CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the result of the research findings and discussions that include data of research findings, hypothesis testing and discussion.

A. The Description of Data

In this study, the researcher presented the data of students' score in speaking skill between who taught by using Information-gap activity and students' who taught without any strategy. Here, the researcher wanted to know the effectiveness of speaking skill on Information-gap activity of eighth graders at MTs Aswaja Tunggangri in academic year 2017/2018. The effectiveness can be seen from the significant different score of students' speaking skill before and after being taught by using speaking test.

The researcher conducted pre-test, giving treatments by using speaking skill test and post-test. Before and after doing treatment, researcher has done the pre-test and the post-test. Pre-test and post-test were done to obtain students' pronunciation achievement score. The subject of the research consists of two classes. The data was described into two tables. The table showed students' score and achievement in control class and the table showed the students' score and achievement in experimental class. The data of this research were the pre-test scores and post-test scores of control group and experimental group. The scores were presented as follows:

1. The Data of Control Class

After conducting pre-test and post-test for control class, the researcher obtained the score from control class . The data were as follows:

Table 4.1

The Students' Speaking Score of Control Class

No	Name	Class	Pre Test	Post Test	Gain
1	AQH	VIII B	48	52	4
2	EW	VIII B	48	60	12
3	EPC	VIII B	56	64	8
4	FP	VIII B	60	72	12
5	FND	VIII B	44	56	12
6	ILA	VIII B	48	64	16
7	MNA	VIII B	72	80	8
8	MAFH	VIII B	60	80	20
9	MRW	VIII B	60	76	16
10	NAS	VIII B	44	68	24
11	NM	VIII B	64	76	12
12	RPS	VIII B	72	80	8
13	RK	VIII B	48	68	20
14	SMS	VIII B	56	76	20
15	SET	VIII B	64	80	16
16	SPS	VIII B	60	76	16
17	WJM	VIII B	52	72	20
18	WFH	VIII B	60	76	16
19	YDA	VIII B	44	68	24
20	YI	VIII B	56	76	20
21	YW	VIII B	52	72	20
22	FKR	VIII B	56	76	20
23	NAS	VIII B	48	76	28
24	APDU	VIII B	56	80	24

Based on the table 4.1, there were 24 students' as sample of the research. So, there were only 24 students' of control class as the sample in this study. The descriptive statistic of control class was as follow:

a. Pre-test and Post-test of Control Class

The researcher used SPSS 23.0 version to know the descriptive statistic and the percentage of students' pre-test in control class.

Table 4.2

Pre-test and Post-test Score in Control Class

		Pre_con	Post_con
N	Valid	24	24
	Missing	0	0
Mean		55.33	71.83
Std. Error of Mean		1.645	1.606
Median		56.00	76.00
Mode		48[a]	76
Std. Deviation		8.058	7.867
Variance		64.928	61.884
Range		28	28
Minimum		44	52
Maximum		72	80
Sum		1328	1724

Based on the table 4.2 above, it showed that the pre-test of control class minimum score was 44, the maximum score was 72, and the mean score 55.33. While the post-test of control class, the minimum score was 52, the maximum score was 80, and the mean score was 71.83. Then, it was also presented using distribution frequency in the following table:

Table 4.3

Frequency of Pre-test and Post-test in Control Class

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	44	3	12.5	12.5	12.5
	48	5	20.8	20.8	33.3
	52	2	8.3	8.3	41.7
	56	5	20.8	20.8	62.5
	60	5	20.8	20.8	83.3
	64	2	8.3	8.3	91.7
	72	2	8.3	8.3	100.0
	Total	24	100.0	100.0	

The table 4.3 above showed that pre-test score minimum was 44 and score maximum was 72. Score 44 had 3 frequency (12.5%), score 48 had 5 frequency (20.8%), score 52 had 2 frequency (8.3%), score 56 had 5 frequency (20.8%), score 60 had 5 frequency (20.8%), score 64 had 2 frequency (8.3%), and score 72 had 2 frequency (8.3%).

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	52	1	4.2	4.2	4.2
	56	1	4.2	4.2	8.3
	60	1	4.2	4.2	12.5
	64	2	8.3	8.3	20.8
	68	3	12.5	12.5	33.3
	72	3	12.5	12.5	45.8
	76	8	33.3	33.3	79.2
	80	5	20.8	20.8	100.0
	Total	24	100.0	100.0	

The while the post-test showed that score minimum was 52 and score maximum was 80. Score 52 had 1 frequency (4.2%), score 56 had 1 frequency (4.2%), score 60 had 1 frequency (4.2%), score 64 had 2 frequency (8.3%), score 68 had 3 frequency (12.5%), score 72 had 3 frequency (12.5%), score 76 had 8 frequency (33.3%), and score 80 had 5 frequency (20.8%).

The categorization of the students' pre-test and post-test score as follow:

Table 4.4
Categorization of Students' Score in Control Class

Pre-test Score

Range of Score	Frequency	Grade	Percentage
81 – 100	0	A	0%
61 – 80	9	B	37.5%
41 – 60	15	C	62.5%
0 – 40	0	D	0%

Post-test Score

Range of Score	Frequency	Grade	Percentage
81 – 100	0	A	0%
61 – 80	21	B	87.5%
41 – 60	3	C	12.5%
0 – 40	0	D	0%

Based on the table 4.4 above, it can be seen that in pre-test, there were 15 students (62.5%) got score 41 – 60 in grade C. then, there were 9 students (37.5%) got score 61 -80 in grade B. Meanwhile, there was no student (0%) got in score 0 – 40 in grade D and the score 81 – 100 in grade A.

Besides in post-test, there were 3 students (12.5%) got score 41 –

60 in grade C. Then, there were 21 students (87.5%) got score 61 – 80 in

grade B. Meanwhile, there was no student (0%) got in score 0 – 40 in

grade D and the score 81 – 100 in grade A.

s

2. The Data of Experimental Class

After conducting pre-test and post-test for experimental class, the

researcher obtained the data. The data were as follows:

Table 4.5

The Students' Speaking Score of Experimental Class

No	Name	Class	Pre Test	Post Test	Gain
1	AF	VIII A	52	64	12
2	AYP	VIII A	52	72	20
3	ADP	VIII A	44	52	8
4	AB	VIII A	44	48	4
5	BDS	VIII A	56	68	12
6	ESA	VIII A	60	72	12
7	HER	VIII A	72	84	12
8	FRC	VIII A	88	96	8
9	INC	VIII A	72	88	16
10	KSP	VIII A	52	72	20
11	MFMM	VIII A	88	96	8
12	MRRR	VIII A	60	76	16
13	MFZA	VIII A	52	76	24
14	RADC	VIII A	64	80	16
15	SMB	VIII A	88	96	8
16	SA	VIII A	52	76	24
17	JZ	VIII A	60	76	16
18	SSP	VIII A	76	92	16
19	WNH	VIII A	72	88	16

Based on the table 4.5, there were 19 students as sample of the

research. So, there were only 19 students of experimental class as the

sample in this study. The descriptive statistic of experimental class was as

follow:

a. Pre-test and Post-test of Experimental Class

The researcher used SPSS 23.0 version to know the descriptive statistic and the percentage of students' pre-test in experimental class. The result of the of the calculation was as follows:

Table 4.6

Pre-test and Post-test Score in Experimental Class

		Pre_ex	Post_ex
N	Valid	19	19
	Missing	0	0
Mean		63.37	77.47
Std. Error of Mean		3.284	3.152
Median		60.00	76.00
Mode		52	76
Std. Deviation		14.315	13.741
Variance		204.912	188.819
Range		44	48
Minimum		44	48
Maximum		88	96
Sum		1204	1472

Based on the table 4.6 above, it showed that the pre-test of experimental class minimum score was 44, the maximum score was 88, and the mean score was 63.37. While the post-test of experimental class, the minimum score was 48, the maximum score was 96, and the mean score was 76.00. Then, it was also presented using distribution frequency in the following table:

Table 4.7

Frequency of Pre-test and Post-test in Experimental Class

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	44	2	10.5	10.5	10.5
	52	5	26.3	26.3	36.8
	56	1	5.3	5.3	42.1
	60	3	15.8	15.8	57.9
	64	1	5.3	5.3	63.2
	72	3	15.8	15.8	78.9
	76	1	5.3	5.3	84.2
	88	3	15.8	15.8	100.0
	Total	19	100.0	100.0	

The table 4.7 above showed that pre-test score minimum was 44 and score maximum was 88. Score 44 had 2 frequency (10.5%), score 52 had 5 frequency (26.3%), score 56 had 1 frequency (5.3%), score 60 had 3 frequency (15.8%), score 64 had 1 frequency (5.3%), score 72 had 3 frequency (15.8.3%), score 76 had 1 frequency (5.3%).

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	48	1	5.3	5.3	5.3
	52	1	5.3	5.3	10.5
	64	1	5.3	5.3	15.8
	68	1	5.3	5.3	21.1
	72	3	15.8	15.8	36.8
	76	4	21.1	21.1	57.9
	80	1	5.3	5.3	63.2
	84	1	5.3	5.3	68.4
	88	2	10.5	10.5	78.9
	92	1	5.3	5.3	84.2
	96	3	15.8	15.8	100.0
	Total	19	100.0	100.0	

The while the post-test show that score minimum was 48 and score maximum was 96. Score 48 had 1 frequency (5.3%), score 52 had 1 frequency (5.3%), score 64 had 1 frequency (5.3%), score 68 had 1 frequency (5.3%), score 72 had 3 frequency (15.8%), score 76 had 4 frequency (21.1%), score 80 had 1 frequency (5.3%), score 84 had 1 frequency (5.3%), score 88 had 2 frequency (10.5%), score 92 had 1 frequency (5.3%), and score 96 had 3 frequency (15.8%).

The categorization of the students' pre-test and post-test score were as follows:

Table 4.8

Categorization of Students' Score in Experimental Class

Pre-test Score

Range of Score	Frequency	Grade	Percentage
81 – 100	3	A	15.8%
61 – 80	5	B	26.4%
41 – 60	11	C	57.8%
0 – 40	0	D	0%

Post-test Score

Range of Score	Frequency	Grade	Percentage
81 – 100	7	A	36.8%
61 – 80	10	B	52.7%
41 – 60	2	C	10.5%
0 – 40	0	D	0%

Based on the table 4.8 above, it can be seen that in pre-test, there were 11 students (57.8%) got score 41 – 60 in grade C. Then, there were 5 students (26.4%) got score 61 -80 in grade B. There were 3 students (15.8%) got score 81 – 100 in grade A. Meanwhile, there was no student

(0%) got in score $0 - 40$ in grade D. Besides in post-test, there were 2 students (10.5%) got score 41- 60 in grade C. Then, there were 10 students (52.7%) in grade B. There were 7 students (36.8%) got score $81 - 100$ in grade A. Meanwhile, there was no student (0%) got in score $0 - 40$ in grade D.

B. Hypothesis Testing

The interpretations to test the hypothesis are stated as follow:

1. H_o (Null Hypothesis) stated that there was no significant difference on students' speaking achievement between students who were taught and who were not taught by using Information-gap Activity of eight grade at MTs Aswaja Tunggangri.

2. H_a (Alternative Hypothesis) stated that there was any significant difference on students' speaking achievement between students who were taught and who were not taught by using Information-gap Activity of eight grade at MTs Aswaja Tunggangri.

This research used standard significance 95% ($\alpha = 0.05$) to test the hypothesis. The interpretations to test the hypothesis were stated as follow:

1. If sig (2-tailed) value less than 0.05, it means that null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected and alternative hypothesis (H_a) is accepted. So, there was no significant difference on students' speaking achievement between students who were taught and who were not taught by using Information-gap Activity at eight grade of MTs Aswaja Tunggangri.

2. If sig (2-tailed) value greater than 0.05, it means that null hypothesis (H$_0$) is accepted and alternative hypothesis (H$_a$) is rejected. So, there was any significant difference on students' speaking achievement between students who were taught and who were not taught by using Information-gap Activity at eight grade of MTs Aswaja Tunggangri.

The researcher needed to test the f-test in order to see variance that the both groups were equal. The hypothesis for the f-test can be seen below:

1. H$_0$: $\sigma^2_1 = \sigma^2_2$ or the hypothesis states that there is an equal between the variance of experimental and control class.

2. H$_0$: $\sigma^2_1 \neq \sigma^2_2$ or the alternative hypothesis states that there is not equal between the variance of experimental and control class.

This research used standard significance 95% ($\alpha = 0.05$) to test the hypothesis. The interpretations to test the hypothesis were stated as follow:

1. If sig greater than 0.05, then the null hypothesis is not rejected. Thus, *equal variance assumed* is used. It meant that variance of experimental and control class is equal.

2. If sig greater than 0.05, then the null hypothesis is rejected. Thus, *equal variance not assumed* is used. It meant that variance of experimental and control class is not equal.

To know the whether there was any significant difference on students' speaking achievement between students who were taught and who were not taught by using Information-gap Activity, the researcher computed Independent Sample Test by using SPSS 23.0 version. The outputs of group

statistics (table 4.9) and output of F-Test and T-Test (table 4.10) were as follows:

Table 4.9

Output of Group Statistics Test

	Class	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Score	Ex	19	77.47	13.741	3.152
	Con	24	71.83	7.867	1.606

Based on the table 4.9 above, the subjects in experimental class were 19 students and the subjects in control class were 24 students. The mean of experimental class was 77.47 and the mean of control class was 71.83. The standard deviation of experimental class was 13.741 and the standard deviation of control class was 7.867. Meanwhile, the standard error mean of experimental class was 3.152 and the standard error mean of control class was 1.606.

Table 4.10

Output of F-Test and T-Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	.575	.974	1.694	41	.000	5.640	3.330	-1.085	12.366
Equal variances not assumed			1.594	27.123	.000	5.640	3.538	-1.617	12.898

In addition, based on table 4.10 (independent samples test), the result of F-test shown that Sig was 0.974, and it was bigger than 0.05 (0.974 > 0.05). Consequently, the null hypothesis of F-test was not rejected. As such, *equal variances assume* was used. The result of T-test above shown that Df was 41 and sig was 0.000. It was lower than 0.05 (0.000 < 0.05). It could be concluded that the alternative hypothesis was accepted. So the hypothesis testing in this research is there was any significant difference on students' speaking achievement between students who were taught and who were not taught by using Information-gap Activity at eight grade of MTs Aswaja Tunggangri.

C. Discussion

In this research, a researcher conducted the research in two classes during the teaching learning process. The subjects of the research consisted of 43 students. The researcher decided class VIII A as the experimental class and class VIII B as the control class. VIII A was given by the treatment and VIII B was given without any treatment. In this research, the researcher administering two kinds of test, they are pre-test and post-test.

Based on the research finding, it showed that the mean scores between pretest and posttest of experimental class and control class was different. Students of control class didn't reveal significant improvement. It could be seen from the mean score of pretest was 55.83 and mean score of posttest 71.83. In the other hand, the students who were taught by using Information-gap Activity or in experimental class reveal significant improvement. It could be seen from the mean score of pretest was 63.37 and the mean score of posttest was 77.47. The students speaking achievement could be increase and the mean of the students posttest score in experimental score was bigger than the mean of students' score in control group (77.47 > 71.83). The result showed that the posttest of experimental class was better than posttest of control class.

The data of the statistical computation and the data were collected by using SPSS 23.0 version. It showed that the result of the students who were taught by using Information-gap Activity. The significant value was 0.000 which was lower than significant level 0.05 (0.000 < 0.05). Therefore, the null

hypothesis was rejected and the alternative hypothesis was accepted. So, there was significant difference on students' speaking achievement between students who were taught and who were not taught by using Information-gap Activity at eight grade of MTs Aswaja Tunggangri. It could be said that Information-gap Activity was affective to teaching speaking and suggested to be used in junior high school level.

The used of information-gap activity was really effective to teaching speaking. The students more felt interest, fun, and enjoyable to practicing it when the researcher taught them. The students can learn to trust, to communicate, to accept, and to support each other in their group. It was known from the increased mean score in experimental class. According to Harmer (2007:275), information-gap activities are those where students have different pieces of information about the same subject and have to share this information in order to for them both to get all the information they need to perform task. This activity brought positive effects on teaching speaking. Richards (2008:19) states that mastery of speaking skill in English is a priority for many second language or foreign language learners. So, the speaking is important skill to learn in mastery of English.

The finding of this study was also supported by the previous study that compared Information-gap Activity that gave contribution to teaching learning process. Hassan Soleimani from Department of Applied Linguistics, Payame Noor University, Iran has ever conducted a study with the title "The Effect of Pre-task Planning through Information Gap on Speaking Skill of Foreign

Language Learner", the conclusion state that the Information-gap was effective on learning speaking skill. It's line with research result that conducted by Maman Asrobi, Ketut Seken and Wayan Suarnajaya at Tenth Grade Students of MAN SELONG which they concluded that the use Information gap activity was able to improve the student's speaking skill. The students were more confident to speak in English. They could retell the story fluently and their vocabulary also increased. Furthermore, the students were actively engaged in the teaching learning process. They were enthusiastic in doing the activities and their motivation also improved. It's line with research result that conducted by Pariyaporn Setjun, Pimyupa Praphan and Intisarn Chaiyasuk from Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Mahasarakham University conducted a research under the title "Improving Sixth Grade Students' Speaking Skill through Information Gap with Different Task Types and Complexity". The researcher concluded that the speaking skill through Information-gap was effective to improve the students' speaking skills because information gap activity give opportunities for students to practice their speaking. The students can interact with their friends. Lastly, information gap may boost student's confidence and also motivation in their speaking.

Overall, the result above implied that the use of Information-gap Activity gave positive effect to the students' speaking skill in tell descriptive story. It has been verified by the result of data analysis that there was significant difference score of the eighth grade in MTs Aswaja Tunggangri. Thus the result, there was any significant difference on students' speaking

achievement between students who were taught and who were not taught by using Information-gap Activity at eight grade of MTs Aswaja Tunggangri.