

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

A. Findings

As mention in the research methodology, for getting the data, the researcher distributed questionnaire to know the students' motivation in learning English, especially in speaking at PPB Antasari Islamic University Banjarmasin. Then, the researcher conducted an oral test to know students' speaking performance. After both of the data collected, the researcher analyzed each data firstly. Motivation is assessed b Likert' scale rating and speaking performance is measured by David' scale rating score. After each data analyzed, to see the correlation between students' motivation in learning and their speaking score, the researcher analyzed both of the data by applying the formula of correlation Product Moment by Pearson.

1. Students' motivation score

In this study, students' motivation in learning is as independent variable (X). To measure it, the study used questionnaire. As mentioned in data analysis procedure, the questionnaires in this study have 25 items adopted form AMTB by Gardner. The questionnaires were assessed by Likert scale rating. This scale rating has five options. They are: *Strongly agree* (Sangat setuju), *Agree* (Setuju), *Undecided* (Ragu-ragu), *Disagree* (Tidak setuju), and *Strongly disagree* (Sangat Tidak setuju). The results of questionnaires are described in a table (**See appendix I**). The following table

describes the result of questionnaires about students' motivations in learning English especially in speaking after accumulated.

Table 4.1 Score of students' motivation in learning (X Variable)

| No | Respondent | group | Motivations' score (X) |
|----|------------------|-------|------------------------|
| 1 | Verissya | 7 | 67 |
| 2 | Norhalimah | 46 | 71 |
| 3 | Misna | 3 | 67 |
| 4 | Siti | 72 | 72 |
| 5 | Nadia | 52 | 69 |
| 6 | Oktaviani | 16 | 65 |
| 7 | Norhikmah | 47 | 68 |
| 8 | Noryuliani | 26 | 73 |
| 9 | Nurul hafizah | 70 | 78 |
| 10 | Asriatul | 83 | 62 |
| 11 | Fitra | 42 | 72 |
| 12 | Rejanurrahman | 42 | 83 |
| 13 | Abdussomad | 29 | 74 |
| 14 | Nurdin | 69 | 74 |
| 15 | Muhammad al ibnu | 82 | 79 |
| 16 | Gunawan | 49 | 80 |
| 17 | M. Wahyu R. | 81 | 78 |
| 18 | M. Rizki | 60 | 78 |
| 19 | M. Aulia R. | 25 | 85 |

| | | | |
|----|----------------|----|----|
| 20 | Akhmad Ridha S | 10 | 82 |
| 21 | M. Yusuf | 69 | 79 |
| 22 | M. Hafiz H | 12 | 80 |
| 23 | M. Amin R | 54 | 85 |
| 24 | Budi Sulaiman | 80 | 67 |
| 25 | A. Fajar | 41 | 66 |
| 26 | A.Sarwani | 84 | 85 |
| 27 | M. Murtadho | 38 | 85 |
| 28 | M. Yusuf G. | 75 | 68 |
| 29 | Ahmadi | 47 | 73 |
| 30 | Fadel Herdy | 15 | 70 |
| 31 | Seri Megawati | 6 | 78 |
| 32 | Siti Marzait | 26 | 83 |

The continuous of table on page 49

| | | | |
|----|-----------------|----|----|
| 33 | Naely Fatimah | 25 | 76 |
| 34 | Jihan Puspawati | 26 | 76 |
| 35 | Karniati | 81 | 83 |
| 36 | Isnaniah | 88 | 75 |
| 37 | Raifa N M. | 3 | 78 |
| 38 | Fathia R. | 14 | 69 |
| 39 | Riatul A | 8 | 70 |
| 40 | Reka | 2 | 70 |
| 41 | M. Maulana | 86 | 85 |
| 42 | Abdurrasyid | 47 | 78 |

| | | | |
|----|------------------|----|-----------------|
| 43 | Ahmad | 70 | 80 |
| 44 | M. Hilmi | 59 | 82 |
| 45 | Ali Akbar | 56 | 70 |
| 46 | Diky Ridwan | 54 | 79 |
| 47 | Najarullah amien | 53 | 67 |
| 48 | Johan | 86 | 85 |
| 49 | M. Nassir | 35 | 73 |
| 50 | Fadil Hardi | 62 | 72 |
| | N=50 | | $\sum X = 3764$ |

Descriptive
Statistic

Statistics

DATA

| | | |
|----------------|---------|-----------------|
| N | Valid | 50 |
| | Missing | 0 |
| Mean | | 75.28 |
| Median | | 75.50 |
| Mode | | 78 ^a |
| Std. Deviation | | 6.386 |
| Range | | 23 |
| Minimum | | 62 |
| Maximum | | 85 |

a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown

From the data above, the researcher can see the total score of 50 respondents is 3764. By applying SPSS program, can be seen that the mean of the students' motivation score is 75.28, the median of the students' motivation score is 75.50, the standard deviation of the students' motivation score is 6.38 the mode of the students' motivation score is 78, the range of

the students' motivation score is 23, the minimum score of the students' motivation is 62, and the maximum score is 85.

Based on the statistic result above, there are 5 categories of motivated students based on David P Haris' table score. Therefore, from the table above, it is considered that the mode of students' motivation score is 78, It means the students that got its score more than other score and the mean of the students' motivation score is 75.28 it is considered that students' motivation is in good level.

2. Students' speaking score

In this case, the students' speaking performance is as the dependent variable (Y). To know students' speaking score, the researcher conducted oral test to the students by asking them to introduce themselves, to talk about their experience, to tell their ambition in their future life and how to get it and to tell their like and dislike. The test is evaluated into five criteria; they are pronunciations, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. The five criteria are the components of speaking skill. In this study, the students are scored based on five components of speaking by using the scale rating scores of David P. Harris. Here are the result of students' speaking performance.

Table 4.2 Score of students speaking test (Y Variable)

| No | Respondent | group | Speaking score |
|----|------------|-------|----------------|
| 1 | Verissya | 7 | 96 |

| | | | |
|----|------------------|----|----|
| 2 | Norhalimah | 46 | 76 |
| 3 | Misna | 3 | 92 |
| 4 | Siti | 72 | 52 |
| 5 | Nadia | 52 | 40 |
| 6 | Oktaviani | 16 | 48 |
| 7 | Norhikmah | 47 | 40 |
| 8 | Noryuliani | 26 | 32 |
| 9 | Nurul hafizah | 70 | 40 |
| 10 | Asriatul | 83 | 40 |
| 11 | Fitra | 42 | 44 |
| 12 | Rejanurrahman | 42 | 20 |
| 13 | Abdussomad | 29 | 52 |
| 14 | Nurdin | 69 | 40 |
| 15 | Muhammad al ibnu | 82 | 20 |
| 16 | Gunawan | 49 | 44 |
| 17 | M. Wahyu R. | 81 | 20 |
| 18 | M. Rizki | 60 | 36 |
| 19 | M. Aulia R. | 25 | 20 |
| 20 | Akhmad Ridha S | 10 | 56 |
| 21 | M. Yusuf | 69 | 48 |
| 22 | M. Hafiz H | 12 | 40 |
| 23 | M. Amin R | 54 | 40 |
| 24 | Budi Sulaiman | 80 | 28 |
| 25 | A. Fajar | 41 | 48 |

| | | | |
|----|---------------|----|----|
| 26 | A.Sarwani | 84 | 20 |
| 27 | M. Murtadho | 38 | 32 |
| 28 | M. Yusuf G. | 75 | 20 |
| 29 | Ahmadi | 47 | 48 |
| 30 | Fadel Herdy | 15 | 40 |
| 31 | Seri Megawati | 6 | 76 |
| 32 | Siti Marzait | 26 | 76 |

The continuous of table on page 52

| | | | |
|----|------------------|----|----|
| 33 | Naely fatimah | 25 | 76 |
| 34 | Jihan Puspawati | 26 | 76 |
| 35 | Karniati | 81 | 40 |
| 36 | Isnaniah | 88 | 28 |
| 37 | Raifa N M. | 3 | 84 |
| 38 | Fathia R. | 14 | 92 |
| 39 | Riatul A | 8 | 76 |
| 40 | Reka | 2 | 76 |
| 41 | M. Maulana | 86 | 40 |
| 42 | Abdurrasyid | 47 | 40 |
| 43 | Ahmad | 70 | 44 |
| 44 | M. Hilmi | 59 | 48 |
| 45 | Ali Akbar | 56 | 56 |
| 46 | Diky Ridwan | 54 | 64 |
| 47 | Najarullah amien | 53 | 40 |
| 48 | Johan | 86 | 20 |

Descriptive
Statistic
Speaking (Y)

| | | | |
|----|-------------|----|-----------------|
| 49 | M. Nassir | 35 | 40 |
| 50 | Fadil Hardi | 62 | 40 |
| | N = 30 | | $\sum Y = 2360$ |

Statistics

DATA

| | | |
|----------------|---------|--------|
| N | Valid | 50 |
| | Missing | 0 |
| Mean | | 48.08 |
| Median | | 40.00 |
| Mode | | 40 |
| Std. Deviation | | 20.832 |
| Range | | 76 |
| Minimum | | 20 |
| Maximum | | 96 |

From the data above, the researcher can see the total score of 50 respondents is 2360. By applying SPSS program, can be seen that the mean of the students' speaking score is 48.08, the median of the students' speaking score is 40, the standard deviation of the students' speaking score is 20.83, the range of the students' speaking score is 76, the mode of the students' speaking score is 40, the minimum of the students' speaking score of the students' motivation is 20, and the maximum of the students' speaking score is 96.

Based on the statistic result above, the mean speaking score is 48. It means most of students' speaking performance based on the table is in the very low level, some of them in low, good, fair, level and some of them in excellent level. It also can be seen from the minimum speaking score is 20, the maximum speaking score is 95.

3. The Correlation between Students' Motivation in Learning and Their Speaking Performance.

In this case, both of scores of the students' motivation and students' speaking performance are correlated by Pearson's Product Moment formula. The data are described in the following table:

Table 4.3 the calculating of Questionnaire of Motivation and Speaking score.

| Student (N) | Motivation (X) | Speaking (Y) | X ² | Y ² | XY |
|-------------|----------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|------|
| 1 | 67 | 96 | 4489 | 9216 | 6432 |
| 2 | 71 | 76 | 5041 | 5776 | 5396 |
| 3 | 67 | 92 | 4489 | 8464 | 6164 |
| 4 | 72 | 52 | 5184 | 2704 | 3744 |
| 5 | 69 | 40 | 4761 | 1600 | 2760 |
| 6 | 65 | 48 | 4225 | 2304 | 3120 |
| 7 | 68 | 40 | 4624 | 1600 | 2720 |

The continuous of table on page 54

| | | | | | |
|----|----|----|------|------|------|
| 8 | 73 | 32 | 5329 | 1024 | 2336 |
| 9 | 78 | 40 | 6084 | 1600 | 3120 |
| 10 | 62 | 40 | 3844 | 1600 | 2480 |
| 11 | 72 | 44 | 5184 | 1936 | 3168 |
| 12 | 83 | 20 | 6889 | 400 | 1660 |
| 13 | 74 | 52 | 5476 | 2704 | 3848 |

| | | | | | |
|----|----|----|------|------|------|
| 14 | 74 | 40 | 5476 | 1600 | 2960 |
| 15 | 79 | 20 | 6241 | 400 | 1580 |
| 16 | 80 | 44 | 6400 | 1936 | 3520 |
| 17 | 78 | 20 | 6084 | 400 | 1560 |
| 18 | 78 | 36 | 6084 | 1296 | 2808 |
| 19 | 85 | 20 | 7225 | 400 | 1700 |
| 20 | 82 | 56 | 6724 | 3136 | 4592 |
| 21 | 79 | 48 | 6241 | 2304 | 3792 |
| 22 | 80 | 40 | 6400 | 1600 | 3200 |
| 23 | 85 | 40 | 7225 | 1600 | 3400 |
| 24 | 67 | 28 | 4489 | 784 | 1876 |
| 25 | 66 | 48 | 4356 | 2304 | 3168 |
| 26 | 85 | 20 | 7225 | 400 | 1700 |
| 27 | 85 | 32 | 7225 | 1024 | 2720 |
| 28 | 68 | 20 | 4624 | 400 | 1360 |
| 29 | 73 | 48 | 5329 | 2304 | 3504 |
| 30 | 70 | 40 | 4900 | 1600 | 2800 |
| 31 | 78 | 76 | 6084 | 5776 | 5928 |
| 32 | 83 | 76 | 6889 | 5776 | 6308 |
| 33 | 76 | 76 | 5776 | 5776 | 5776 |
| 34 | 76 | 76 | 5776 | 5776 | 5776 |
| 35 | 83 | 40 | 6889 | 1600 | 3320 |
| 36 | 75 | 28 | 5625 | 784 | 2100 |
| 37 | 78 | 84 | 6084 | 7056 | 6552 |

| | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| 38 | 69 | 92 | 4761 | 8464 | 6348 |
| 39 | 70 | 76 | 4900 | 5776 | 5320 |
| 40 | 70 | 76 | 4900 | 5776 | 5320 |
| 41 | 85 | 40 | 7225 | 1600 | 3400 |
| 42 | 78 | 40 | 6084 | 1600 | 3120 |
| 43 | 80 | 44 | 6400 | 1936 | 3520 |
| 44 | 82 | 48 | 6724 | 2304 | 3936 |
| 45 | 70 | 56 | 4900 | 3136 | 3920 |
| 46 | 79 | 64 | 6241 | 4096 | 5056 |
| The continuous of table on page 55 | | | | | |
| 47 | 67 | 40 | 4489 | 1600 | 2680 |
| 48 | 85 | 20 | 7225 | 400 | 1700 |
| 49 | 73 | 40 | 5329 | 1600 | 2920 |
| 50 | 72 | 40 | 5184 | 1600 | 2880 |
| N=50 | $\Sigma X=3764$ | $\Sigma Y=2404$ | $\Sigma X^2=285352$ | $\Sigma Y^2=136848$ | $\Sigma XY=179068$ |

$$r_{xy} = \frac{N \Sigma XY - (\Sigma X)(\Sigma Y)}{\sqrt{(N \Sigma X^2 - (\Sigma X)^2)(N \Sigma Y^2 - (\Sigma Y)^2)}}$$

$$r_{xy} = \frac{50 \times 179068 - (2404) \times (3764)}{\sqrt{(50 \Sigma 285352 - (3764)^2) (50 \Sigma 136848 - (2404)^2)}}$$

$$r_{xy} = \frac{8953400 - 9048656}{\sqrt{(14267600 - 14167696)(6842400 - 5779216)}}$$

$$r_{xy} = \frac{-95256}{\sqrt{(99904 \times 1063184)}}$$

$$r_{xy} = \frac{-95256}{\sqrt{(106216334336)}}$$

$$r_{xy} = \frac{-95256}{325908.5}$$

$$r_{xy} = 0.2922$$

The result is similar with the SPSS accounting result; it means that the result from accounting above can be trusted. The table can be seen bellow:

Table 4.4 The correlation result by using SPSS

| | | Correlations | |
|------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------|
| | | motivation | speaking |
| Motivation | Pearson Correlation | 1 | -.292* |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | | .039 |
| | N | 50 | 50 |
| Speaking | Pearson Correlation | -.292* | 1 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .039 | |
| | N | 50 | 50 |

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

From the calculation above, it is found that score r_{xy} is 0.2922.

B. Discussion

The next step is to find the significant of variables by calculating r_{xy} is tasted by significant test formula:

$$t_{count} = \frac{r \sqrt{n-2}}{\sqrt{1-r^2}}$$

In which t_{count} = t value

r = value of correlation coefficient

n = total of sample

Therefore, it is calculated that:

$$\begin{aligned} t_{count} &= \frac{r \sqrt{n-2}}{\sqrt{1-r^2}} = \frac{0.2922\sqrt{50-2}}{\sqrt{1-0.2922^2}} \\ &= \frac{0.2922\sqrt{48}}{\sqrt{1-0.08538084}} \\ &= \frac{0.2922 \times 6.9282}{\sqrt{0.91461916}} \\ &= \frac{0.2922 \times 6.9282}{0.9563} \\ &= \frac{2.0244}{0.9563} \end{aligned}$$

$$t_{count} = 2.1169$$

Before tasted by t_{count} , the researcher made two hypothesis of significant: an alternative hypothesis (H_a) and a null hypothesis (H_0).

a. Alternative hypothesis (H_a)

There is a significant correlation between students' motivation and their speaking performance.

b. Null Hypothesis (H_0)

There is no significant correlation between students' motivation and their speaking performance.

The formulation of test:

- a. If $t_{count} > t_{table}$, it means that the null hypothesis is rejected and there is significant correlation.
- b. If $t_{count} < t_{table}$, the null hypothesis is accepted and there is no significant correlation.

Based on the calculation above, the result is compared by t_{table} in the significant 0.05 and $n = 50$. The researcher found out the degree of freedom (Df) with the formula:

$$\begin{aligned} Df &= N - nr \\ &= 50 - 2 \\ &= 48 \end{aligned}$$

From $Df = 48$, it is obtained $t_{table} = 2.01$. It means that t_{count} is bigger than t_{table} or $2.116 > 2.01$. Therefore, the alternative hypothesis is accepted. So that, there is significant correlation between students' motivation in learning and their speaking performance.

After the writer calculated the data by applying the correlation of product moment formula and finding the result of r_{xy} , the second is to give interpretation of the r_{xy} .

From the analyzing data of students' motivation (X) and students' speaking score (Y), it appeared that the correlation index between X and Y variable is $r_{xy} = 0.2922$.

From the analyzing the data of students' motivation in learning (X) and students' speaking performance (Y), it appeared the correlation index

between variable X and Y is $r_{xy} = 0.2922$. It means that between both variable has a low correlation. It can be seen at simple interpretation toward the correlation index “r” Product Moment r_{xy} on the following table (Murdan, 2006, p. 135):

Table 4.5 The simple interpretation of r_{xy}

| “r” Product Moment r_{xy} | interpretation |
|-----------------------------|----------------|
| 0.00 - 0.20 | Very low |
| 0.20- 0.40 | Low/weak |
| 0.40- 0.60 | Medium |
| 0.60- 0.80 | High |
| 0.80- 1.00 | Very High |

By looking in the table above, the result $r_{xy} = 0.2922$ n the interval 0.20 - 0.40. It indicates the gravity of correlation in this study is in the lower level.

Here the interpretation by using r_{table} . Firstly, the researcher found out the degree of freedom (Df) with the formula:

$$Df = N - nr$$

$$= 50 - 2$$

$$= 48$$

Secondly, by checking the r_{table} in $Df = 48$, it is found that at the degree of significance 5% and 1%, it can be concluded as follow:

The significant 5 % = r_o : $r_t = 0.2922 > 0.273$, it means that in the significant 5% r_o (r_{xy}) is bigger than r_t . So, the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) which state there is correlation

between students' motivation in learning and their speaking performance is accepted.

Besides, in the significance $1\% = r_o: r_t = 0.2922 < 0.354$, it means that in the significance 1% r_o (r_{xy}) is smaller than r_t . It is considered that the null hypothesis is accepted and alternative hypothesis (Ha) is rejected which states that in 1% significance there is no significant correlation between students' motivation in learning and their speaking performance.

Therefore, from the result above can be concluded that students' motivation in learning has lower correlation or contribution in improving and developing students in speaking performance.

To prove the result of hypothesis in this study, the researcher calculates the obtained data by Pearson's coefficient correlation of product moment in the previous term. The formulations of hypothesis of this study are as follows:

- a. The null hypothesis (Ho) = There is no significant correlation between X variable and Y variable.
- b. The alternative hypothesis (Ha) = There is significant correlation between X variable and Y variable.

From the formulation above, the writer follows some assumptions as follows:

- a. If the result of calculation r_o is lower than r_t (r_{table}) $r_o < r_t$, the null hypothesis is (Ho) is accepted, and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is rejected.

b. If the result of calculation r_o is bigger than r_t (r_{table}) $r_o > r_t$, the null hypothesis is (Ho) is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted.

The result of r_{count} value (0.2922) is bigger than r_{table} value with significant value 0.05 the null hypothesis is rejected but in the significant value 0.01 the null hypothesis is accepted, so can be concluded:

There is correlation between students' motivation in learning English and their speaking performance in significant value 5% but in significant value 0.01 there is no correlation between students' motivation and their speaking performance.

According to Sudijno, if in significant value 5 % there is correlation and in significant 0.01% there is no correlation. Concluded that in this study there is correlation between students' motivation in learning and there speaking performance. It looks contradiction with the result that was found by researcher that motivation of the students is high and their speaking is low but in fact why students' speaking performance is low, it causes that most of the students are in basic class and regular class.

In this study, after the researcher calculated the data finding is found that there is correlation between students' motivation and their speaking performance but in low level.

The result of this study is similar with the expert's statement that motivation is one of many other factors that influence the students to speaking (Shams, 2008, p. 120). Yes from the result, motivation gives low influences

to the students speaking performance. So from this statement, motivation is not the biggest factor in influencing students speaking performance but others. This statement have been proofed with the result of this study.

In other theory about motivation as Elliot states that motivation is an internal state that push us to do an action, pushes us in particular direction, keep engaged in certain activities, the result of this study according to students' motivation scores and their speaking performance score, motivation is not big enough to push up all students to practice English so that most students get weak score in speaking and just some of them get good score in speaking performance.