage
1	Always get effect	4	25	36.76 %
2	Often get effect	3	20	29.41 %
3	Sometime get effect	2	21	30.88 %
4	Never get effect	1	2	2.94 %

From the data above, the effect of friend in learning is quite good in supporting students in learning. There are 25 students (36.76 %) always get effect of friend in learning, 20 students (29.41 %) often get effect of students in learning, 21 students (30.88 %) sometime get effect of friend in learning, and 2 students (2.94 %) never get effect of friend in learning.

Table 4.11. Frequency Distribution of the Effect of Condition Inside or Outside the Class for Learning Achievement

No	Category	Score	Frequency	Percentage
1	Always get effect	4	40	58.82 %
2	Often get effect	3	14	20.58 %
3	Sometime get effect	2	12	17.64 %
4	Never get effect	1	2	2.94 %

From the table 4.11. the condition inside or outside the class have big effect for students learning achievement, it can be seen from the table above, there are 40 students (58.82 %) always get effect, 14 students (20.58 %) often get effect, 12 students (17.64 %) sometime get effect, and 2 students (2.94 %) never get effect.

Table 4.12. Frequency Distribution of Lecture's Style and Learning Method for Students' Learning Achievement.

No	Category	Score	Frequency	Percentage
1	Always get effect	4	45	66.17 %
2	Often get effect	3	8	11.76 %
3	Sometime get effect	2	13	19.11 %
4	Never get effect	1	2	2.94 %

From the table 4.11. Lecture's style and learning method also have big effect for students' learning achievement. It can be seen from the table above, there are 45 students (66.17 %) always get effect, 8 students (11.76 %) often get effect, 13 students (19.11 %) sometime get effect, and 2 students (2.94 %) never get effect.

Table 4.13. Frequency Distribution about the Effect of Schedule Time in Learning for Students

No	Category	Score	Frequency	Percentage
1	Never get effect	4	1	1.47 %
2	Sometime get effect	3	22	32.35 %
3	Often get effect	2	18	26.47 %
4	Always get effect	1	27	39.70 %

From the table above can be seen that the schedule time sometime effect students in learning, there are 1 student (1.47 %) who never get effect, 22 students (32.35 %) who sometime get effect, 18 students (26.47 %) who often get effect, and 27 students (39.70 %) who always get effect. It can give bad effect for students in learning achievement.

Table 4.14. Frequency Distribution of student's Activeness to Study before the Class

No	Category	Score	Frequency	Percentage
1	Always	4	1	1.47 %
2	Often	3	6	8.82 %
3	Sometime	2	58	85.29 %
4	Never	1	3	4.41 %

Table 4.14. shows that students' activity to study before the class is not good enough, because the table can be known that there is only 1 student (1.47 %) who

always study before the class interaction and there are 6 students (8.82 %) who often study before the class, while 58 students (85.29 %) who sometime study before the class and there are 3 students (4.41 %) who never study before the class.

Table 4.15. Frequency Distribution of student's Activeness to Restudy after the Class

No	Category	Score	Frequency	Percentage
1	Always	4	3	4.41 %
2	Often	3	7	10.29 %
3	Sometime	2	53	77.94 %
4	Never	1	5	7.35 %

Table 4.14. shows that students' activity to restudy after the class is not good enough too, because the table can be known that there is only 3 student (4.41 %) who always study before the class interaction and there are 7 students (10.29 %) who often study before the class, while 53 students (77.94 %) who sometime study before the class and there are 5 students (7.35 %) who never study before the class.

Table 4.16. Frequency Distribution of Student's Attention to the Lecture's Explanation.

No	Category	Score	Frequency	Percentage
1	Always	4	23	33.82 %
2	Often	3	22	32.35 %
3	Sometime	2	23	33.82 %
4	Never	1	-	

Table 4.16. Shows that the students who always pay attention to the lecture's explanation there are 23 students (33.82 %). Students who often pay attention to the lecture's explanation amount to 22 students (32.35 %), and 23 students (33.82 %) sometime pay attention to the lecture's explanation. It means there is no student who never pays attention to the lecture's attention.

Table 4.17. Frequency Distribution of Students Understanding in Explaining the Lectures

No	Category	Score	Frequency	Percentage
1	Always	4	2	2.94 %
2	Often	3	26	38.23 %
3	Sometime	2	39	57.35 %
4	Never	1	1	1.47 %

From the table above. It can be known that students understanding in learning is quite good, it can be seen there is only 2 students (2.94 %) who always understand the lectures' explanation and there are 26 students (38.23 %) who often understand the lectures' explanation, while 39 students (57.35 %) who sometime understand the lectures' explanation and there is 1 student (1.47 %) who never understand the lectures' explanation.

Table 4.18. Frequency Distribution of Student's Way in Understanding the Subject.

No	Category	Score	Frequency	Percentage
1	Asking to lecture	4	10	14.70 %
2	Discuss it with friend	3	41	60.29 %
3	Study alone	2	13	19.11 %
4	Do not anything	1	4	5.88 %

The table above shows that there are 10 students (14.70 %) ask to the lecture, 41 students (60.29 %) discuss with friend, and there are 13 students (19.11 %) study alone, and there are 4 students (5.88 %) don't do anything. From the date above it indicate that the student's willingness to understand the subject is good enough.

Table 4.19. Frequency Distribution of Student's Activeness to do Assignment

No	Category	Score	Frequency	Percentage
1	Always	4	50	73.52 %
2	Often	3	15	22.05 %
3	Sometime	2	3	4.41 %
4	Never	1	-	-

From the table above, it can be known most of students have awareness to do their assignment, because in the table shows there are 50 students (73.52 %) who always do their assignment and there are 15 students (22.05 %) who often do the assignment, 3 students (4.41 %) sometime do assignment and no one student never do the assignment.

Table 4.20. Frequency Distribution of Student in Having a Subject Literature

No	Category	Score	Frequency	Percentage
1	Always	4	9	13.23 %
2	Often	3	18	26.47 %
3	Sometime	2	41	60.29 %
4	Never	1	-	-

From the table above, it can be seen that the students subject literature are not good enough, because there only 9 students (13.23 %) who always have a subject

literature, and 18 students (26.47 %) who often have a subject literature, and most of them 41 students (60.29 %) sometime have a subject literature.

Table 4.21. Frequency Distribution of the Student's Willingness to Go to Library in the Enjoy Time

No	Category	Score	Frequency	Percentage
1	Always	4	3	4.41 %
2	Often	3	9	13.23 %
3	Sometime	2	55	80.88 %
4	Never	1	1	1.47 %

Table 4.21. Shows that students are not quite good in using the enjoy time. It can be seen that only 3 students (4.41 %) who always go to the library in the enjoy time, 9 students (13.23 %) who often go to the library, while 55 students (80.88 %) sometime go to the library and 1 students (1.47 %) who never goes to the library in enjoy time.

Table 4.22. Frequency Distribution of Student's Activeness in Student Study Club

No	Category	Score	Frequency	Percentage
1	Very active	4	-	-
2	Active	3	12	17.64 %
3	Sometime	2	16	23.52 %
4	Never	1	40	58.82 %

Table 4.22. Shows that the student's activeness in Students Study Club are not good enough, because from the table can be known that there is no one of students who very active in Student Study Club. There are 12 student (17.64 %) who active in SSC, 16 students (23.52 %) sometime active in SSC, and 40 students (58.82 %) who never active in Student Study Club.

Table 4.23. Frequency Distribution of Student's Interest in Getting Good Result

No	Category	Score	Frequency	Percentage
1	Very interested	4	33	48.52 %
2	Interested	3	27	39.70 %
3	Sometime	2	6	8.82 %
4	Just fine	1	2	2.94 %

Table 4.23. shows that the student's interest in getting good result are good enough, because from the table can be known that there are 33 students (48.52 %) very interested in getting good result, 27 students (39.70 %) are interested to get good result, 6 students (8.82 %) some time to be interested to get good result, and 2 students (2.94 %) are just fine to get good result.

Table 4.24. Frequency Distribution of Student's Interest in Learning

No	Category	Score	Frequency	Percentage
1	Very interested	4	21	30.88 %
2	Interested	3	22	32.35 %
3	Sometime	2	22	32.35 %
4	Just fine	1	3	4.41 %

From the table above, it can be known that 22 students (30.88 %) are very interested in learning, 22 students (32.35 %) are interested in learning, 22 students (32.35 %) are sometime interested in learning, and 3 students (4.41 %) are just fine in learning.

Table 4.25. Frequency Distribution of Student's Activeness in Following the Seminar

No	Category	Score	Frequency	Percentage
1	Very active	4	3	4.41 %
2	Active	3	17	25 %
3	Sometime	2	47	69.11 %
4	Never	1	1	1.47 %

Table 4.25. Shows that the student's activeness in Following the Seminar are good enough, because from the table ca be known that there 3 students (4.41 %) who very active in following the seminar. 17 student (25 %) who active in following the

seminar, 47 students (69.11 %) sometime active in following the seminar, and 1 student (1.47 %) who never active in following the seminar.

From the tables above, it can be seen that students' motivation in learning is varied. And it is dived in to three categories. It can be seen on the table bellow:

Table 4.26. Frequency Distribution of Students' Learning Motivation

No	Interval	Category	Frequency	Percentage
1	61 – 80	High	19	27.94 %
2	41 – 60	Moderate	47	69.12 %
3	21 – 40	Low	2	2.94 %
Total			68	100 %

From the table above, it can be seen that there are 19 students (27,94 %) who have high motivation, 47 students (69,12 %) who have moderate motivation, and 2 students (2,94 %) who have low motivation. From this frequency, the writer interprets the students' learning motivation into category which has been determined previously. Clearly it can be seen on the table bellow:

Table 4.27. Working Table of Students' Learning Motivation

No	Interval	F	X	FX
1	61 – 80	19	70,5	1339,5
2	41 – 60	47	50,5	2373,5
3	21 – 40	2	30,5	61
		$\Sigma f = 68$	-	$\Sigma f = 3774$

$$M_x = \frac{\sum fx}{n} = \frac{3774}{68} = 55,5 \text{ (Moderate Motivation)}$$

2. The Correlation between Students' motivation and their Learning Achievement.

To find out the date about student's index cumulative score, the writer uses documentary technique, which the writer gets the date of student's index cumulative score on four semester from the date can be known the lowest score is 2,55 and the highest score is 3,93. Clearly can be seen on the table bellow:

Table. 4.28. Student's Index Cumulative Score

Subject Number	ICS (IPK)	Subject Number	ICS (IPK)
1	2,93	35	3,41
2	3,32	36	2,55
3	3,37	37	3,37

4	3,93	38	3,26
5	3,46	39	2,90
6	3,36	40	2,90
7	3,11	41	3,24
8	3,48	42	3,46
9	3,34	43	3,47
10	3,28	44	3,51
11	3,32	45	3,18
12	3,34	46	3,64
13	3,15	47	3,33
14	3,00	48	3,62
15	3,68	49	3,35
16	3,27	50	2,78
17	3,16	51	3,26
18	2,98	52	3,50
19	3,38	53	3,29
20	2,98	54	3,32
21	2,56	55	3,17
22	3,28	56	3,27
23	3,00	57	2,58
24	2,87	58	3,04
25	2,93	59	3,17
26	3,56	60	3,48
27	3,46	61	3,11

28	3,31	62	3,18
29	3,32	63	3,21
30	3,50	64	3,25
31	3,24	65	3,33
32	3,61	66	3,13
33	3,11	67	3,40
34	3,78	68	2,84

From the table above, it can be seen that from 68 students who have been as sample there are 19 students reach the highest score of students' cumulative score that is 3,93 and 2 students reach the lowest score that is 2,55.

Furthermore, to find out the correlation between students' motivation and their learning achievement, can be seen on the table bellow:

Table 4.29. Frequency Distribution of Student's Index Cumulative Score and Level of Learning Motivation

STATISTIC	Student's Motivation		
	High	Moderate	Low
	2,93	3,32	2,55
	3,93	3,37	2,84
	3,68	3,46	
	3,16	3,36	
	3,50	3,11	
	3,78	3,48	

	3,41	3,34	
	2,90	3,28	
	3,47	3,32	
	3,51	3,34	
	3,64	3,15	
	3,33	3,00	
	3,62	3,27	
	2,78	2,98	
	3,50	3,38	
	3,17	2,98	
	3,27	2,56	
	3,18	3,32	
	3,25	3,00	
		2,87	
		2,93	
		3,56	
		3,46	
		3,31	
		3,32	
		3,24	
		3,61	
		3,11	
		3,37	
		3,26	

	2,90	
	3,24	
	3,46	
	3,18	
	3,35	
	3,26	
	3,29	
	3,32	
	2,58	
	3,04	
	3,17	
	3,48	
	3,11	
	3,21	
	3,33	
	3,13	
	3,40	

STATISTIC	Student's Motivation in Learning		
	High	Moderate	Low
			71
N	19	47	2
P	0,19	0,47	0,02
M	3,37	3,22	2,69

To test the hypothesis that is the highest student's learning motivation the more their index cumulative score, the writer uses *Triserial* correlation formula.

Because the data are ordinal and interval data. The formula is:

$$r_{tris} = \frac{\sum (O_r - O_t) \cdot (M)}{SD_{tot} \{(O_r - O_t)^2\} \cdot P}$$

Before finishing *triserial* correlation formula, there are some steps which should be done, they are:

a. Making Working Table of r Serial

Table. 4.30. Working Table of r Serial

Level	N	P	O	(O _r - O _t)	(O _r - O _t) ²	$\frac{(O_r - O_t)^2}{P}$	M	(O _r - O _t) (M)
High	19	0,19	0	0,27137	0,073641	0,387584	3,37	0,914516
Moderate	47	0,47	0,27137	-0,22295	0,049706	0,105757	3,22	-0,717899
Low	2	0,02	0,04842	-0,04842	0,002344	0,1172	2,69	-0,130249
			0					
Total	68	0,68	-	-	-	0,610541	-	0,066368

b. Calculating Total Deviation Standard

Before operation the formula of *triserial* correlation, firstly is calculate the standard deviation by using the formula bellow:

$$SD_{tot} = \sqrt{\frac{\sum fx^2}{N}}$$

Note:

SD : Standard Deviation

f_x : Cumulative Frequency

N : Total Number of Sample

To make easy in calculating the standard deviation (SD_{tot}), the writer makes working the table as bellow:

Table. 4.31. Working Table of Total Deviation Standard

X	f	X	fX	$x = X - M$	X^2	FX^2
3,80 – 3,93	1	3,36	3,36	0,12	0,0144	0,0144
3,66 – 3,79	2	3,72	7,44	0,48	0,2304	0,4608
3,52 – 3,65	4	3,58	14,32	0,34	0,1156	0,4624
3,38 – 3,51	12	3,44	41,28	0,20	0,04	0,48
3,24 – 3,37	23	3,30	75,90	0,06	0,0036	0,0828
3,11 – 3,23	11	3,17	34,87	-0,07	0,0049	0,0539
2,97 – 3,10	5	3,03	15,15	-0,21	0,0441	0,2205
2,82 – 2,96	6	2,89	17,34	-0,35	0,1225	0,735
2,68 – 2,81	1	2,74	2,74	-0,50	0,25	0,25
2,54 – 2,67	3	2,60	7,80	-0,64	0,4096	1,2288
	68	-	220,20	-	-	3,9886

$$M = \frac{\sum fx}{N}$$

$$M = \frac{220,20}{68} = 3,24$$

$$SD_{tot} = \sqrt{\frac{\sum fx^2}{N}}$$

$$SD_{tot} = \sqrt{\frac{3,9886}{68}}$$

$$SD_{tot} = \sqrt{0,0586}$$

$$= 0,242$$

So, the total deviation standard is 0,242

c. Operation the *Triserial* Formula

After calculating the standard deviation, *triserial* formula can be used to calculate the correlation between two variable of this research, the calculation can be seen bellow:

$$\sum (O_r - O_t) (M) = 0,066368$$

$$\sum \frac{(O_r - O_t)^2}{P} = 0,610541$$

$$r_{tris} = \frac{\sum (O_r - O_t) \cdot (M)}{\frac{SD_{tot} \{(O_r - O_t)^2\}}{P}}$$

$$= \frac{0,066368}{0,242 \cdot 0,610541}$$

$$= \frac{0,066368}{0,147751} = 0,449$$

Thus, can be known that correlation between students' motivation and their learning achievement is 0,449. This correlation shows that the correlation is positive.

The coefficient correlation which is get from *triserial* correlation (r_{tris}) formula is considered overestimated than the real r , so that is need to correct by using the correlation factor. That is $r_{ch} \cdot r_{triserial}$, the formula is:

$$r_{ch} = r_{tris} \sqrt{\sum \left[\frac{O_r - O_p}{P} \right]}$$

Note:

r_{ch} = *Chotomisasi Correlation*

$$= 0,449 \cdot \sqrt{0,610541}$$

$$= 0,449 \cdot 0,781371$$

$$= 0,350$$

But $r_{ch} = 0,350$ is considered underestimated from r of product moment and need to corrected by using *chotomisasi* table. Because of *triserial chotomisasi* used three categories, so that $r_{ch} = 0,350$ have the correlation factor 1,099. So, $(0,350) \cdot (1,099) = 0,384$.

Then it is consulted with critical table of Product Moment

- In the level of significance 95 % = 0,235
- In the level of significance 99 % = 0,306

So, in interval 1 % is $r_{xy} 0,384 > r_t 0,306$

That means there is positive correlation between students' motivation and their learning achievement of the English Department IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin batch 2006 on four semesters.

C. Data Analysis

1. Hypothesis Test

The final result is deemed equivalent with Product Moment, so it can be concluded that $r_{xy} = 0,384$ is consulted to the critic table of r Product Moment.

- In the level of significance 95 % = 0,235
- In the level of significance 99 % = 0,306

So, in interval 1 % is $r_{xy} 0,384 > r_t 0,306$

Based on the result of the calculating above, it can be said that there is a significance correlation between students' motivation and their learning achievement, because the value of $r_{xy} = 0,384$ more than r table on significance level 5 % as well as on significance level 1 %.

It denoted learning motivation effect the students' learning achievement. Students who have high motivation will get the high score, because they can enjoy their learning activity, on the contrary low motivation will make students are lazy to learn consequently they will get bad score.

2. Research Result Analysis

The final scoring by using statistic measurement design that is *triserial* correlation technique is found out the correlation between students' motivation and their learning achievement.

The final data analysis is $r_{\text{tris}} = 0,449$ but this value is overestimated then it was corrected by using formula which get the score $r_{\text{ch}} = 0,350$ but this score is underestimated from the real r , than it compared to the *chotomisasi* table. Then it compared to the critic tables of r Product Moment in significance level 1 % and significance level 5 %.

In consulted the result of r_{xy} with the critic table of r Product Moment, sum up subject checked as much 68 students. Hence Product Moments for $N = 68$, at significance level 5 % = 0,235 and at significance level 1 % = 0,306

From the data analysis, it can be concluded, that is:

- a. H_0 = there is not correlation between students' motivation and their learning achievement of the English Department IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin batch 2006 on four semesters.
- b. H_a = there is correlation between students' motivation and their learning achievement of the English Department IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin batch 2006 on four semesters is accepted

Based on the result of this research, it could be seen motivation had contribution in learning achievement, in spite of there were some others factor, such as teacher method in teaching, the condition of classroom or collage, parents' attention, teacher and students' relationship and subject equipment, could influence learning achievement, because learning activity not only influenced by internal factor influencing, but also external factor.