## CHAPTER IV

## FINDING AND DISCUSSION

This chapter describes about research findings and discussion that include data of research findings, hypothesis testing and discussion.

## A. Research Findings

To know students' speaking achievement before and after using Talk Show Technique, the researcher conducted pre-test and post-test as previously mentioned.

The result of students' speaking achievement after doing all of the steps in process speaking in pre-test and post-test then were analyzed by using speaking scoring rubric and got the data to analyze.

## 1. The Description of Data

In this section, the researcher presented the data on the students' speaking ability between students that taught speaking without applying talk show technique and students that taught by applying talk show technique in speaking. The subjects of the research consist of two classes. There are 7B as control group and 7C as experiment group. The purpose of the researcher is to know the effectiveness of applying talk show technique toward speaking ability for first grade of MTsN 1 Blitar. The data were collected from students pre-test and post-test of both classes. The data were described into two tables. The table 4.1 showed the students' score and achievement in control class and the table 4.4 showed the students' score and achievement in experiment class. Each table has three columns; the first
column showed the number of students, the second showed the name of students, the third column showed pre-test and the fourth showed post-test scores.

### 1.1 The Data of Control Class

Table 4.1 The Students' Scores of Control Class

| NO. | NAMA (x) | PRETEST | POSTTEST | NO. | NAMA (x) | PRETEST | POSTTEST |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | ABH | 69 | 75 | $\mathbf{2 1}$ | MRF | 63 | 88 |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | AS | 75 | 75 | $\mathbf{2 2}$ | MSA | 69 | 75 |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | ANA | 63 | 75 | $\mathbf{2 3}$ | MZA | 75 | 69 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | ARW | 75 | 75 | $\mathbf{2 4}$ | MLDF | 75 | 63 |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | BSMI | 75 | 81 | $\mathbf{2 5}$ | MRSW | 69 | 63 |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | BFI | 63 | 69 | $\mathbf{2 6}$ | MUA | 75 | 75 |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | CBMD | 69 | 81 | $\mathbf{2 7}$ | MRHA | 75 | 81 |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | DIP | 63 | 81 | $\mathbf{2 8}$ | MAP | 63 | 69 |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | FRWW | 69 | 75 | $\mathbf{2 9}$ | MPS | 56 | 69 |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | HFI | 63 | 75 | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | MA | 69 | 88 |
| $\mathbf{1 1}$ | IMPS | 69 | 75 | $\mathbf{3 1}$ | MF | 75 | 81 |
| $\mathbf{1 2}$ | MNF | 69 | 81 | $\mathbf{3 2}$ | MNAR | 63 | 69 |
| $\mathbf{1 3}$ | MS | 63 | 75 | $\mathbf{3 3}$ | MU | 75 | 81 |
| $\mathbf{1 4}$ | MSY | 75 | 69 | $\mathbf{3 4}$ | MZF | 69 | 69 |
| $\mathbf{1 5}$ | MZRA | 69 | 81 | $\mathbf{3 5}$ | MZM | 75 | 81 |
| $\mathbf{1 6}$ | MDI | 75 | 81 | $\mathbf{3 6}$ | NFR | 69 | 69 |
| $\mathbf{1 7}$ | MFA | 56 | 69 | $\mathbf{3 7}$ | NRP | 69 | 63 |
| $\mathbf{1 8}$ | MHA | 69 | 69 | $\mathbf{3 8}$ | REP | 63 | 75 |
| $\mathbf{1 9}$ | MNS | 63 | 75 | $\mathbf{3 9}$ | VLS | 63 | 75 |
| $\mathbf{2 0}$ | MIAP | 56 | 75 |  |  | $\Sigma X=2650$ | $\mathbf{~} \mathbf{Y}=2913$ |

According to the result of pre-test and post-test, it shows that the lowest score in pre-test was 56 and the highest score was 75 . Beside, the lowest score of post-test was 63 , the highest score was 81 .
a) Pretest of Control Class

Table 4.2 Descriptive Statistic Pretest

Statistics
pretest

| N | Valid | 39 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
|  | Missing | 0 |
| Mean |  | 67.95 |
| Median | 68.75 |  |
| Mode | 69 |  |
| Std. Deviation | 5.943 |  |
| Minimum | 56 |  |
| Maximum | 75 |  |
| Sum | 2650 |  |

Based on the table 4.2 above, shows Mean of pre-test score 67.95. It means the mean score is low.
b) Posttest of Control Class
table 4.3 Descriptive Statistic Posttest

Statistics
posttest

| N | Valid | 39 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
|  | Missing | 0 |
| Mean | 74.68 |  |
| Median | 75.00 |  |
| Mode | 75 |  |
| Std. Deviation | 6.404 |  |
| Minimum | 63 |  |
| Maximum | 88 |  |
| Sum | 2913 |  |

Based on the table 4.3 above, shows that Mean of postest score 74.68. Then, it can be concluded the gain of mean score between pretest and posttest was 6.73 .

### 1.2 The Data of Experimental Class

Table 4.4 The Students' Scores of Experimental Class


According to the result of pre-test and post-test from the experiment class, it showed that the lowest score of pre-test was 56 and the highest score was 75 . And after the writer gave the treatment by applying talk show technique in speaking, the writer gave the students posttest. The data showed in the post test the lowest score was 69 and the highest score was 94.
a) Pretest of Experimental Class

Table 4.5 Descriptive Statistics Pretest
Statistics
pretest

| N | Valid | 40 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
|  | Missing | 0 |
| Mean | 67.81 |  |
| Median | 68.75 |  |
| Mode | 69 |  |
| Std. Deviation | 5.929 |  |
| Minimum | 56 |  |
| Maximum | 75 |  |
| Sum | 2713 |  |

Based on the table 4.5 above, shows Mean of pre-test score 67.81 .
b) Posttest of Experimental Class

Table 4.6 Descriptive Statistics Posttest

Statistics
posttest

| N | Valid | 40 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
|  | Missing | 0 |
| Mean | 82.34 |  |
| Median | 81.25 |  |
| Mode | 81 |  |
| Std. Deviation | 6.771 |  |
| Minimum | 69 |  |
| Maximum | 94 |  |
| Sum | 3294 |  |

Based on the table 4.6 above, shows Mean of post-test score 82.34. Then, it can be concluded the gain of mean score between pretest and posttest was 14.53 .

## B. Hypothesis Testing

The hypothesis testing of this study as follows:

1. The Null Hypothesis (Ho)

There is no significant difference on the students' ability in speaking taught by applying and without being applying talk show technique.
2. The Alternative Hypothesis (Ha)

There is significant difference on the students' ability in speaking taught by applying and without being applying talk show technique.

To know whether there are any significant different students speaking ability between the students who are taught and the students who are no taught by applying talk show technique, the calculating result should show whether Ho is rejected meanwhile Ha is accepted. To analyzed data the researcher use SPSS 20 version, the result can be seen on table as below:

Table 4.7 Group Statistic

## Group Statistics

|  |  |  | Std. Error <br> Mean |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Score | control_class | 39 | 74.68 | 6.404 | 1.025 |
|  | experimental_class | 40 | 82.34 | 6.771 | 1.071 |

Table 4.7 shows there were two classes; it was control class and experiment class. First control class, shows N cell there are 39, Mean of score control class (74.68), Standard Deviation for control class (6.404), and standard error mean for control class (1.025). Meanwhile, in the experiment class, shows
cell there are 40, Mean of score experiment class (82.34), Standard Deviation for experiment class (6.771), and Standard Error Mean for experiment (1.071).

In addition, the result of t-test testing with the helped of SPSS program 20 version can be seen on table 4.8 as below:

Table 4.8 Independent Sample Mean

|  |  | Lexene's <br> Test for Equality of Variances |  | t-test for Equality of Means |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. <br> (2- <br> tailed) | Mean <br> Differe nce | Std. <br> Error <br> Differen ce | 95\% Confidence Interval of the Difference |  |
|  |  | Lower |  |  |  |  |  |  | Upper |
|  | Equal variance s assumed |  | . 258 | . 613 | $-5.166$ | $77$ | . 000 | -7.664 | 1.484 | -10.618 | -4.710 |
|  | Equal <br> variance <br> s not <br> assumed |  |  | $-5.170$ | $76.931$ | $.000$ | $-7.664$ | 1.483 | -10.616 | $-4.712$ |

Based on the table 4.8, the result of t -test on above it can be concluded, that P value (sig) is 0.000 , and it is lower than $0.05(0.000<0.05)$. It was found that there is significant difference of students' score between those who are taught by applying talk show technique and those who are not. It means that speaking using talk show technique is effective.

## C. Discussion

From the research finding above, the data were analyzed with the helped of SPSS program 20 version. The student who are taught by using talk show technique make significant improvement, as seen from the mean score of pretest was (67.81) and the mean score of posttest was (82.34). The students who are taught without by using talk show technique did not make
significant improvement, as seen from the mean score of pretest was (67.95) and the mean score of posttest was (74.64). The gain of the mean score of control class between pretest and posttest was 6.73. Meanwhile, gain of the mean score of experiment class between pretest and posttest was 14.53 . Even though, the pretest score experiment class was better than pretest score of control class, but the gain of score experiment class is high. It means that talk show technique is effective for speaking in Junior High School.

Based on the research at MTsN 1 Blitar, it can be inferenced that speaking by using talk show technique is better than without by using talk show technique. Furthermore, the students who learned speaking through talk show technique and those who are not, having such a significant difference that the students' speaking scores who were taught by using talk show technique are higher than those who were not. It can also be concluded that using talk show technique can attract students speaking ability in language learning. Livingstone and Lunt (1994) states that talk show is a program which serves entertainment through talk. Because talk show is fun it can make students more confident and fluent to speak with others. Besides, Oxford Dictionary (2018) define talk show as a chat show, especially one in which listeners, viewers, or the studio audience are invited to participate in the discussion. Based on that statement, all the learners have chance to speak because talk show doing by group and every member of group must speak. While talk show doing most of them were being spontaneous by giving small comments and clapped hands in each show.

This is also aligned with Nimehchisalem" (2013) statement that every student also may add spontaneous gestures, small jokes, and words in their performances. Most students also show enthusiasm in learning English by using Talk Show technique. This is in line with Klippel"s (1985) theory that talk show technique is guided by the intention to achieve effective language learning situations. This technique can be the alternative to solve the learners' problems, first problem is inhibition by using this technique learners speak by grouping and hole activities are doing with their friends it can increase their confidence to more active in speaking. Second problem is lack of topical knowledge by this technique learners speak related their knowledge so learners can speak without worried that they can't speak. Third problem is low participations by this technique all learners have a chance to speak. The forth problem is using mother tongue by this technique all learners speak English in the class. So, it can be concluded that speaking by applying talk show technique can increase students' ability and score.

Briefly, the speaking ability in the experiment class has proven that talk show is effective toward students' ability in speaking. The findings of the research confirm the findings of preceding studies. The previous study written by Palupi (2015), which found out that talk show technique is suitable technique that can encourage students' speaking ability and it can increase the students' confidence to speak in front of the class. Another studies was conducted by Mustain (2016), which found out that talk show technique given contributes a lot to the students and it could be implemented
in the classroom because the students that given talk show perform better than those with without using talk show. Based on the finding and the previous studies, talk show technique that can be applied in teaching and learning English. The students can easily to speak and more enthusiast in the class. So, practice speaking by applying talk show technique can make students more enthusiast to speak and improve speaking score.

