CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the researcher presents data description, hypothesis testing, and discussion of research finding.

A. Data Description

The purpose of data description is to show the result of research. The subject of the research was the tenth graders of SMK Negeri 1 Boyolangu Tulungagung on academic year 2018/2019 which X-Bisnis dan Pemasaran 2 class as experimental group and X Akuntansi dan Keuangan 3 class as control group. In this sub-chapter the researcher present the score of pre-test and post-test both from experiment group and control group.

In this research, the researcher was conducted around five meetings. The first meeting was used to conduct pre-test to know students' speaking ability before receiving treatment. The researcher taught the students of experimental group in small group interaction and the control group without small group interaction in second until fourth meeting. The school curriculum was K13, so the researcher used scientific approach as learning method to teach both class. The difference was in the used of Small Group Interaction. The researcher taught different topic for each meeting and asked students to speak in whole lesson for the second until fourth meeting. Then, the researcher conduct post-test to know students' speaking ability after receiving treatment from the researcher on the fifth meeting. The final result of students speaking

performance of pre-test and post-test were analyzed by using scoring rubric of speaking.

a. The data from students' speaking scores of experimental group (X Bisnis dan Pemasaran 2) can be seen in this following table:

Students' Score of Pre-Test and Post-Test of Experimental Group

No.	Name	Score	
		Pre-test	Post-test
1.	D.M.K	9	14
2.	D.N	11	15
3.	D.R.N	10	15
4.	E.P.R	10	16
5.	E.K.I	9	13
6.	E.K.R	10	16
7.	E.V.R	9	14
8.	E.N.I.S	10	17
9.	E.U.F	6	8
10.	E.A.S	6	10
11.	E.D.L	10	15
12.	E.F.M	9	13
13.	E.T.R	10	13
14.	F.D.R	9	12
15.	F.N	8	13
16.	F.L	8	12
17.	F.D.M	10	10
18.	F.H.P	7	12
19.	F.A.N	8	11
20.	G.L.S	7	12
21.	H.H.C.N	9	12
22.	H.N.L.R	10	15

23.	H.P.R	7	11
24.	H.D.R	9	12
25.	I.N,A	10	15
26.	I.F	9	15
27.	I.Z.R	10	12
28.	J.C.P	10	15
29.	J.P.A	8	13
30.	K.A	8	10
31.	K.Y	9	12
32.	K.F.S	9	12
33.	L.A	10	11

b. The data from students' speaking scores of control group (X Akuntansi dan Keuangan 3) can be seen in this following table:

Students' Score of Pre-Test and Post-Test of Control Group

No.	Name	Score	
		Pre-test	**Post-test**
1.	H.N	9	13
2.	I.I	9	9
3.	I.R.A	10	10
4.	I.S	9	12
5.	I.I	9	9
6.	I.Y	10	10
7.	I.D.R.K	10	12
8.	K.A	7	7
9.	K.S.A	8	8
10.	K.P.P	10	10
11.	K.K	10	10
12.	K.S.R	9	9

13.	L.N	8	9
14.	L.A	10	10
15.	L.M	10	10
16.	L.K.W	9	10
17.	L.T	7	7
18.	L.A.Q	7	8
19.	M.R.M	8	10
20.	M.E	8	8
21.	M	10	10
22.	N.P.A	7	7
23.	N.D.Z.F	7	10
24.	N.A.F	10	10
25.	N.O.A	10	10
26.	N.M	8	8
27.	N.R.N	8	8
28.	N.P.W	7	7
29.	N.B	8	8
30.	N.W	9	10
31.	N.A.P	7	7
32.	N.R.W	7	9
33.	N.D.A	8	8
34.	O.A.H.P	8	8
35.	O.F.N	7	8
36.	P.A.O	9	9

1. Result of Pre-test

The Pre-test was done by giving students instruction to introduce themselves in front of the class one by one. In this Pre-test, there were 33 students of experimental group and 36 students of control group. After the

scores are collected, researcher calculated the data using SPSS 21.0 program which the result as bellow:

Table 4.1 Descriptive Statistic Pre-test of Experimental Group

		Pre-test
N	Valid	33
	Missing	0
Mean		8.91
Std. Error of Mean		.219
Median		9.00
Mode		10
Std. Deviation		1.259
Variance		1.585
Range		5
Minimum		6
Maximum		11
Sum		294

The table 4.3 above shows that the mean of students' speaking score of experimental group of Pre-test was 8.91. It means that the average score of 33 students of experimental group was 8.91. Based on the table above, the lowest score was 6 and the higher score was 11. Then, median score was 9.00 and the mode score was 10.

Table 4.2 Frequency Pre-test of Experimental Group

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	6	2	6.1	6.1	6.1
	7	3	9.1	9.1	15.2
	8	5	15.2	15.2	30.3
Valid	9	10	30.3	30.3	60.6
	10	12	36.4	36.4	97.0
	11	1	3.0	3.0	100.0
	Total	33	100.0	100.0	

Based on the table 4.3, the median score was 9.00 which if seen on the table above 10 students got score 9.00, 10 students got score less than 9.00, and 13 students got score more than 9.00. Then, based on table 4.3, the mode score was 10, it means that the most frequent score was 10. Therefore, based on table 4.4, many students got score 10.

Table 4.3 Descriptive Statistic Pre-test of Control Group

		Pre-test
N	Valid	36
	Missing	0
Mean		8.53
Std. Error of Mean		.193
Median		8.50
Mode		10
Std. Deviation		1.158
Variance		1.342
Range		3
Minimum		7
Maximum		10
Sum		307

The table 4.5 above shows that the mean of students' speaking score of control group of Pre-test was 8.53. It means that the average score of 36 students of control group was 8.53. Based on the table above, the lowest score was 7 and the higher score was 10. Then, median score was 8.50 and the mode score was 10.

Table 4.4 Frequency Pre-test of Control Group

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	7	9	25.0	25.0	25.0
	8	9	25.0	25.0	50.0
Valid	9	8	22.2	22.2	72.2
	10	10	27.8	27.8	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Based on the table 4.5, the median score was 8.53 which if seen on the table above 9 students got score 8.53, 9 students got score less than 8.53, and 18 students got score more than 8.53. Then, based on table 4.5, the mode score was 10, it means that the most frequent score was 10. Therefore, based on table 4.6, many students got score 10.

It can conclude that the mean of students' speaking score of pre-test from experimental and control group were different based on table 4.3 and 4.4 above. The mean of experimental group was higher than control group. If we take summarize from both group's mean there were 8. It was still far from the maximum score from five criteria of speaking that was 25. Based on the result,

some students can introduce themselves one by one, but there are some aspect that still less such as still difficult to use accurate grammar, their speech is slow, hesitant & strained except for short memorized phrases, they have very limited vocabulary also their pronunciation sometimes make listener cannot understand.

1. **Result of Post-Test**

The Post-test was done by giving students instruction to describe particular situation or picture in front of the class. In this Post-test, there were 33 students of experimental group and 36 students of control group. After the scores are collected, researcher calculated the data using SPSS 21.0 program which the result as bellow:

Table 4.5 Descriptive Statistic Post-test of Experimental Group

	Post-test
N Valid	33
Missing	0
Mean	12.91
Std. Error of Mean	.360
Median	13.00
Mode	12
Std. Deviation	2.067
Variance	4.273
Range	9
Minimum	8
Maximum	17
Sum	426

The table 4.7 above shows that the mean of students' speaking score of experimental group of Post-test was 12.91. It means that the average score of 33 students of experimental group was 12.91. Based on the table above, the lowest score was 8 and the higher score was 17. Then, median score was 13.00 and the mode score was 12.

Table 4.6 Frequency Post-test of Experimental Group

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	8	1	3.0	3.0	3.0
	10	3	9.1	9.1	12.1
	11	3	9.1	9.1	21.2
	12	9	27.3	27.3	48.5
Valid	13	5	15.2	15.2	63.6
	14	2	6.1	6.1	69.7
	15	7	21.2	21.2	90.9
	16	2	6.1	6.1	97.0
	17	1	3.0	3.0	100.0
	Total	33	100.0	100.0	

Based on the table 4.7, the median score was 13.00 which if seen on the table above 5 students got score 13.00, 16 students got score less than 13.00, and 12 students got score more than 13.00. Then, based on table 4.7, the mode score was 12, it means that the most frequent score was 12. Therefore, based on table 4.8, many students got score 12.

Table 4.7 Descriptive Statistic Post-test of Control Group

		Post-test
N	Valid	36
	Missing	0
Mean		9.11
Std. Error of Mean		.245
Median		9.00
Mode		10
Std. Deviation		1.469
Variance		2.159
Range		6
Minimum		7
Maximum		13
Sum		328

The table 4.9 above shows that the mean of students' speaking score of control group of Post-test was 9.11. It means that the average score of 36 students of control group was 9.11. Based on the table above, the lowest score was 7 and the higher score was 13. Then, median score was 9.00 and the mode score was 10.

Table 4.8 Frequency Post-test of Control Group

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	7	5	13.9	13.9	13.9
	8	9	25.0	25.0	38.9
	9	6	16.7	16.7	55.6
Valid	10	13	36.1	36.1	91.7
	12	2	5.6	5.6	97.2
	13	1	2.8	2.8	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Based on the table 4.9, the median score was 9.00 which if seen on the table above 6 students got score 9.00, 14 students got score less than 9.00, and 16 students got score more than 9.00. Then, based on table 4.9, the mode score was 10, it means that the most frequent score was 10. Therefore, based on table 4.10, many students got score 10.

From the result of calculation of post-test between experimental group and control group, it can conclude that there was improvement scores in both of groups. Though, the improvement score in experimental group was higher than in control group.

Table 4.9 Descriptive Group Statistic

	Class	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Result	Experient Class	33	12.91	2.067	.360
	Control Class	36	9.11	1.469	.245

Based on table 4.11 above shows that mean in post-test of experimental group was higher than mean of control group. It means that the use small group interaction can improve student's speaking ability. Though the conclusion was only a descriptive conclusion**.**

B. Hypothesis Testing

- If the score has significance difference of students speaking ability with using small group interaction, so H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted.

- If the score has no significance difference of students speaking ability without using small group interaction, so H_1 is rejected and H_0 is accepted.

Therefore, to investigate whether small group interaction was effective or not to teach speaking at tenth grades, the researcher tested the result of Post-test by using Independent Samples T-Test using SPSS 21.0 program.

Table 4.10 Independent Sample 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	3.948	.051	8.854	67	.000	3.798	.429	2.942	4.654	
Equal variances not assumed			8.726	57.273	.000	3.798	.435	2.926	4.669	

Referring to table 4.12, it shows that in Levene's Equality of Variance, it seen that F=3.948 (p value=0.051) because of p higher than 0.05, it indicated that there is no difference in variance data or it can said that the data was equal/homogenous. If the data was homogeneous, check on the result of equal variance assumed. Based on the table above that DF (Degree of Freedom) was 67. Therefore, the way to test whether the alternative Hypothesis (Ha) can be accepted was by comparing the p-value with the standard level of significance that was 0.05. The convention to accept the alternative Hypothesis (Ha) was if the p-value was less than 0.05 (<0.05). As shows by table 4.12 above, the p-value was less than 0.05. (0.000<0.05).

Thus, there was enough evidence indicating that alternative Hypothesis (Ha) was accepted and the null Hypothesis (H_0) was rejected. The interpretation can be concluded with saying "There is any significant difference between students' speaking ability before and after being taught by using small group interaction". According to that evidence, it can answer the research problem or question that small group interaction effective to teach and to improve students' speaking skill at tenth grade of SMK Negeri 1 Boyolangu, Tulungagung.

C. Discussion

After all explanation above the researcher present the discussion of data analysis. Based on the explanation and the calculation above, small group interaction gave positive effect to student's speaking ability. It was prove by the gained significance value of T-Test which less than 0.05 (0.000<0.05) that means the alternative Hypothesis (Ha) is accepted and the null Hypothesis (Ho) is rejected. We can say that small group interaction is effective to teach speaking and also to improve students' speaking skill.

Furthermore, from the students' score in Pre-test and Post-test that there was improvement of mean from Pre-test 8.91 to Post-test 12.91. Based on that data, it showed that the students get good improvement in their speaking achievement after receiving some treatment from the researcher by using small group interaction. Although, in Pre-test the students make many mistake especially in the use of fluency, pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar and

details. Almost all the students have difficulties to use accurate grammar, their speech is slow, hesitant & strained except for short memorized phrases, their pronunciation sometimes make listener cannot understand also they have very limited vocabulary.

Afterward, the students received treatments using small group interaction, the result showed that small group interaction can improve students' speaking skill and give good impact on students' speaking ability especially in vocabulary, fluency, and pronunciation aspects. Also, there were the significant different of Post-test score between class which was taught using small group interaction and the one which was taught without using small group interaction.

According to Stewart (2004: 8) using small group interaction can developing students' self-awareness, managing personal stress, solving problem analytically and creatively, motivating others, building effective teams and team works . As the result of this research students more expressive and confident in speaking after they practice with their friends or group because they get motivation to improve their speaking skill. Based on the explanation above, it can be said that small group interaction give a significant effect to tenth grade students speaking ability at SMK Negeri 1 Boyolangu, Tulungagung where the value of Post-test is higher than Pre-test after the researcher give students some treatment.

In addition, this research is also in line with the previous study that found small group interaction is effective to teach speaking. As explanation from previous study by Naqsabandi (2015), there is any significant difference between students' speaking ability before they are taught by using small group interaction in descriptive text and after taught by using small group interaction in descriptive text. In that research he gave prove that the obtained score of t-test. The tcount showed that tcount is higher than ttable (tcount 8.198 > ttable 2.05). It means that H1 (alternative hypotheses) was accepted and H0 (null hypotheses) was rejected. Since tcount was higher than ttable, there was a significance difference between students' speaking ability before they were taught by using small group interaction in descriptive text and after they are taught by using small group interaction in descriptive text. He conduct the research using one group pre-test, treatment, post-test. Based on the data above, he gave result that the mean of post-test was higher than the mean of pre-test (M2 = 18.357 > M1 = 14.285). He concluded that the use of small group interaction in teaching speaking was quite success/effective to improve students' speaking ability after they were taught by using small group interaction was better than students' speaking ability before they were taught using small group interaction. He conclude that small group interaction in teaching speaking has a significant effect in the students speaking skill on even semester of the first grade of SMPN 3 Kedungwaru, Tulungagung.

In this research, the researcher formulated some reasons why small group interaction effective to improve speaking skill:

a. Small group interaction can built students confidence to speak English after they learn with their friends.

b. Small group also provides a social framework like sharing experience and makes enjoyment in playing and learning together.

According to explanation above, the researcher implied that and as a teacher we should use appropriate method in teaching learning process which would help the students improve their speaking ability.