

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

This chapter the researcher presents the findings which have been collected during research, and discussion about the data of the research.

#### **A. The Description of Data**

The aim of the research was to obtain whether there was a significant effect of students' speaking ability taught by using elicitation technique at VIII class of MTsN pucanglaban. The data of this research were taken from the test.

The data were the students' scores of speaking ability improvement from pre-test to post-test scores of both experimental and control classes. Before giving posttest, the researcher gave pretest to all of the samples in both classes. The speaking result was evaluated by concerning four components: accuracy, fluency, comprehensibility, content. Each component had its scores. The effectiveness can be seen from the significant different score of students' speaking ability before and after being taught by using Elicitation Technique.

To know the students' mastery whether it was good or not, the researcher gave category as follows : (See table 4.1)

**Table 4.1 Rating Scale**

No.	Range of Score	Grade	Criteria
1.	81-90	A	Excellent
2.	71-80	B	Very Good
3.	61-70	C	Good
4.	51-60	D	Enough/Fair
5.	41-50	E	Poor

1. The data of experimental class

After conducting pre-test and post-test for experimental class, the researcher obtained the data. The data are as follows:

**Table 4.2 Students' speaking ability score before and after being taught using elicitation technique**

No	Name	Pre-test	Post-test
1	AIA	45	55
2	AR	55	60
3	AAA	45	60
4	AL	50	65
5	DP	55	70
6	EEW	60	65

7	ES	50	60
8	FN	55	70
9	VFA	55	60
10	FS	60	75
11	IE	65	75
12	MFM	45	60
13	MF	45	55
14	NDK	60	70
15	MAA	55	65
16	NL	50	60
17	NHS	45	55
18	NSR	60	80
19	PWP	55	65
20	RSR	50	65
21	RAN	45	60
22	SPR	60	70
23	SP	65	80
24	SY	55	65
25	SH	50	70

Based on the table 4.2, there were 25 students as sample of the research.. The descriptive statistic of experimental class is as follows:

a. Pre-test of Experimental Class

The researcher used SPSS 16.0 version to know the descriptive statistic and the frequency of students' pre-test in experimental class. The frequency divided into five criteria: excellent, verygood, good, enough/fair, poor, (see table 4.1). The result of the calculation is as follows :

**Table 4.3 Descriptive Statistic of Pre-test**

**Descriptive Statistics**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Pretest	25	45	65	1335	53,40	6,410
Valid N (listwise)	25					

Based on the table 4.3 above, it showed that the minimum score of pre-test was 45, the maximum score was 65, and the mean was 53.40

**Table 4.4 The Frequency of Students' Speaking Ability before Taught by Using Elicitation Technique**

**Pretest**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 45	6	24,0	24,0	24,0
50	5	20,0	20,0	44,0

55	7	28,0	28,0	72,0
60	5	20,0	20,0	92,0
65	2	8,0	8,0	100,0
Total	25	100,0	100,0	

From the table 4.4, The frequency of pretest score of experimental class after being distributed there are 11 students getting score between 41 – 50, which means that the students' speaking ability was poor, 12 students getting score between 51 – 60 which means that on the students' speaking ability is enough/fair, there are 2 students getting score between 61 – 70 which means that on students' speaking ability is good.

There were 6 students who got score 45 (24.0%), 5 students got score 50 (20.0%), 7 students got score 55 (28.0%), 5 students got score 60 (20.0%), 2 students got score 65 (8.0%), The highest frequency was in score 55 (7 students).

#### a. Post-test of Experimental Class

The researcher used SPSS 16.0 version to know the descriptive statistic and the frequency of students' pre-test in experimental class. The frequency divided into four criterions: excellent, good, enough/fair, poor, (see table 4.1). The result of the calculation is as follows :

**Table 4.5 Descriptive Statistic of Post-test****Descriptive Statistics**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Posttest	25	55	80	1635	65,40	7,205
Valid N (listwise)	25					

Based on the table 4.5 above, it showed that the minimum score of post-test was 55, the maximum score was 80, and the mean was 65.40.

**Table 4.6 The Frequency of Students' Speaking Ability after Taught by Using Elicitation Technique**

**Posttest**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 55	3	12,0	12,0	12,0
60	7	28,0	28,0	40,0
65	6	24,0	24,0	64,0
70	5	20,0	20,0	84,0
75	2	8,0	8,0	92,0
80	2	8,0	8,0	100,0
Total	25	100,0	100,0	

From the table 4.6, The frequency of posttest score of experimental class after being distributed there are 10 students getting score between 51 – 60, which means that the students' speaking ability

was enough/ fair, 11 students getting score between 61 – 70 which means that on the students' speaking ability is good, 9 student getting score between 71 – 80 which means that on the students' speaking ability is very good.

There were 4 students who got score 55 (12.0%), 7 students got score 60 (28.0%), 6 students got score 65 (24.0%), 5 students got score 70 (20.0%), 2 students got score 75 (8.0%), 2 student got score 80 (8.0%). The highest frequency was in score 56 (7 students).

## 2. The data of control class

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

**Table 4.7 Students' speaking ability score before and after being taught without using Plus Minus Interesting Strategy**

No	Name	Pre-test	Post-test
1	ALA	60	65
2	AST	65	65
3	AA	60	55
4	AN	55	50
5	ADP	55	60
6	AAA	60	55
7	DP	45	50
8	DIP	50	55

9	FEP	55	50
10	IA	50	65
11	IE	65	60
12	JKR	55	55
13	KA	60	65
14	MRM	50	55
15	MCH	55	60
16	MDZF	60	60
17	MZA	65	70
18	NA	65	65
19	NL	45	50
20	RG	70	70
21	RFK	65	70
22	RNB	55	55
23	SSP	60	65
24	SPR	55	50

Based on the table 4.7, there were 24 students as sample of the research.. The descriptive statistic of control class is as follows

a. Pre-test of Control Class

The researcher used SPSS 16.0 version to know the descriptive statistic and the frequency of students' pre-test in control class. The



frequency divided into five criterions: excellent, very good, good, enough/fair, poor, (see table 4.1). The result of the calculation is as follows :

**Table 4.8 Descriptive Statistic of Pre-test**

**Descriptive Statistics**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Pretest	24	45	70	57,50	6,594
Valid N (listwise)	24				

Based on the table 4.8 above, it showed that the minimum score of pre-test was 45, the maximum score was 70, and the mean was 57.50.

**Table 4.9 The Frequency of Students' Pre-test in Control Class**

**Pretest**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 45	2	8,3	8,3	8,3
50	3	12,5	12,5	20,8
55	7	29,2	29,2	50,0
60	6	25,0	25,0	75,0
65	5	20,8	20,8	95,8
70	1	4,2	4,2	100,0
Total	24	100,0	100,0	

From the table 4.9, The frequency of pretest score of control class after being distributed there are 5 students getting score between 41 – 50, which means that the students' speaking ability was poor, 13 students getting score between 51 – 60 which means that on the students' speaking ability is enough/fair. 6 students getting score between 61 – 70 which means that on the students' speaking ability is good

There were 2 students who got score 45 (8.3%), 3 students got score 50 (12.5%), 7 students got score 55 (29.2%), 6 students got score 60 (25.0%), 5 students got score 65 (20.8%), 1 student got score 70 (4.2%). The highest frequency was in score 55 (7 students) and score.

b. Post-test of Control Class

The researcher used SPSS 16.0 version to know the descriptive statistic and the frequency of students' post-test in control class. The frequency divided into five criterions: excellent, very good, good, enough/fair, poor, (see table 4.1). The result of the calculation is as follows :

**Table 4.10 Descriptive Statistic of Post-test**

**Descriptive Statistics**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Posttest	24	50	70	59,17	6,863
Valid N (listwise)	24				

Based on the table 4.10 above, it showed that the minimum score of post-test was 50, the maximum score was 70, and the mean was 59.17.

**Table 4.11 The Frequency of Students' Post-test in Control Class**

posttest

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 50	5	20,8	20,8	20,8
55	6	25,0	25,0	45,8
60	4	16,7	16,7	62,5
65	6	25,0	25,0	87,5
70	3	12,5	12,5	100,0
Total	24	100,0	100,0	

From the table 4.11, The frequency of posttest score of control class after being distributed there are 5 student getting score between 41 – 50, which means that the students' speaking ability was poor, 10 students getting score between 51 – 60 which means that on the students' speaking ability is enough/fair, 9 students getting score between 61 – 70 which means that on the students' speaking ability is good.

There were 5 students who got score 50 (20.8%), 6 students got score 55 (25.0%), 4 students got score 60 (16.7%), 6 students got score 65

(25.0%), 3 students got score 70 (12.5%). The highest frequency was in score 55 (6 students) and score 65 (6 students).

## B. Hypothesis Testing

Stating the null and alternative hypotheses

1. Null Hypothesis (Ho): There is no significant difference between the students' speaking scores before and after being taught by using Elicitation Technique.
2. Alternative Hypothesis (Ha): There is significant difference between the students' speaking scores before and after being taught by using Elicitation Technique.

To know whether there is any significant difference on students' speaking ability between students who were taught and who were not taught by using Elicitation Technique, The researcher computed Independent Sample Test by using SPSS 16.0 Version. The outputs are as follows:

**Table 4.12 The Output of Group Statistic**

Group Statistics					
	Kelas	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
nilai	kelas experiment	25	65,40	7,205	1,441
	kelas kontrol	24	59,17	6,863	1,401

As table 4.12 showed that mean in post- test of experimental group was higher then min of control group. It indicated that in the average, the use of elicitation techniue has coused the improvement of students speaking achievement. But it was important to know that such a conclusion was only a descriptive conclusion.

**Table 4.13 The Output of Independent Sample Test**

**Independent Samples 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
nilai	Equal variances assumed	,031	,861	3,098	47	,003	6,233	2,012	2,186	10,281
	Equal variances not assumed			3,101	46,998	,003	6,233	2,010	2,190	10,277

Before compute the t-test, the researcher did the homogeneity testing using F test (Levene's Test) to know whether to use *Equal Variance Assumed* or use *Equal Variance Not Assumed*. If the variance is

the same, then the t-test use equal variance assumed. If the variance is different, then the t-test use equal variance not assumed. The hypotheses in F test are as follows:

1. Ho: both variance are the same (experimental and control class).
2. Ha: both variance are different (experimental and control class).

Ho is accepted if P value  $> 0,05$  and Ho is rejected if P value  $< 0,05$ .

Based on the table 4.13 above, it shows that P value (sig) is 0,861. It means that 0,861 is bigger than 0,05 and Ho is accepted. It can be concluded that both variance (experimental and control class) are the same and that the researcher used Equal Variance Assumed in making decision of T-test.

Based on the table 4.13 above, the value of  $t_{\text{count}}$  (equal variance assumed) is 3.098 and P value is 0.000. At the significance level of 0.05 in two-tailed, the score of  $t_{\text{table}}$  is 1.995. It means that  $t_{\text{count}}$  is bigger than  $t_{\text{table}}$  ( $6.233 > 2.060$ ) and P value is smaller than 0.05 ( $0.000 < 0.05$ ). Since the value of  $t_{\text{count}}$  is bigger than  $t_{\text{table}}$  and P value is smaller than 0.05, it means that the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted and the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected. In other words, it can be concluded that there is significant difference on students' score in speaking ability between those who were taught by using Elicitation Technique and those who were not.

For interpretation of decision based on the result of probability achievement that was:

- a. If the probability  $>0.050$ , so the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) accepted
- b. If the probability  $<0.050$ , so the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) rejected

Since 0.000 is smaller than significance level ( $\alpha$ ) 5%. The null hypothesis is rejected. In other word, the hypothesis saying that the mean after the treatment is smaller than or equal to the one before the treatment is rejected. It automatically accepts the alternative hypothesis saying that the mean after the treatment is bigger than the one before the treatment.

The conclusion is that Elicitation Technique is effective for improving the student's speaking ability.

### **C. Discussion**

This part presents the discussion of the research findings. There are three research question proposed in this study. The discussion focuses on the finding of the three proposed research questions. The first discussion is about the students speaking before being taught by using elicitation technique. Meanwhile, the second discussion focuses on the students speaking after being taught by using elicitation technique. Third, the discussion focused about investigate there are any significant difference achievement before and after being taught by using elicitation technique.

According to Mujayanah (2004-16) In attempt to make the teaching and learning process successful, especially in teaching speaking, the

teacher should consider some characteristic of successful speaking. they are four characteristic : 1). Learners talk a lot 2). Participant is even 3) Motivation is high 4). Language is of an acceptable level.

There are many ways to teach english one of way to teach english especially speaking is elicitation technique. to support elicitation technique there are some previous study According to farida fatmawati (2006) and Era Litawati (2014) the main function of elicitation technique is elicate the idea from students.

From the result of the research finding above, it shows that there is significant difference on the students' score in speaking ability between those who were taught by Elicitation Technique with those who were not. The mean of the students who were taught by using Elicitation Technique (experimental class) are 53.40 in pre-test and 65.40 in post-test. The mean of the students who were not taught by using Elicitation Technique (control class) are 57.50 in pre-test and 59.17 in post-test, and the result of the mean difference is 6.233

Based on the research conducted at MTsN Pucanglaban Tulungagung, it can be inferenced that teaching students by using Elicitation Technique is better than students who are not. It means that Elicitation Technique is effective to use in teaching speaking ability. (Dailey, 2010). Obviously, it is very beneficial for language learning



because it can facilitate students' speaking and provide large opportunity of language practice.

Based on the result of this study above indicates that the Elicitation Technique treatment increase students' speaking ability. Students of eight grade at MTsN Pucanglaban have a good response while applying Elicitation Technique and that the students more enthusiastic in learning speaking ability.