

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

A. Findings

It has been done in this study, the writer would explained some things about the results that have been found when the research took place which would be drawn conclusions according to the initial planning that has been written in the previous section. This chapter presented the result of experimental class research conducted in the eighth grader of MTs. Al-Mawahib Banjarmasin. Before planning study, writer have observed the atmosphere of Simple Present Tense learning during the practice of PPL 2 took place in MTs. Al-Mawahib Banjarmasin. The process ran for two months. In PPL 2, with the English teacher from the school the writer has followed the process of learning English as a teacher for 12 meetings. From the program also the writer found a lot of problems that arose especially related to mistakes that made by students while learning the language, acquired language and used the language in English class. The position of the study participants at that time was as a grade VII student of MTs. AL-Mawahib Banjarmasin. In addition to observed in the classroom, the writer also spent much of her time hang out with them while class finished such as during broke, read books in the library,

cleaned up in front of the class, ate together in canteen and prayed in congregation. The writers indirectly asked them to talk about the problems they often experience when the process of learning English in the class takes place. Many of them felt very confused about the concept of English, especially on the use of English sentences were good and true. Some of these difficulties were the reason they more dominant in Indonesian and regional languages when the English learning process took place even though the writer had tried to use English as closely as possible when learning began until the learning was over. However they still did it, even, there was one of them who deliberately told through a short message that she wanted to be a very smart English learner and had to become an English teacher but because of the difficulties she faced when learned, made her mind especially if she made an error when asked by the teacher to make sentences in English but at the time, the writer understood that they had just gone to grade level and they were still in the process of learning, a new learning environment with a new friend, and different from the previous elementary school.

After that, writer continued the observation when the research and treatment lasted for 2 weeks, started on August 1st, 2017 until post-test was completed. The number of samples that had followed the course of the study were 24 students consisted of 21 males and 3 females students. Together with their English teacher, the 24 students followed pre-test,

treatments and post-test. They are the seventh graders who had gone to grade VIII in MTs. Al-Mawahib Banjarmasin. So, the writer did research in grade VIII along with their English teacher from the school to was studied. Overall, the observations carried out have taken place in accordance with the original plan of obtained permits and acceptable and welcomed in the school concerned in MTs. Al-Mawahib Banjarmasin. Having previously conducted discussions on the preparation of research, the school concerned is given the opportunity to conduct tests during 2 meetings, the first meeting for pre-test and the last meeting for post-test. In addition, writer was also given the opportunity to did treatment as much as 4 times the meeting with the mutual agreement that teacher to did treatment as much as 3 times meeting with the writer as a writer and 1 time meeting given the opportunity to the writer to re-explained all the explanations submitted by their teacher as a review of learning before did post-test.

1. Pre-test

Part of this research was test. The first test was a pre-test that had been held on Tuesday, August 1, 2017 at 10:40 a.m to finished for 30 minutes or 1 hour lesson. 10 minutes before test began, the teacher explained the intent and purpose of test because most of them asked about the test that would be given. After that, teacher gave the writer an opportunity to explained the specific purpose of the test. The writer

opened the test by greeted them first, asked their news after less than 1 year, did not meet after the end of the PPL 2 program. They were asked by the writer to answered the test contained 20 items by choosed one answered 2 choices of answers that had been provided by writer. The writer also gave them an opportunity to answered within 30 minutes without asked questions by asked the answers from teachers or discussed with their friends. Writer only asked them to answered the questions given in accordance with their own comprehension and ability. But beforehand, the writer gave a hint that the material used in the test was about "Simple Present Tense" in positive verbal or nominal formulas sentences because basically, writer have discussed before with their teacher about the material to be tested because they also had just been introduced about the material "Simple Present Tense" and the material would continued and would be used into the material "Descriptive Text" after the material "Simple Present Tense" finished so that teacher also felt helped by the existence of this research because they also still have not mastered with the material, then most of them just follow the instructions that have been given by writer without asked a lot. The test was started by the writer, distributed them a questionnaire at that time was received by 24 students. Writer as supervisor gave their chance to answered about 30 minutes pre-test. During the pre-test, a few of them feel confused to answered even someone asked directly to their teacher and writer to be

given the answers but writer asked them repeatedly to answered as best as they could. 30 minutes after the pre-test, the students were asked by the writer to collected the results of their answers which would be analyzed later, have the results been valid if used as a test to determined the ability agree their language learning level.

Preliminary test data on class VIII MTs. Al-Mawahib Banjarmasin was the result of *Pre-test* value. This value could be seen in the appendix 6. Summary of the result from the initial test could be seen in the following table.

Table 4.3 Students *Pre-Test* Description

Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance	Maximum Score	Minimum Score
78,3333	19,54185	381,884	100	45

Based on table 4.3 it could be seen that the results of the initial test students average value of 78.3333, the standard deviation was 19.54185, variance was 381,884, maximum score was 100 and the minimum score obtained by students was 45. Calculation could be seen in appendix 6.

Table 4.4 Interpretation of the *Pre-test* result

Interpretation Results from preliminary test

Scores	F	%	Interpretation
45	1	4,2	Not Good
55	6	25,0	Pair
60	2	8,3	Pair
75	1	4,2	Good
80	1	4,2	Good
85	1	4,2	Very Good
90	3	12,5	Very Good
95	5	20,8	Very Good
100	4	16,7	Very Good
	24	100	

Based on the 4.4 table, it could be seen that in the experimental class there were 13 students or 54.2% included in very good qualifications, 2 students or 8.4% included in good qualification, 8 students or 33.3% included in pair qualification, and 1 student or 4.2% were included in not good qualification.

a. Validity Test and Reliability Test Result

To know the level of item validity, it could be noted numbers in table Item-Total Statistics. The score would be compared between the total score (r value count) with the value of (r table). If r count was greater than r table, so the item was valid. The result decision had been attached by the writer on appendix 5. In the table showed that the overall value of items was more than 0.3438, it was the validity value in the category of medium validity because the value of all items between 0,400 up to 0,600.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,727	21

Furthermore, for reliability test could be observed table Item-Total Statistics table on appendix 8 and Reliability Statistics table above. In the table showed that the total score was 0.727. This was the value of reliability in a high category according to the criteria

that have been described by the writer on the explanation of research method that the value was between 0.61 to 0.80. Thus the instrument was reliable.

2. Treatments

Before the teaching-learning process began, as usually the teacher first opened the meeting by greeted, lead the prayer before studied, asked the news, absent students and asked them about a dictionary. In accordance with the applicable curriculum, teachers also lured them with brainstorming at the beginning of learning. In general, students followed the research process for four meetings smoothly and according to the classroom learning process as usual.

a. The 1st Meeting (Tuesday, August 1st 2017)

After the writer took her seat in the back corner of the class, teacher opened the class and greeted the students. Teacher started the class by introduced new material through brainstorming about "Simple Present Tense". One of them answered, although there were some mistakes when she tried to explained, but the teacher still gave rewards by saying "Good" to him. She began to gave examples and explained the material. After a few minutes, the teacher asked students to asked directly about things that they had not understand

before they were given exercises for made sentences by wrote directly on the whiteboard because all the students no one offered themselves, finally teacher tried to wrote a sentence in the form of the Indonesian language "*Andi minum kopi setiap malam*" and asked them to wrote it in English on the whiteboard. Suddenly before one of them came forward, a student mentioned directly in the wrong form of "Andi drink coffee every night". Without furthered invitation, the teacher immediately used the "recast" strategy while said "Good job, Yes, Andi drinks coffee every night", because his teacher's interest in his previous strategy, she finally asked them to name the next example in person. Teacher uttered the phrase "*Dia laki-laki tidur setiap pagi*". One of them replied directly, "He sleep every morning". The teacher said, "Yes, good, He sleeps every morning". The conversation finished until the learning time of the day was over.

In general at the first meeting, students still made many mistakes both in pronunciation of words and sentence form. But when the teacher provided a "recast" strategy, the writer unknowingly paid attention to their actions. Some of them just whispered to themselves that the sentence they mentioned was wrong and the teacher confirmed their phrase.

Below were some words and sentences they said in the wrong form and teacher tried to justify with "recast":

STUDENTS	TEACHER
Et	/i:t/
complEmEnt	/ˈkɒmplɪm(ə)nt/
V1	Verb One
S	Subject
Pull	Full
I sleep in the morning	I sleep every morning
Andi drink coffee every night	Andi drinks coffee every night
He sleep every morning	He sleeps every morning
<i>Table 4.1</i>	

- b. The 2nd Meeting (Saturday, August 5th 2017)

The beginning of the meeting at the second meeting begins with the teacher giving the material review at the previous meeting. He also explained that "Simple Present Tense" is a routine. After students are diabsen, the teacher immediately asks a student named Rizani to give an example on the whiteboard. Rizani also advanced and wrote the phrase "I eat everyday", because Rizani does not show any mistakes, the teacher again asks the other students to come forward. After several students tried to write the sample on the board, the teacher continued the material by introducing the negative formula from "Simple Present Tense". The way the teacher explains is to previously write an example on the whiteboard and ask students to mention the formula of the sentence. Students are given training after the teacher feels enough to explain the material on that day. The exercises are still in the form of Indonesian sentences such as exercises at previous meetings. After all the students have collected the results of their practice, the teacher again asks the students to ask questions about the material they have not understood. Then, he closed the meeting by giving students homework.

The use of recasts at this meeting was used by teacher when asked students to come forward for wrote sentence

examples, when students mentioned examples of sentences and when conversations occurred within the class. Below were some of the words and sentences they said in the wrong form and the teacher tried to justify with "recast":

STUDENTS	TEACHER
I swimming everyday	“Yes, I swim every day”
Drink	Drinks
Sii (She)	/ʃi:/
Tuesday	Thursday
Sixteen (60)	Sixty
Nineteen (90)	Ninety
Siska not listen the every music And Siska doesn't listens music every afternoon	“Yes, Siska doesn't listen music every afternoon”

<i>Table 4.2</i>

c. The 3rd Meeting (Tuesday, August 8th 2017)

By greeted and began the lesson, the teacher re-reviewed the material she had previously explained at the first and second meetings. Then teacher again asked one of them to wrote the contents on the whiteboard. They also wanted to going forward one by one to wrote the example sentence requested by the teacher. Below were the results of the example they wrote.

- 1) Oya doesn't walk in the night. (written by Aulia)
- 2) Oya walks in the night. (written by Fajri and Syamsuddin)
- 3) Fikri eats everyday. (written by Fikri)
- 4) Fikri doesn't eat everyday. (written by Musthofa)
- 5) Imis and Mimin sleep every night. (written by Yandi)
- 6) Imis and Mimin don't sleep every night. (written by Fauzi)

From the sentence that had been written above, the teacher continued the lesson by explained the material

interrogative sentence formula. She asked students to guess the formula after wrote the negative form of sentences that students wrote on the whiteboard. Together they said, "Do / Does + S + V1 + C +?". After that, the teacher immediately pointed the students to said the example of sentence. Below was an example they mentioned directly.

- 1) Do Fikri and Ifan eat every night?
- 2) Does Zaki eat Naya every night?
- 3) Do Zaki and Naya eat every night?

The teacher felt that the students had been able to capture the material that day, they were finally given exercises. The teacher again closed the lesson at that day's meeting by said hello and asked them to collect assignments and exercises.

In general, the students at this meeting almost gave a positive response so that they rarely even showed no wrong, but it was not mean that they have understood the material given but some of them were silent and did not speak while the learning took place.

- d. Last Meeting (Saturday, August 12th 2017)

That day was the last meeting, where the process of teaching and learning was directed by writer. As with previous teacher, writer started classes with greeted and took 10 minutes with reviewed all material from the first meeting to the last meeting. Writer asked students to made sentences from "keywords" mentioned directly by her. Below was a keyword that writer gave them:

- 1) Run, drink and read
- 2) I, she, they and it.
- 3) Do and does.

From reviewed of the material, the writer used recast to justified student's mistakes. Not many of them made mistakes, because they were already interested in the material and have been discussed for three meetings. Furthermore, writer spent the last meeting introduced them material about the nominal form of "Simple Present Tense". By gave examples while explained, some of them strongly responded to the material of the day. It is advantageous for the writer to explained deeply about things they have not understood. Even the sentences exemplified by them were almost true, as below.

- 1) I am beautiful
- 2) My father is driver.

“Yes, my father is a driver”. (Recast)

3) She is student

“Ok, good, she is a student”. (Recast)

4) You are famous

5) It is delicious

Without hesitating to continue the learning, the writer gave them directed training by asking students to make sentences using the following keywords:

1) They

2) It

3) Rahman

4) Randy, Ryan and Rifandi

5) You and I

6) My sister

7) This school

8) We

While paying attention to their notebooks, the writer gave them 5 minutes to answer. The writer's goal was to know the extent they are able to answer quickly and precisely. After that, the writer asked them to read the sentence they had written. Below were the results of their practice:

1) They are teacher

- 2) It is book
- 3) Rahman is police
- 4) Randy, Ryan and Rifandi are run
- 5) You and I are eat
- 6) My sister is mother
- 7) This school is absent
- 8) We are family

By the few sentences they mentioned, there were some sentences that still wrong and the pattern form so. From their mistakes, writer directly utilized recast as a strategy to corrected the problem directly while provided a good reward after they finished mentioning it. Below were a recast given by the writer to students:

- 1) “Excellent, it is a book”
- 2) “Very good, Rahman is a police”
- 3) “Ok, Randy, Ryan and Rifandi run at school”
- 4) “Yes, you and I eat cake”

Overall, when students were asked to wrote a sentence with a pattern that had been taught, they did it correctly compared when they were asked to directly mentioned the sentence directly. The time was running out, the writer again explained to repeat all material given especially the positive

sentence pattern in order to lure their memories back before they did post-test. When everything was done, the writer closed the meeting that day and thanked them for the precious opportunity given to them especially for the research process.

3. Post-Test

Then the final step after treatments, the writer gave final test as an evaluation material. In this case, test was same as pre-test. With the aim was to know the progress of material they got during the four meetings. Most of them had mastered the material and performed the evaluation quietly without asked as they did when the pre-test took place. This test was conducted on 12th August 2017 just after they were finished with the final material when the last meeting took place. When they worked on about 30 minutes and long before the test ran out, they had collected it first. The end result of this post-test would be compared with the initial value of pre-test.

The final test was performed to determine the learning outcomes in the class after the experiment. The test done at the fourth meeting in the class after experiment. The distribution of a student's number who took test could be seen in the following table.

Tabel 4.5 Number of Students Followed *Post-Test*

Data	Kelas
------	-------

Final Test	24 students
Total Students	24 students

Based on table 4.5 could be seen on the final test implementation at class after experiment was followed by 24 student or 100% from the previous total.

The student learning summary outcomes from the final test given, could be seen in the following table.

Tabel 4.6 *Post-Test* Students Description

Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance	Maximum Score	Minimum Score
91,6667	9,51734	90,580	100	70

Based on the 4.6 table, it could be seen that the final test result of the experimental class students obtained an average of 91.6667, standard deviation was 9.51734, variance was 90,580, maximum score was 100 and the minimum score obtained by students was 70. Calculation could be seen in appendix 7.

Tabel 4.10 The *Post-Test* Results Interpretation

Values	F	(%)	Interpretations
70	1	4,2	Good
75	1	4,2	Good
80	3	12,5	Very Good
85	3	12,5	Very Good
90	3	12,5	Very Good
95	2	8,3	Very Good
100	11	45,8	Very Good
	24	100	

Based on 4.10 table, it could be seen that in the experimental class there were 22 students or 91.6% included in very good qualification and 2 students or 8.4% included in good qualification.

4. The Effectiveness of Using Recast as Corrective Feedback

a. *Normality Test*

After defined the view variable, activated the view data and entered the post-test data then analyzed it so that the result of this test as described in appendix 9.

Based on the Kolmogrov-Smirnov One-Sample Test table, it showed that P-value = Sig. of score of 0, 09. The value of P-values was used to proved the hypothesis made. The decision made on the

proposed hypothesis was accepted or rejected in the following manner:

H_0 : Learning result which had been taught were normally distributed

H_1 : Learning result which had been taught were not normally distributed

Decision rule:

- a) If the value of $\alpha = 0.05$ was less than Asymp.Sig (2 -sided), then H_0 was accepted.
- b) If the value of $\alpha = 0.05$ was greater than or equal to Asymp.Sig (2 -sided), then H_0 was rejected.

Therefore, because Asymp.Sig (2 -sided) = 0, 09 was greater than the value $\alpha = 0.05$, then H_0 was accepted. It means that the learning outcomes of the material that has been taught to students in this study was normal distribution.

b. *Homogeneity Test*

After defined the view variable, enabled the data view and entered the *post-test* data, assumptions about whether the students' learning result sample came from a population of the same variance by testing the homogeneity of variance test and the result as described in appendix 10.

In the test table of variances homogeneity indicated that the homogeneity and variance test results to test whether homogeneous or unhomogeneous variance was analyzed by hypothesis submission as follows:

H_0 : Learning outcomes were taught Homogeneous

H_1 : Learning outcomes were taught Not Homogeneous

With the data results and attention to the hypothesis above, the writer also made a decision that:

- a. If the α value = 0.05 was smaller or equal to the Sig (2 tailed) value, so H_0 was accepted.
- b. If the α value = 0.05 was greater than the Sig (2 tailed) value, so H_0 was rejected.

From homogeneity of variances result test, P-value = 0, 286. The result of P-value was bigger than $\alpha = 0.05$, H_0 was accepted, it means students learning result taught by used recast as corrective feedback was Homogen.

Based on the ANOVA or F_{test} table, it was found that F_{count} was 0. 964 with significance level = P-value = 0, 478. To proved whether the test was significant or not, it was used F Test.

H_0 : There was no significant difference between the learning outcomes of students who were taught with recasts as corrective feedback.

H_1 : There is a significant difference between the learning outcomes of students who are taught with recasts as corrective feedback.

Significance Test rules:

- a. If F_{count} was greater than or equal to F_{table} , so H_0 was rejected, it means significant.
- b. If F_{count} was smaller than F_{table} , so H_0 was accepted, it means not significant.

Therefore, the writer looked for the value of F_{table} used the F table with formula:

$F_{table} = F_{\{(dk \text{ numerator} = m), (dk \text{ denominator} = n-m-1)\}}$, where m = variable total.

$F_{table} = F_{\{(dk \text{ numerator} = 1), (dk \text{ denominator} = 22)\}}$

$F_{tabel} = 4,30$

$F_{count} = 0.964$ was smaller than $F_{table} = 4,30$, so H_0 was accepted, means that there was no significant difference between students learning result and recast as corrective feedback.

From homogeneity of variances result test, P-value = 0, 286. The result of P-value was bigger than $\alpha = 0.05$, H_0 was accepted, it means students learning result taught by used recast as corrective feedback was Homogen.

c. *Hypothesis and Significant of Hypothesis test*

After defined the view variable, activated the view data and entered the *post-test* data then analyzed it, so the result of this test was described in appendix 11.

In the One Sample Statistics table showed that as many $N = 24$ students obtain the mean = 78.3333 and standard deviation = 19.541854.

In the One Sample Test table showed the statistical value, that was $t = 7,103$ (t value = 7,103); df (degree of freedom) = $n-1 = 24-1 = 23$; Sig (2-tailed) = 0,000.

That result was to proved the hypothesis made. To made a decision whether the proposed hypothesis was accepted or rejected, it was done in the following manner.

H_0 : Students' learning outcomes after recast as corrective feedback less than or equal to 50 of the average ideal value.

H_1 : Students' learning outcomes after the recast was applied as corrective feedback more than 50 from the average ideal value.

Rule of decision.

a) If $t_{count} \leq t_{table}$, H_0 accepted

b) If $t_{count} > t_{table}$, H_0 ignored

To test the hypothesis could be done in two ways: The first way related to t_{count} in the One Sample Test table by used t_{table} .

Based on SPSS analysis result, $t_{count} = 7,103$ with significant level $\alpha =$

0.05. Looked for t_{table} value used t Table for one-party test with formula $df = N - 1 = 24 - 1 = 23$ so $t_{table} = 1,714$. Because $t_{count} > t_{table}$, then H_0 was rejected, it means students learning outcomes after applied recast as corrective feedback more than 50 from the average ideal value.

The second way, related to the value of P-value or significance (Sig.2 Sided) with $\alpha = 0.05$ on the One Sample Test table. The rules of decision were:

- a) If $\alpha = 0.05$ was smaller or equal to Sig value. (2 tailed), so H_0 was received
- b) If $\alpha = 0.05$ is greater than the Sig value. (2 tailed), so H_0 was rejected

Based on the SPSS analysis, Sig. (2-tailed) = 0,000, because it only tested one side, the Sig value was divided by 2, it was $0.000 / 2 = 0.0$ was smaller than $\alpha = 0.05$, so H_0 was rejected. It means that students' learning outcomes after the recast was applied as corrective feedback more than or equal to 50 of the average ideal value.

B. Discussion

From the statistic measurements above shows that H_0 (null hypothesis) **was rejected** and H_a (alternative hypothesis) **was accepted**. The value of T_{count} is high than of T_{table} (value of critic "t"). it can be concluded:

1. There was a significant difference in students' achievement by using recast as corrective feedback in Simple Present Tense teaching the Eighth grader of MTs. Al-Mawahib Banjarmasin.
2. There was effective in using using recast as corrective feedback in Simple Present Tense teaching the Eighth grader of MTs. Al-Mawahib Banjarmasin.

Based on the result of the test there were different highest and lowest score of the test. The highest test score of students when used recast was 100 and the highest score of the students when did not use recast was 100. While the lowest score of the students when used recast was 70 and the lowest score of the students when did not use recast was 45. It could be concluded that recast helps students in improving their English achievement especially in grammar (Simple Present Tense). In addition Nicholas (2001), recasts can be effective if the learner has already begun to use a particular linguistic feature and is in a position to choose between linguistic alternatives.

The writer also found a difference mean score between the students when used and did not use recast. The mean score of the students is 91,6667 it means the Simple Present Tense of students when used recast was in excellent category. In other hand, the mean score of students when did not used recast was 78,3333 it means the Simple Present Tense achievement of students when used recast is in good category. Then, it is related with the collecting numerical

data that are analyzed using mathematically. The researcher found the result of the test from the subject or T_{count} is high than T_{table} . In conclusion, there was significant different in Simple Present Tense between students who used and did not use recast as corrective feedback.

Based on English teacher at MTs. Al-Mawahib Banjarmasin, the teacher said in teaching and learning by recast as corrective feedback could help the teacher to correct the students error in learning Simple Present Tense form. The correction that the writer means in this study is “Recast” as one of corrective feedback. Recast is one of feedback technique that teacher scare use, especially in Indonesia which is use English as a foreign language. Mackey (2006) said that it is the corrective strategy through the language learners errors when their English skill have to done a reformulation.

It is also supported by the argumentation by Dirman (2014), one process that can be integrated in exercises to make learning more communicative is with feedback. The strategies involved in using language in this way are very important in communication. The process of obtaining feedback can be applied by encouraging students to be good and honest listeners, Dirman (2014).

In the case of interviews, writer did so informally. That was, the writer took sidelines of the empty time and asked a few things about strategies that have been used for students when the research took place. It aim to knew

honestly about it. And after the interview, below were the answer from the teacher:

a. Recast promoted language acquisition.

According to her, looked from some results of training and test results, recast promoted language acquisition, although not most of the students still had many mistakes. But consciously they understood their mistakes.

b. Recast keeps the students' mental and motivation.

According to her, mental was not seem to affect, because they were still showed their original mental in learning but about motivation, they looked motivated especially with the new material were fun and reunited with writer.

Generally, the two points above suggested to teacher expected that recast strategy will be reused in the process of introduced learning materials to assisted them especially in corrective feedback.

Based result research by Ali and Anita (2016) indicated that in doing so, it aims to help teachers to better understand the effectiveness of full recast and partial recast in different grammatical structures. Other research by Abdollahzadeh (2011), the effect of recast in task-based grammar instruction. He said that error correction, especially in grammar

instruction, is an area which has been constantly under investigation due to its prominence and occurrence in EFL contexts.