

CHAPTER IV

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

This chapter includes the research findings and discussion, which encompass the validation of research instruments through the examination of their validity and reliability, an analysis of students' learning strategies and their impact on speaking fluency, the association between these two variables, and a dedicated section for further discussion. This chapter will provide the gathered data and thereafter perform calculations using the previously established procedure.

A. Finding

The study's findings encompassed the assessment of the research instruments' validity and reliability, an examination of students' learning strategies, the analysis of questionnaire data, the evaluation of students' speaking skill scores, and a correlation analysis between students' learning strategies and their speaking fluency. In order to get data from individuals, the researcher utilized questionnaires and tests as a means of addressing the study inquiries.

This study includes two variables: students' learning strategies (variable X) and students' speaking fluency (variable Y). The researcher administered questionnaires to ascertain the learning strategies employed by students. The researcher then issued speaking tests to assess students' speaking fluency.

1. Validity and Reliability Test Results

a. Validity

To assess its validity, the Product Moment Correlation method can be employed with the assistance of SPSS. The validity test results, based on instrument trials conducted with 72 respondents (r-table: 0,232) , are shown in the table below:

Table 4.1 Validity Test Result

Statement	r-count	Description
1	0,341	Valid
2	0,456	Valid
3	0,462	Valid
4	0,601	Valid
5	0,498	Valid
6	0,555	Valid
7	0,511	Valid
8	0,424	Valid
9	0,449	Valid
10	0,495	Valid
11	0,527	Valid
12	0,579	Valid
13	0,612	Valid
14	0,612	Valid
15	0,455	Valid
16	0,441	Valid
17	0,271	Valid
18	0,129	Invalid
19	0,430	Valid
20	0,416	Valid
21	0,566	Valid
22	0,457	Valid
23	0,577	Valid
24	0,544	Valid
25	0,471	Valid
26	0,461	Valid

27	0,332	Valid
28	0,416	Valid
29	0,199	Invalid
30	0,584	Valid
31	0,497	Valid
32	0,421	Valid
33	0,418	Valid
34	0,439	Valid

Based on the validity results presented in the table above, out of the 34 questions in the questionnaire, 32 questions are considered valid while 2 questions are considered invalid. Consequently, the study excluded or disregarded any queries that were deemed invalid.

b. Reliability

The reliability test results for each variable, based on the instrument trials conducted with 72 respondents, are shown in the following table:

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,883	34

The reliability test showed a Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of 0.883, indicating a substantial level of reliability. This value is within the range of 0.80 to 0.90, which is regarded significantly high. Therefore, it can be deduced that the questionnaire used in this study is dependable.

2. The Learning Strategies Used by the Students in Learning Speaking

This research was carried out at SMAN 3 Banjarmasin. Researcher collected data from a sample of 72 students from class X. Data was gathered by conducting student speaking skills tests and questionnaires. The questionnaire results indicated that the students employed the six language learning strategies at different proficiency levels.

Table 4.3 Categories of Learning Strategy Used by Students

No.	Learning Strategies	Mean
1.	Memory	2,53
2.	Cognitive	2.39
3.	Compensation	2.46
4.	Metacognitive	3.05
5.	Affective	2.02
6.	Social	2.59
Total Mean		2.51

The data results demonstrate that students used all six types of learning strategies. Students who use memory strategies usually learn by arranging vocabulary according to their categories, they also usually memorize words. Students who learn with cognitive strategies usually use their cognitive skills, such as reasoning, analyzing, often taking notes. Students who use compensation strategies in learning are students who usually use their own language when they want to say something. Students who learn to speak with metacognitive strategies are not much different from students who use cognitive strategies, except that in this strategy students learn to find the right learning style by finding out, identifying, and making plans. Students who learn with affective

strategies usually use their emotions when learning so that they learn to control feelings, emotions, motivation, and attitudes related to learning. Students who learn using social strategies are usually happy with activities carried out in groups, because this strategy emphasizes the effectiveness of student interaction.

There was no significant variation in the frequency of any strategy employed by students. In response to the first research question in Chapter I, students in class X at SMAN 3 Banjarmasin utilized all six categories of learning strategies: Memory, Cognitive, Compensatory, Metacognitive, Affective, and Social Strategies.

3. The Students' Speaking Skill Score

For the speaking test, students were instructed to conduct a paired conversation from the student work activity book. The topic presented was regarding vacation. Working with the subject's teacher, the researcher classified the grading requirements for students' speaking skills. The following table describes the outcomes of the students' speaking skills:

Table 4.4 Students Speaking Test Score

No.	Students	Class	Speaking Score	Fluency Score
1	Student1	A	87	3
2	Student2	A	95	5
3	Student3	A	95	5
4	Student4	A	95	4
5	Student5	A	95	4
6	Student6	A	93	4

7	Student7	A	87	4
8	Student8	A	90	4
9	Student9	A	95	4
10	Student10	A	93	4
11	Student11	A	95	4
12	Student12	A	87	3
13	Student13	B	87	4
14	Student14	B	90	4
15	Student15	B	93	4
16	Student16	B	90	4
17	Student17	B	83	3
18	Student18	B	90	4
19	Student19	B	93	5
20	Student20	B	93	5
21	Student21	B	85	3
22	Student22	B	85	3
23	Student23	B	83	2
24	Student24	B	87	4
25	Student25	C	87	3
26	Student26	C	87	3
27	Student27	C	90	3
28	Student28	C	93	4
29	Student29	C	90	3
30	Student30	C	90	3
31	Student31	C	83	2
32	Student32	C	87	3
33	Student33	C	93	4
34	Student34	C	90	3
35	Student35	C	93	4
36	Student36	C	83	2
37	Student37	D	95	5
38	Student38	D	95	5
39	Student39	D	93	4
40	Student40	D	90	4
41	Student41	D	90	4
42	Student42	D	90	4
43	Student43	D	90	4
44	Student44	D	93	4
45	Student45	D	93	4

46	Student46	D	87	4
47	Student47	D	90	4
48	Student48	D	93	4
49	Student49	E	95	5
50	Student50	E	95	5
51	Student51	E	90	4
52	Student52	E	85	2
53	Student53	E	85	3
54	Student54	E	90	4
55	Student55	E	95	4
56	Student56	E	95	4
57	Student57	E	90	4
58	Student58	E	90	4
59	Student59	E	90	4
60	Student60	E	90	4
61	Student61	F	93	4
62	Student62	F	93	4
63	Student63	F	83	3
64	Student64	F	83	3
65	Student65	F	87	4
66	Student66	F	90	4
67	Student67	F	90	4
68	Student68	F	87	4
69	Student69	F	83	3
70	Student70	F	87	3
71	Student71	F	87	3
72	Student72	F	87	3
Highest Score			95	5
Lowest Score			83	2
Average			89,875	3,7361

The table above shows the results of the students' speaking skill test scores. Looking at the results, the researcher determined the data's average value. The results showed that the average value of the students' final speaking test was 89.875 (rounded to 90). Furthermore, based on their fluency aspect scores, 8 students have the highest fluency score,

which is 5. This signifies that class X students at SMAN 3 Banjarmasin score very well in speaking English.

Table 4.5 Students Speaking Aspects Scores

ASPECT	HIGHEST SCORE	TOTAL SCORE	PERCENTAGE
Grammar	3	216	17,75%
Vocabulary	4	222	18,24%
Comprehension	4	230	18,9%
Fluency	5	269	22,1%
Pronunciation	5	280	23,01%

The speaking skill rubric includes five aspects: grammar, vocabulary, comprehension, fluency, and pronunciation. Each aspect has a maximum of 5 points and a minimum of 1. The table above shows that the greatest score for each aspect varies: grammar has a score of 3, vocabulary and comprehension have a score of 4, and fluency and pronunciation have a score of 5. The participants' total scores and percentage indicators were grammar 216 (17,75%), vocabulary 222 (18,24%), comprehension 230 (18,9%), fluency 269 (22,1%), and pronunciation 280 (23,01%).

4. The Correlation between Students' Learning Strategies and Their Speaking Fluency

The researcher analyzed the result of each variable, as suggested by prior data. The following are the findings of the correlation study that

investigated the relationship between speaking learning strategies and students' speaking fluency. The data were acquired using the Pearson Product Moment technique in SPSS.

Table 4.6 Result of Pearson Product Moment Correlation

		Learning Strategies	Speaking Fluency Score
Learning Strategies	Pearson Correlation	1	1,000**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		<,001
	N	73	73
Speaking Fluency Score	Pearson Correlation	1,000**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<,001	
	N	73	73

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The data calculated using SPSS indicates a significance level of 0.001 for the link between students' learning methodologies and their speaking fluency. The result is less than 0.05, showing a correlation between the two variables. The Pearson correlation coefficient for the given data is 1, which above the significant value of 0.232 (at a significance level of 5%) calculated using the formula $r\text{-count} > r\text{-table}$ for a sample size of 72. The evidence suggests a very high correlation between students' learning strategies and their speaking fluency.

5. Hypothesis Testing

The hypothesis used in this research is as follows:

Ha : Students' learning strategies correlate with their speaking fluency.

H0 : Students' learning strategies do not correlate with their speaking fluency.

The Pearson's Product Moment method was employed to assess the correlation. The table presents the findings, indicating that N.Sig is equal to 0.001 and r-count is equal to 1.

a. H_0 accepted if $N.Sig \geq 0.05$ ($\alpha=5\%$)

b. H_a rejected if $N.Sig \leq 0.05$ ($\alpha=5\%$)

According to the analytical findings, the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis (H_a) is accepted, with a significant value of 0.001, which is less than the predetermined threshold of 0.05.

The study showed a notable association between students' speaking fluency and their learning strategies. Therefore, students should possess an understanding of their learning strategies in order to enhance their English speaking skills.

B. Discussion

This section reviews the findings obtained from the data analysis. This analysis involves assessing students' learning strategies, their speaking fluency, and the correlation between their learning strategies and speaking fluency. The analysis is based on the data collected from the method of instruction questionnaire and the speaking test.

1. The Learning Strategies Used by the Students in Learning Speaking

Based on the research findings, it is evident that there is variation in the utilization of learning strategies among students. The questionnaire's calculation findings indicate that the average score for Memory Strategy

is 2.53, Cognitive Strategy is 2.39, Compensation Strategy is 2.46, Metacognitive Strategy is 3.05, Affective Strategy is 2.02, and Social Strategy is 2.59.

Metacognitive strategies encompass techniques such as focusing, organizing, self-evaluating, and error-checking in the study of languages. These strategies enable students to regulate their emotions and motivation in relation to language learning by actively monitoring their progress. These strategies facilitate students in structuring their learning by aiding them in recognizing, strategizing, self-evaluating, and overseeing their errors or the learning process. Metacognitive methods enable students to assess their performance in order to determine what aspects need improvement and how to enhance them.

The students' second most often utilized strategy was Social Strategies, with an average score of 2.59. Through the implementation of these strategies, students can develop language proficiency by actively interacting with individuals who are fluent in the desired language. This encompasses the act of posing inquiries, engaging in communication with colleagues, and cultivating a more profound comprehension of the culture. Students' strategies in oral communication indicate a strong preference for collaborative learning, either by obtaining knowledge from the teacher or interacting with their peers. These strategies encompass the act of asking other speakers to repeat themselves and speaking more slowly. The memory strategies were ranked third, with an

average score of 2.53. These strategies facilitate the storage and retrieval of new information for students by utilizing techniques such as classification, mental associations, visual and auditory assistance, reviewing, and adding physical actions.

Students sometimes employ Compensation Strategy and Cognitive Strategy as part of their learning strategy. The Compensational Strategy has a mean score of 2.46, but the Cognitive Strategy has an average of 2.39. Compensation strategies allow students to utilize new languages for comprehension or expression, despite their inadequate understanding. These strategies are employed to make up for a lack of grammatical knowledge and, perhaps, access to dictionaries. Students have the ability to comprehend and generate new language without being influenced by their inadequate knowledge or skills. Cognitive techniques facilitate students' comprehension and production of new language through activities such as critical thinking, deliberate practice, effective communication, analysis, and summarization.

The final strategy is an affective strategy. The mean use of this approach is the most minimal among the six categories of approaches examined in this research, specifically 2.02. This strategy assists students in managing their own emotions, motivations, and attitudes, including the reduction of anxiety, enhancement of self-esteem, and control of self-impulsion.

2. The Correlation between Students' Learning Strategies and Their Speaking Fluency

The data collected has produced definitive conclusions and responses for each hypothesis. The N.Sig value is statistically significant at a level of 5% ($0.001 < 0.05$), indicating that the null hypothesis (H0) is rejected in favor of the alternative hypothesis (H1). There is a significant correlation between the learning strategy used by the student and their ability to speak fluently. Student learning strategies are classified as high-level when the average score reaches 2.51. Students commonly utilize strategies for learning, and their speaking fluency can be categorized as exceptionally high, with an average score of 3.74 out of 5.

From the information provided, it can be concluded that acquiring effective learning strategies is essential for students to improve their speaking skills. This illustrates that the learning strategy has a substantial influence on improving the oral proficiency of underachieving students. Students who have various kinds of speech-learning strategies to improve their ability to speak are more likely to attain a high score in speech skills. On the other hand, students who have limited opportunities to enhance their speaking abilities are more prone to get low marks in their oral proficiency. Moreover, utilizing the suitable learning strategy is believed to improve their performance in acquiring speech and strengthen students' efforts to study language.

As has been written by previous researchers that if students use good strategies, it will affect the speaking fluency ability of each student. It is stated by several researchers that the more effective students use the right learning strategy, it will affect their abilities including in terms of language.

In accordance with the average results of previous studies that researchers write have a very strong correlation between one variable and another. Previous research from Abdullah said there was a significant correlation between learning strategies and speaking ability with higher learning strategies leading to better speaking ability. Learners who actively engage in strategies such as self-monitoring tend to show improvements in pronunciation accuracy and fluency. This correlation underlines the importance of using effective strategies to improve pronunciation. Other studies that have been done before also have the same results on average, which are significantly correlated because students use diverse and thorough learning strategies.