

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

A. Findings

In this data presentation, the writer presented and described the result of the field-research which has been done in the twelfth grade students of IPS at MA. An-Najah Islamic Boarding School Martapura academic year 2017/2018. The data were collected from the result of Pre-Test and Post-Test from both Experimental and Control class.

In the previous chapter, to collect the data from the research the writer used a test which was given to the samples of the research. The test was an oral test, the students were asked to work in group and performed the dialogue in front of the class.

Both Experimental and Control class were taught with the same material but different technique in teaching speaking. The Experimental class was taught using STAD (Student Team Achievement Division) and for the Control class, traditional approaches as the technique which was used by the teacher in teaching English was taught as usual, this technique emphasizes on teacher rather than group working. In Experimental class, before beginning the lesson, the teacher divided the students in a small group consist of 4 or 5 students. Students discussed the material from the teacher and solved the problem in their group, this activity emphasizes on group working so that

they had more opportunity to communicate and practice the language with their friends.

Before applying the instrument in both Experimental and Control class, the writer analyzed the instrument whether it is valid and reliable or not. The writer used SPSS statistic 22 program to analyze the validity and reliability of the instrument.

Table 4.1 Analysis of Validity Instrument from XII IPA

Case Processing Summary

	N	%
Valid	25	100
Total	25	100

Correlations by Pearson

Item	r_{tabel}		Decision
	r_{hitung}	($\alpha = 0.05; n = 25$)	
X1	0.718	0.413	Valid
X2	0.844	0.413	Valid
X3	0.769	0.413	Valid
X4	0.792	0.413	Valid

X5	0.826	0.413	Valid
Jumlah	1	0.413	Valid

The writer used SPSS statistic 22 program to test the validity of the instrument. Based on table 4.1, those 5 items; 0.718, 0.844, 0.769, 0.792, 0.826. To test whether those instruments are valid or not, the writer compared both value of (r_{hitung}) and (r_{tabel}). If (r_{hitung}) is higher than (r_{tabel}) those item of instruments are valid. Based on *Case Processing Summary* the number of sample validity instrument was 25 students. Comparing to (r_{tabel}), 25 students with significance 5% is (0.413). The conclusion, 5 item of the instruments were valid because those items higher than (r_{tabel}). ($0.718 > 0.413$), ($0.844 > 0.413$), ($0.769 > 0.413$), ($0.792 > 0.413$), ($0.826 > 0.413$).

Table 4.2 Analysis of Reliability Instrument from XII IPA

Reliability Statistic

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.803	6

The writer used SPSS statistic 22 program to test the reliability of the instrument. From the table 4.2, the data showed that Cronbach's Alpha

was 0.803, it means that the instruments of the research were very high reliability.

Table 4.3 Test of Normality from Experimental and

Control class (Pre-Test)

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

	Pre-Test	Experimental	Control
N		26	26
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.049 ^c	.054 ^c

Based on table 4.3, the writer compared the normality test of pre-test from both Experimental and Control class which calculated from SPSS statistic 22 program. The writer used *One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test*, the result showed that *P-value* from both Experimental and Control class were 0.049 and 0.054. If the significance level ($p \text{ value} > 0.05$) then the data is normally distributed.

The *P-value* of Experimental class was 0.049 with significance 0.05, it means that the result of pre-test of Experimental class was higher than the significance ($0.049 > 0.05$). The *P-value* of Control class was 0.054 with significance 0.05, it means that the result of pre-test of Control class was higher than the significance 0.05 ($0.054 > 0.05$). From the calculated data

above, it showed that the result of pre-test from both Experimental and Control class were normally distributed.

Table 4.4 Test of Normality from Experimental and

Control class (Post-Test)

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

Post-Test	Experimental	Control
N	26	26
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.070 ^c	.114 ^c

Based on table 4.4, the writer compared the normality test of post-test from both Experimental and Control class which calculated from SPSS statistic 22 program. The writer used *One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test*, the result showed that *P-value* from both Experimental and Control class were 0.70 and 0.114. If the significance level ($p \text{ value} > 0.05$) then the data is normally distributed.

The *P-value* of Experimental class was 0.70 with significance 0.05, it means that the result of post-test of Experimental class was higher than the significance 0.05 ($0.70 > 0.05$). The *P-value* of Control class was 0.114 with significance 0.05, it means that the result of post-test of Control class was higher than the significance 0.05 ($0.114 > 0.05$). From the calculated data above, it showed that the result of post-test from both Experimental and Control class were normally distributed.

Table 4.5 Test of Homogeneity from Experimental and Control class (Pre-Test)

	Sig.
Pre-Test	.885

Based on table 4.5, the result of homogeneity test of Pre-Test which calculated from SPSS 22 program from both Experimental and Control class were 0.885 with significance 0.05. It means the result of homogeneity test from both Experimental and Control class were higher than the significance ($0.885 > 0.05$) then the data were homogeneous.

Table 4.6 Test of Homogeneity from Experimental and Control class (Post-Test)

	Sig.
Post-Test	.727

Based on table 4.6, the result of homogeneity test of Post-Test which calculated from SPSS 22 program from both Experimental and Control class were 0.727 with significance 0.05. It means the result of homogeneity test from both Experimental and Control class were higher than the significance ($0.727 > 0.05$) then the data were homogeneous.

Table 4.7 Students' Score for Experimental class**(Pre-Test and Post-Test)****Experimental Class**

	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Mean	59.69	72.15
Median	60	72
Mode	56	72
Minimum	48	64
Maximum	72	88
SUM	1552	1876

Pre-Test Frequency of Experimental Class

Score	Frequency
48	1
52	2
56	8
60	6
64	6
68	2

72	1
Total	26

Post-Test Frequency of Experimental Class

Score	Frequency
64	4
68	6
72	7
76	6
80	1
84	1
88	1
Total	26

Based on table 4.7, the result of Pre-Test and Post-Test from Experimental class were difference. The mean score of Post-Test (72.15) it was higher than the mean score of Pre-Test (59.69). Thus, mode of Post-Test was (72) it was higher than mode of Pre-Test was (56). The median from both Pre-Test and Post-Test were difference; Post-Test was (72), Pre-Test was (60). From the table above, the sum of Pre-Test was (1552) with the

minimum score was (48) and the frequency was (1), then the maximum score was (72) and the frequency was (1). Further, the sum of Post-Test was (1876) with the minimum score was (64) and the frequency was (4), then the maximum score was (88) and the frequency was (1).

**Table 4.8 Students' Score for Control Class
(Pre-Test and Post-Test)**

Control Class		
	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Mean	59.53	66.92
Median	60	68
Mode	56	72
Minimum	48	56
Maximum	72	80
SUM	1548	1740

Pre-Test Frequency of Control Class

Score	Frequency
48	1
52	2
56	8

60	6
64	7
68	1
72	1
Total	26

Post-Test Frequency of Control Class

Score	Frequency
56	1
60	5
64	6
68	5
72	7
76	1
80	1
Total	26

Based on table 4.8, the result of Pre-Test and Post-Test from Control class were difference. The mean score of Post-Test was (66.92) it was

higher than the mean score of Pre-Test was (59.53). Thus, mode of Post-Test was (72) it was higher than mode of Pre-Test was (56). The median from both Pre-Test and Post-Test were difference; Post-Test was (68), Pre-Test was (60). From the table above, the sum of Pre-Test was (1548) with the minimum score was (48) and the frequency was (1), then the maximum score was (72) and the frequency was (1). Further, the sum of Post-Test was (1740) with the minimum score was (56) and the frequency was (1), then the maximum score was (80) and the frequency was (1).

Table 4.9 Students' Score for Experimental and Control Class (Post-Test)

	Post-Test	
	Experimental	Control
Mean	72.15	66.92
Median	72	68
Mode	72	72
Minimum	64	56
Maximum	88	80
SUM	1876	1740

Based on table 4.9, the result of Post-Test from both Experimental and Control class were difference. The mean score of Experimental class was (72.15) it was higher than the mean score of Control class was (66.92). Thus,

mode of Post-Test from both Experimental and Control class were same (72). The median from both Experimental and Control class were difference; Experimental was (72), Control was (68). From the table above, the sum of Experimental class was (1876) with the minimum score was (64) and the frequency was (4), then the maximum score was (88) and the frequency was (1). Further, the sum of Control class was (1740) with the minimum score was (56) and the frequency was (1), then the maximum score was (80) and the frequency was (1).

Table 4.10 Hypothesis Testing Independent Sample T Test

Group Statistic			
Class	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Experimental	26	72.1538	6.03783
Control	26	66.9231	5.83042

Based on table group statistic 4.10, the data showed that the sample for each class from both Experimental and Control class was 26 students. The result of mean score from both classes were 72.15 and 66.92, while the (standard deviation) were 6.03 and 5.83.

The data above, showed that both classes from Experimental and Control class were normally distributed and homogeneous. Due to the data were normally distributed and homogeneous, then Independent Sample T

Test can be applied by the writer to test the equality variances from both Experimental and Control class, with hypothesis:

Ho : There is no difference variances from both Experimental and Control class

Ha : There is difference variances from both Experimental and Control class

The decisions were:

If $\alpha = 0.05 > Sig.$ (2 tailed), Ho accepted and Ha rejected.

If $\alpha = 0.05 < Sig.$ (2 tailed), Ho rejected and Ha accepted.

Table 4.11 Independent Sample T Test

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances

	Sig.	Df	Sig. (2 tailed)
Equal variances assumed	.727	50	.003
Equal variances not assumed		49.939	.003

Based on table 4.11, the data showed that $P\text{-value} = 0.727$, due to $P\text{-value}$ ($0.727 > 0.05$), it can be concluded that Ho accepted and Ha rejected.

It means that there is no difference variance from both Experimental and Control class, in other words the data were homogenous. Thus, the writer used (*equal variances assumed*).

The data above, showed that there is no difference variances from both Experimental and Control class. The writer also used Independent Sample T Test to test the significance of differences two mean from two distributions, to answer the hypothesis of the research:

Ho : $\mu_1 = \mu_2$: There is no significant result of students' speaking skill who taught by implementing Student Team Achievement Division (STAD) .

Ha : $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$: There is significant result of students' speaking skill who taught by implementing Student Team Achievement Division (STAD).

From the result of Independent Sample T-Test above, the data showed that *P-value* = 0. 003, because *P-value* (0. 003 < 0.05), then Ho rejected and Ha accepted. It means that there is significant result of students' speaking skill who taught by implementing Student Team Achievement Division (STAD) on students' speaking skill.

B. Discussion

After all obtained data were presented, they were also needed to be analyzed. To analyze the data, the writer divided the description based on the problem statements which were stated on the chapter 1.

The result of the research presented that the lowest score of pre-test for Experimental class which was taught by implementing Student Team Achievement Division (STAD) was (64) and the highest one was (88). The mean score of pre-test for Experimental class was (59.69) and the mean score of post-test was (72.15). The result showed that the achievement score in

students' speaking for Experimental class which was taught by implementing Student Team Achievement Division (STAD) technique seems improved. The mean score before treatment was (59) than became (72) after treatment. It means that students' achievement in speaking who taught by implementing Student Team Achievement Division (STAD) technique improved 13 points.

Based on the result, it can be concluded that students' speaking skill who taught by implementing Student Team Achievement Division (STAD) technique improved due to its socially oriented lessons taught and learned through small group interaction, so that the students were able to communicate and practice the language more with their group members. According to Slavin (2005, p.17) "Students work together in achieving its objectives by upholding the norms of the group, actively assist and motivate students to succeed shared passion, active role as a peer tutor to further enhance the success of the group, interaction among students with increasing their ability to argue".

The result of the research presented that the lowest score of pre-test for Control class who taught by traditional method as the technique in their usual teaching English was (56) and the highest one was (80). The mean score of pre-test for Control class was (59.53) and the mean score of post-test was (66.92). The result showed that the achievement score in students' speaking for Control class which was taught by traditional method as the technique in their usual teaching English seems increased. The mean score for pre-test was (59) and for post-test became (67). It means that students'

achievement in speaking who taught by traditional method as the technique in their usual teaching English improved 8 points.

Based on the result, it can be concluded that students' speaking skill who taught by traditional method as the technique in their usual teaching English improved 7 points. It was smaller than students in Experimental class which was taught by implementing Student Team Achievement Division (STAD) technique. There was reason which caused the achievement's score in Control class was not improved significant from pre-test to post-test, because of lack of interaction among students in the classroom while teaching and learning process. This activity caused the students did not have more opportunity to practice the language with their friends, in other words the teacher should apply the appropriate technique during teaching process to improve students' skill.

From both Experimental and Control class results, the writer concluded that there is significant result of students' speaking skill who taught by implementing Student Team Achievement Division (STAD) technique. The data showed that the mean score of post-test from Experimental class was (72.15), and the mean score of post-test from Control class was (66.92). It means that the mean score of post-test from Experimental class was higher 5 points than the mean score of post-test from Control class. Both classes showed the significance difference students' score in speaking, the Experimental class was more effective than the Control class

because the Experimental class was treated by implementing Student Team Achievement Technique (STAD) in teaching English.

Student Team Achievement Division (STAD) technique emphasizes on group working rather than compete individually, students have more opportunity to communicate and practice the language with their group members in the classroom, this technique also helps them to share the knowledge and solve the problem together.