

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the data findings of the research, covering description of data, hypothesis testing, and discussion

A. Findings

1. The effectiveness of using videotape in reducing English speaking anxiety of the first semester students at the Language Development Center (PPB) of UIN Antasari Banjarmasin.

As mentioned previously, the researcher wanted to know whether there was different score between the students before and after taught by using videotape technique and first semester students anxiety level. In this research, the researcher did a pre-experimental research about the effect of implementing videotape on students' speaking ability and first semester students anxiety level at PPB English class fourteenth group in UIN Antasari academic year 2017/2018. The researcher involved a class consisted 26 students. The data were collected through administering test and questioner. In the beginning the researcher give questioner for the students and then give first test that was pre-test done before the treatment applied to the students. The purpose was to know the students' reading achievment before being the treatment. The result of pre-test showed that their speaking ability was good and enough.

After administering the pre-test, the researcher gave treatment to the students by using videotape technique. During the treatment, the students enjoyed

learning and they were enthusiastic in Videotape technique. When treatment was finished, the researcher administered posttest to know the students' speaking ability after being taught by using Videotape technique. Apparently, the result of the post-test showed that the students' speaking ability improved.

a. Students' speaking ability before being Taught by Videotape technique (pretest)

The numbers of students who took the Pre-test were 26 students. The highest score in pre-test was 84 and the lowest score was 75. This test was intended to know the students' speaking achievement before students got treatment. The student's speaking achievement in pretest was presented in table 4.1:

Table 4.1 The Students' Achievement before using videotape technique (Pre-Test)

Student (N)	Score of Pretest
AR	75
ANE	80
DDFH	80
FS	80
F	77
HN	84
HU	79
H	79
IZ	80
JR	83
MH	80
MJ	79
MAA	83
MFS	79
MH	80
NR	79
NR	79
N	80
NH	79
NA	80

QN	80
R	81
RN	80
RDC	83
SM	81
ZSW	79

The data of students' pre-test, then were arranged in the form of frequency and percentages through score's criteria, as they were presented in the following table:

Table 4.2 The Percentages of Students' speaking ability before being Taught using Videotape Technique

Grade	Criteria of Score	Frequency (f)	Percentage (p)
A	90-100	-	-
B	80-89	16	61.54%
C	70-79	10	38.46%
D	60-69	-	-
		$\sum f = 26$	$\sum p = 100\%$

Based on the table of percentage and criteria above, the students' scores in the pretest were presented as follows:

Table 4.3 The Score's Criteria of the Students before being Taught using Videotape Technique

NO	Score's Criteria	Grade	Criteria
1	90-100	A	Perfect
2	80-89	B	Good
3	70-79	C	Enough
4	60-69	D	Bad

From the criteria in table 4.3, it can be concluded that the students' achievement before taught using Videotape Technique above 61.54% of students got score range from 80-89 with grade B where 38.46% of the students got score

range from to 70-79 with grade C .From the table above, more than half of students still got score enough criteria.

**b. Students' ability after being Taught by Using Videotape Technique
(post test)**

After being given a treatment using Videotape technique, the students were given a post test. The test was same from the pretest, both of them had the same level of difficulties. The numbers of students who took the Post-test were 26 students. The highest score in post-test was 90 and the lowest score was 77. This test was intended to know the students' speaking achievement after students got treatment. The students' speaking ability in post-test was presented in Table 4.4:

Table 4.4 The Students' Achievement after using Videotape technique (Post-Test)

Student (N)	Score of Postest
AR	77
ANE	90
DDFH	83
FS	84
F	80
HN	89
HU	81
H	80
IZ	82
JR	84
MH	83
MJ	85
MAA	85
MFS	81
MH	85
NR	81
NR	85
N	83
NH	82
NA	83

QN	80
R	83
RN	83
RDC	85
SM	87
ZSW	81

The data of students' post-test, then were arranged in the form of frequency and percentages through score's criteria, as it was presented in the following table:

Table 4.5 The percentages of students' speaking ability after using Videotape technique

Grade	Criteria of Score	Frequency (f)	Percentage (p)
A	90-100	1	3.85%
B	80-89	24	92.31%
C	70-79	1	3.85%
D	60-69	-	-
		$\Sigma f = 26$	$\Sigma p = 100\%$

Based on table 4.5, the students' scores in the pretest were presented as follows:

Table 4.6 The Score's Criteria of the Students after being Taught using Videotape Technique

NO	Score's Criteria	Grade	Criteria
1	90-100	A	Perfect
2	80-89	B	Good
3	70-79	C	Enough
4	60-69	D	Bad

From the criteria on table 4.6, it can be concluded that the students who achieved above the average was 3.85% categorized as perfect score where the

student got score range 90-100 with grade A. Meanwhile, there were 92.31% with good criteria where the students got score range from 80-89 with grade B and there was 3.85% categorized where the student got score 71-80 with grade C. From the table above, the majority of the students got score in good criteria.

c. The Result of Pre-test and Post-test of One Group Experimental

Table 4.7 The Result of Pre-test and Post-test of One Group Experimental by Gained Score Using Videotape Technique

No	Student (N)	Score of Pretest	Score of Posttest	Gained Score
1	AR	75	77	2
2	ANE	80	90	10
3	DDFH	80	83	3
4	FS	80	84	4
5	F	77	80	3
6	HN	84	89	5
7	HU	79	81	2
8	H	79	80	1
9	IZ	80	82	2
10	JR	83	84	1
11	MH	80	83	3
12	MJ	79	85	6
13	MAA	83	85	2
14	MFS	79	81	3
15	MH	80	85	5
16	NR	79	81	3
17	NR	79	85	6
18	N	80	83	3
19	NH	79	82	3
20	NA	80	83	3
21	QN	80	80	0
22	R	81	83	2
23	RN	80	83	3
24	RDC	83	85	2
25	SM	81	87	6
26	ZSW	79	81	2
Total		2079	2162	85

1. Determine mean of pre-test of experimental class

$$\begin{aligned} M_{x_1} &= \frac{\Sigma x}{N} \\ &= \frac{2079}{26} \\ &= 79.97 \end{aligned}$$

2. Determine mean of post-test of experimental class

$$\begin{aligned} M_{y_1} &= \frac{\Sigma y}{N} \\ &= \frac{2162}{26} \\ &= 83.15 \end{aligned}$$

3. Determining mean of difference of pretest and posttest

$$\begin{aligned} M_{D1} &= \frac{\Sigma D}{N} \\ &= \frac{85}{26} \\ &= 3.26 \end{aligned}$$

According to the result of pre-test and post-test from the experimental class, it shows that the lowest score of pre-test was 85 and the highest score was 84. Besides, the lowest score of post-test was 77 and the highest score was 90. The mean of pre-test was 79.97 and post-test 83.15. after conducting pre-test and post-test, the mean of gained score that the teacher got was 3.26. the mean of post-test after the students got treatment using Videotape technique was higher than the mean of pre-test before the students got treatment.

Analysis of Data

1) Normality Test

According to Sugiono (2006, p.77), normality test is a test is used to test whether normal or not the distribution of data. The writer used SPSS version 22 program to test the normality of the data. The normality test in this research used the *Shapiro-Wilk* formula, based on the degree of significance 0.05 the data is considered normally distributed if the significance >0.05 . if the significance <0.05 , the data is not normally distributed.

Table 4.8. Normality of pretest and posttest of experimental class

Tests of Normality

	Group	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.
Score	Posttest	.143	26	.185	.935	26	.102
	Pretest	.260	26	.000	.846	26	.001

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Based on table 4.8, it can be seen that the significance from normality test (pre-test) of Shapiro-Wilk shows 0.001. Therefore, the significance score is lower than 0.05 ($0.001 < 0.05$). it means that H_0 is rejected so the data is not normally distributed. And also it can be seen that the significance from normality test (post-test) of Shapiro-Wilk shows 0.102. therefore, the significance score is higher than 0.05 ($0.102 > 0.05$). in other words, H_0 is accepted so the data is normally distributed.

2) Homogeneity Test

Based on the calculation of normality, the writer got the result that all data in pre-test has been not normally distributed and post-test of experiment class has been normality distributed. The next step of the calculation was finding the homogeneity of the data. The purpose of this calculation was to see whether the data/sample in class homogenous or heterogeneous.

Table 4.9 Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Score

Levene			
Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
3.945	1	50	.053

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the result of homogeneity test Levene statistic score shows 3.945 with the significant 0.053. Therefore, the significant score is higher than 0.05 ($0.053 > 0.05$). it means that the sample was-homogeneous.

3) Hypothesis Testing Using Paired Sample U-Test

If the data there are not normality distributed so can not use T-Test. So this study use of U-Test.

Table 4.10 . Table U Test

Test Statistics^a

	Score
Mann-Whitney U	101.500
Wilcoxon W	452.500
Z	-4.388
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.000

a. Grouping Variable: group

In order to test the hypothesis, this research used *Paired Sample U Test*. *Paired Sample U Test* can be used to test whether there is a progress made by students if we compare the means of the scores before and after a teaching learning process. In this research, *Paired Sample U Test* calculated the means of pre-test and post-test score and then the writer had the output of significance value (P value), if the significance value < 0.05 , it is concluded that hypothesis is accepted, but if the significance value > 0.05 it is concluded that hypothesis is rejected.

Based on table above, get Sig. value is 0.000, because the sig. value $< 0,05$ so H_0 is rejected so There is significance difference in students' speaking ability before and after using videtape technique of the first semester students at

the language Development center (PPB) of UIN Antasari Banjarmasin and Ha is accepted.

2. English speaking anxiety level of first semester students at Language Development Center (PPB) of UIN Antasari Banjarmasin

4.11 table result of FLCAS questioner

Student (N)	Score of questioner	Level of anxiety
AR	96	Mildly Anxious
ANE	92	Mildly Anxious
DDFH	71	Relaxed
FS	86	Relaxed
F	106	Mildly Anxious
HN	84	Relaxed
HU	87	Mildly Anxious
H	101	Mildly Anxious
IZ	84	Relaxed
JR	70	Relaxed
MH	90	Mildly Anxious
MJ	83	Relaxed
MAA	103	Mildly Anxious
MFS	105	Mildly Anxious
MH	101	Mildly Anxious
NR	115	Anxious
NR	97	Mildly Anxious
N	94	Mildly Anxious
NH	81	Relaxed
NA	84	Relaxed
QN	112	Anxious
R	88	Mildly Anxious
RN	94	Mildly Anxious
RDC	89	Mildly Anxious

SM	58	Very relaxed
ZSW	99	Mildly Anxious

From the criteria in table 4.10, it can be concluded that first semester students anxiety level are 1 student in Very relaxed level, 8 students in relaxed level, 15 students in mildly anxious level, 2 students in anxious level.

The data of the first semester students anxiety level, then were arranged in the form of frequency and percentages through level's criteria, as it was presented in the following table:

Table 4.21. Table FLCAS Anxiety scale percentege

Range	Level	Frequency(f)	Percentage(p)
124-265	Very Anxious	-	
107-123	Anxious	2	7.69%
86-106	Mildly Anxious	15	57.69%
65-85	Relaxed	8	30.76%
33-64	Very Relaxed	1	3.85%
Total		$\sum f=26$	$\sum p=100\%$

From the range on table 4.6, it can be concluded that the students who got category anxious level was 7.69%, students in mildly anxious was 57.69%, students in relaxed was 30.79%, student in very relaxed was 3.84%. From the table above, the majority of the students in mildly anxious level.

B. Discussion

1. The effectiveness of using videotape in reducing English speaking anxiety of first semester students at Language Development Center (PPB) of UIN Antasari Banjarmasin

As it was previously stated that the U-test is used to check the significant different in scores achieved by one group. The data analysis shows that sig. Value = $0.000 < 0.05$. It means that the alternative hypothesis (H_a) is accepted and null hypothesis (H_o) is rejected. It shows that there is significance difference in students' speaking ability before and after using videotape technique of the first semester students at the language Development center (PPB) of UIN Antasari Banjarmasin. It can concluded that videotape technique is reducing English speaking anxiety of the first semester students at Language Development Center of UIN Antasari Banjarmasin.

Based on the research method, the study is done into three steps. First step is preliminary' study where the writer wants to know the students' speaking ability by administering a pretest. The second step is giving a treatment to the students. The treatment here is giving the Videotape Technique. After getting treatment, the last step the researcher giving a posttest to the students.

The writer believed that using Videotape technique may improve students' speaking ability and reducing students' English speaking anxiety. It can be seen from the quantitative data result above. The students mean score before using Videotape technique increase than students mean score after using

Videotape technique. This technique had improved students' speaking ability and it helped them in reducing anxiety.

Ayogu (2000) stated that when videotape is used to compliment instruction, it can:

- a. reduce abstractions in class lesson;
- b. reduce boredom among students and teacher;
- c. conserve the teacher's energy;
- d. allow moral learning autonomy among students;
- e. restructure the learning environment;
- f. make learning interesting and motivating to students;
- g. minimize the problems of large class size;
- h. promotes students' participation in Oral English lessons;
- i. reduce problem of in sufficiency learning resources, and materials.
- j. encourage individualized learning

From the explanation above, the using Videotape technique in improving speaking ability and reducing students' English speaking anxiety, it was seen by students' speaking ability. By videotape technique they can speak with more preparation and more relax because it can do in out of classroom. Consequently, they can improve their speaking ability through the using Videotape technique. Various forms of technology have also made recording and analyzing large corpora of spoken English more easily accomplished. Celce-murcia (2001 p 13).

2. English speaking anxiety level of first semester students at Language Development Center (PPB) of UIN Antasari Banjarmasin.

According to the calculating above using Microsoft excel 2010, New students first semester speaking anxiety level at language Development center (PPB) of UIN Antasari is mostly in mildly anxious level, 15 students with percentage 57.69% , 1 student in Very relaxed level with percentage was 3.84% , 8 students in relaxed level with percentage was 30.79%, 2 students in anxious level with percentage was 7.69%,

The reasons for the results can be explored in two factors; internal factor and external factors. The internal factor is closely related with the students themselves: they probably did not feel very anxious in English as a foreign language classroom because they felt that they were in the same level both in English level and age. Wachidah (2004) suggested that studying with peers would not make students feel ashamed and clumsy to speak English because they only faced their friends. So it influenced their self confidence positively. The more confident a learner feels, the less anxiety he experiences in learning (Meng & Wang, 2006).